



Date: September 26, 2022

To: Kim Hoffmans, R.N., Ed.D., Team Chair  
Brenda Thames, Ph.D., Vice Chair  
Kevin Bontenbal, Ed.D, ACCJC Staff Liaison

From: Susan Sperling, Ph.D., President, Chabot College

CC: Jamal Cooks, Ph.D., Accreditation Liaison Officer

Re: Chabot College Update on Core Inquiries

Chabot College is looking forward to the upcoming Focused Site Visit. In order to facilitate the team's review process, please see below pertinent college developments pertaining to the core inquiries, in addition to evidence the team may find helpful in advance of the visit.

**Core Inquiry 1:** The team seeks to confirm that all instructional programs (SLOs) and student support services (SAOs) are regularly evaluated for effectiveness related to continuous quality improvement.

**Standards or Policies:** I.B.2 and II.C.2

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 1.**

Overall, the regular evaluation and ensuing continuous improvement of instructional programs and support services are spearheaded by three committees: the Program and Area Review Committee (PAR), the Outcome and Assessment Committee (OAC), and the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC). The PAR committee runs the campus-wide review

process for academic, student, and administrative services and provides synthesis statements<sup>1</sup> and committee-specific reports.<sup>2</sup> The regular review and tracking of course-level, program-level, and service area outcomes is spearheaded by the OAC. The PRAC shepherds the resource prioritization and funding process, utilizing PAR recommendations for institutional planning.

The College regularly evaluates instructional programs (SLOs and PLOs) and service area outcomes (SAOs). All student service areas have SAOs, which are posted in a centralized spreadsheet.<sup>3</sup> Each service area website links to the centralized SAO list.<sup>4</sup>

The college follows a five-year assessment cycle for SLOs, PLOs, and SAOs. The OAC posts the five-year cycle for the review of SLOs<sup>5</sup>, PLOs<sup>6</sup> and SAOs<sup>7</sup> on their website. The policy to extend the review cycle for SLOs, PLOs, and SAOs from three to five years is a relatively recent change. The PAR process is on a three-year cycle (e.g., 2022-2025).<sup>8</sup> The prior PAR cycle (2018-2022) was extended to four years because Chabot wanted to do the comprehensive PAR once the implementation of new software for PAR was complete. (Updating PAR software to continuously improve the PAR process<sup>9</sup> was one of the goals of Chabot's institutional effectiveness planning initiative.) A full cycle of assessment can be seen by reviewing a programs' prior assessments,<sup>10</sup> accessible year-by-year on the PAR website.<sup>11</sup> The PAR, PRAC, and OAC are in the process of analyzing how to integrate assessment and planning cycles most effectively for PAR, SLOs, PLOs, SAOs, the Educational Master Plan, and accreditation.

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 1.**

1. [PAR-Synthesis-Statement\\_Fall-2021](#)
2. [PAR-Committee-Reports-Website](#)
3. [SAOs-Student-Services](#)
4. [Admissions-SAO-Web-Link](#)
5. [SLO-Cycle-Webpage](#)
6. [PLO-Cycle-Webpage](#)
7. [SAO-Cycle-Webpage](#)
8. [PAR-Cycle-Webpage](#)
9. [PAR-Cycle-Continuous-Improvement-Presentation\\_Fall-2021](#)
10. [PAR-Example-Program-Cycles](#)
11. [PAR-PreviousCycles-Yearly-Website](#)
12. [PAR-Completion-Report](#)
13. [SLO-Completion-Report\\_2018-2023](#)
14. [PLO-Completion-Report\\_2022](#)
15. [PAR-SAO-Completion\\_Fall-2021](#)
16. [PAR-Completion-Tracking-Website](#)
17. [OAC-SLO-PLO-SAO-Completion-Website](#)
18. [Curriculum-Curricunet-SLO-PLO-Assessment-Questions\\_Rev-5-22](#)
19. [Curriculum-Curricunet-SLO-PLO-Assessment-Examples](#)
20. [PAR-SLO-PLO-Questions\\_Fall-2022](#)
21. [PAR-SAO-Assessment-Examples\\_Fall-2021](#)

22. [SAO-Assessment-Updates\\_SpringSummerFall-2022](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

Since submitting the ISER, spreadsheets detailing assessment completion of PARs<sup>12</sup> (100%), SLOs<sup>13</sup> (95%), PLOs<sup>14</sup> (74%), and SAOs<sup>15</sup> (91%) have been updated. The college is supporting efforts to get to 100% assessment completion in 2022-23. The spreadsheet documenting PAR completion is posted on the PAR website.<sup>16</sup> Spreadsheets documenting SLO, PLO, and SAO assessment completion are posted on the OAC's website.<sup>17</sup> In the endeavor for continual improvement, the OAC updated PLO assessment questions in spring 2022 to gather more robust evidence of continuous improvement. Programs will utilize the updated PLO assessment questions in their next PLO assessment cycle.

The evaluation of instructional programs (SLOs and PLOs) and service area outcomes (SAOs) includes multiple processes of data analysis, reflection, and planning and regularly leads to continuous quality improvement. For example, the SLO and PLO assessment questions in CurricUNET/META ask faculty members to reflect on whether previous changes impacted learning and/or program outcomes and what future changes they intend to make based on assessment data.<sup>18</sup> Thus, SLO and PLO assessments include documentation of plans for improvement and how changes impact student learning.<sup>19</sup> Finally, in the PAR comprehensive year, faculty will be asked to reflect collectively across SLO/PLO assessments how the actions they took impacted student learning.<sup>20</sup>

To use assessment for continuous improvement in student learning and support services, historically, SAOs have been assessed through PAR. Examples of SAO assessments in the fall 2021 PARs illustrate how areas such as MESA-TRIO STEM, Puente, and General Counseling reflected on their data and made programmatic changes.<sup>21</sup> The SAO assessment report from the Fall 2021 PAR illustrated that many SAOs had been recently developed and not yet assessed. Thus, the vice president of student services collaborated with the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness to provide additional support for SAO assessment in 2022, resulting in many updated assessments.<sup>22</sup> Moving forward, the OAC plans to document SAO assessment through META, which will make support and tracking more streamlined.

**Core Inquiry 2:** The team seeks clarification about the process used to establish institution-set standards (ISS) and how the College determines it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement.

**Standards or Policies:** I.B.3

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions, or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 2.**  
(300 words max.)

Chabot College sets institution set-standards for course completion, certificates and associate degrees awarded, transfers, licensure exam pass rates, and employment rates based on a standard-deviation methodology. In the past, the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (ORPIE) calculated suggestions for institution-set standards based on: 1) calculating the standard deviation of the past five years of data to see how much a metric varies, on average; 2) multiplying the standard deviation by 1.96 and subtracting it from the most recent measurement; and 3) presenting the suggested institution-set standards to the Planning Resource and Allocation Committee (PRAC), so faculty, administrators, and classified professionals could discuss and modify to ensure alignment with the College's mission.<sup>1,2</sup>

To strengthen the institution-set standards process, the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) passed an updated methodology at their May 4, 2022 meeting.<sup>3,4</sup> The updated methodology suggests institution-set standards based on calculating one standard deviation (SD) for the past five years of data and subtracting one SD (as opposed to 1.96 SDs) from the most recent year's data measurement.<sup>4,5</sup> For metrics with large data spreads, this change will result in proposing institution-set standards that are closer to recent metric values to the PRAC, for their discussion, modification, and approval. This change will improve alert mechanisms for catching a decrease in course completion, degree/certificate awards, and transfer rates. The new methodology will also support timely investigation into areas warranting further investigation and actions from the college. The methodology for suggesting institution-set standards for Career and Technical Education (CTE) employment rates for the consideration by the PRAC and CTE faculty members and deans has remained consistent in calculating 90% of the Perkins rate.

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents pertaining to Core Inquiry 2 which will assist the team to better understand current college processes and outcomes.**

1. [InstitutionalEffectiveness-ISS-StretchGoalPresentation-PRAC 2020](#)
2. [InstitutionalResearch-Effectiveness-Goals 2020-21](#)
3. [PRAC-AgendaItem-Goals-ISS 5-4-22](#)
4. [PRAC-Minutes-Goals-ISS 5-4-22](#)
5. [InstitutionalEffectiveness-PRAC-Presentation-Indicators 2022](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

The PRAC also approved the updated methodology that will be utilized when the college falls below institution-set standards at their May 4, 2022, meeting. The ORPIE will compile the data for the ACCJC Annual Report, present the overall status on meeting institution-set standards and stretch goals to the PRAC, including alerts in areas where the college falls below set institution-set standards.<sup>4,5</sup> The PRAC will identify and discuss factors that may have led to decreases in institution-set standards and recommend further investigation into the need for potential changes in institutional policies or practices. The PRAC will also be responsible for: 1) identifying and notifying responsible administrator(s), committee(s), and related faculty and classified professionals; and 2) follow-up with responsible parties on actions taken.

**Core Inquiry 3:** The team seeks to confirm that program review occurs on a regular, scheduled cycle and is used to evaluate academic quality and drive continuous improvement, across both instruction and student services.

**Standards or Policies:** II.A.2, II.A.16 & II.C.1

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions, or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 3.**

Program review occurs on a regular, scheduled cycle. The master calendars for the program and curriculum review processes are posted on committee websites. The Program and Area Review (PAR) website details the three-year cycle for comprehensive and annual reviews<sup>1</sup> and documents completion of PAR by each program/area.<sup>2</sup> A full cycle of assessment can be seen by reviewing a programs' prior PARs,<sup>3</sup> accessible year-by-year on the PAR website.<sup>4</sup> The Outcome and Assessment Committee (OAC) posts the five-year cycle for the review of SLOs<sup>5</sup>, PLOs<sup>6</sup>, and SAOs.<sup>7</sup> The policy to extend the review cycle for SLOs, PLOs, and SAOs from three to five years is a relatively recent change. The PAR, PRAC, and OAC are in the process of analyzing how to integrate assessment and planning cycles most effectively for PAR, SLOs, PLOs, SAOs, the Educational Master Plan, and accreditation. Finally, the PRAC posts the calendar for the annual cycle of the resource request allocation process.<sup>8</sup>

The Curriculum Committee is responsible for the review of Course Outlines of Record (CORs) and the master calendar for COR reviews.<sup>9</sup> The Curriculum Committee annually reviews CORs and publishes the master list of courses that need to be updated. The list is emailed campus-wide and posted on the committee's website.<sup>10</sup> Deans and curriculum representatives remind faculty of the list to encourage compliance. The updated curriculum handbook<sup>11</sup> is posted on the curriculum committee website.<sup>12</sup>

Program Review is used to evaluate academic and student service quality and drive continuous improvement. The PAR committee conducts a systematic review of college-wide trends in program review and develops a synthesis statement based on quantitative and qualitative analyses.<sup>13</sup> The college-wide trend analyses in the synthesis statement were enhanced with the adoption of Qualtrics software. The decision to adopt Qualtrics was the result of the continuous evaluation and improvement of the PAR process.<sup>14</sup>

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents pertaining to Core Inquiry 3 which will assist the team to better understand current college processes and outcomes.**

1. [PAR-Cycle-Webpage](#)
2. [PAR-Completion-Report](#)
3. [PAR-Example-Program-Cycle-Math 2018-21](#)
4. [PAR-Prior-Years-Website](#)
5. [Outcomes-Assessment-SLO-Cycle-Webpage](#)
6. [Outcomes-Assemenet-PLO-Cycle-Webpage](#)
7. [Outcomes-Assessemnt-SAO-Cycle-Webpage](#)

8. [CRAM-Resource-Allocation-Calendar 6-2-2021](#)
9. [Master-Calendar-CORs AY-2022-23](#)
10. [Curriculum-CORs-Calendar-Webpage](#)
11. [Updated Curriculum Handbook](#)
12. [Curriculum-Committee-Handbook-Posted-Website](#)
13. [PAR-Synthesis-Statement Fall-2021](#)
14. [PAR-Cycle Continuous-Improvement Fall-2021](#)
15. [PRAC-PAR-Qualitative-Analysis-Presentation 2-2-22](#)
16. [PRAC-Minutes-Discussion-PAR 2-2-22](#)
17. [Classified-Senate-Minutes-PAR-Presentation](#)
18. [Faculty-Senate-Minutes-PAR-Presentation](#)
19. [PAR-Data-Report-IST Fall-2021](#)
20. [IST-Minutes-Discussing-of-PAR-Data 3-8-22](#)
21. [PLO-Completion-Report 2022](#)
22. [Curriculum-Curricunet-PLO-Assessment-Examples](#)
23. [Curriculum-Curricunet-PLO-Assessment-Questions](#)
24. [PAR-SAO-Assessments-Report Fall-2021](#)
25. [SAO Assessment Updates SpringSummerFall-2022](#)
26. [PRAC-Recommendation-Resource-Request-Based-on-PAR-DRAFT 2-18-21](#)
27. [PRAC-Minutes-Resource-Prioritization-Accountability 3-30-22](#)
28. [College-Annual-Planning-Priorities-Recommendations](#)
29. [Annual-Planning-Priorities](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

Campus-level follow-up discussions on PAR reviews are often guided by the PAR synthesis statement, such as the presentation<sup>15</sup> and follow up discussions in the PRAC,<sup>16</sup> Classified Senate,<sup>17</sup> and Faculty Senate.<sup>18</sup> Additionally, the PAR committee develops committee-specific reports. For example, the PAR committee prepared a report for the Instructional Services Committee (IST).<sup>19</sup> The IST discussed: 1) this report, 2) the PAR synthesis policy implications related to their committee, and 3) the process for handling resource requests.<sup>20</sup> Finally, academic disciplines often hold PAR follow-up discussions in area, department, and division meetings.

Documentation of the implementation of program- and service-level recommendations emanating from PAR is accomplished via assessment reports collected by the PAR committee and OAC. The documentation of PLO assessments,<sup>21</sup> led by the OAC and documented in CurricUNET/META, includes many ideas for continuous improvement.<sup>22</sup> Additionally, the OAC updated PLO assessment questions in spring 2022 to gather more robust evidence of continuous improvement in programs' next PLO assessment cycle.<sup>23</sup>

Through Fall 2021, service areas reported on the status of their SAOs in PARs.<sup>24</sup> The Fall 2021 PAR SAO assessment report illustrated many SAOs had been recently developed and not yet assessed. Thus, additional support for SAO assessment was provided in 2022, resulting in

updated assessments.<sup>25</sup> Moving forward, the OAC plans to document SAO assessment through META, which will make support and tracking more streamlined.

Documentation of the implementation of institutional-level recommendations emanating from PAR often occurs in the PRAC. For example, the PRAC gives instructions—grounded in the PAR synthesis statement—to shared governance committees about how to prioritize PAR resource requests.<sup>26</sup> PRAC requests follow-up presentations from shared governance committees detailing how they utilized PAR and PRAC recommendations in their funding prioritization processes.<sup>27</sup> Additionally, the PRAC spearheads discussions about how to integrate recommendations from the PAR synthesis statement with the priorities of the Educational Master Plan to develop recommendations to senior leadership<sup>28</sup> and for college annual planning priorities.<sup>29</sup>



**Core Inquiry 4:** The team seeks to verify that students receive a syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline of record (COR).

**Standards or Policies:** II.A.3

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions, or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 4.**

In the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) and Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association Faculty Agreement, under Article 9 Working Conditions in the 9B Syllabus Requirement, the contract stipulates that by the end of the first full week of classes, unit members shall submit to their appropriate administrator a copy of a syllabus for each course taught. For short-term classes, submission shall be by the end of the second class meeting. For online classes, submission shall be by the end of the first week of classes. One of 11 contractual items required on the syllabus are the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) associated with that course (which may be provided by text or links).<sup>1</sup>

To strengthen the system of verifying that students receive syllabi including SLOs from the College's officially approved Course of Record (COR), the College implemented a standardized review process for instructional and student services deans. Effective summer 2022, the vice president of academic services communicated to faculty compliance expectations for faculty to include learning outcomes from the officially approved course outline of record (COR) on all course syllabi received by students. In turn, college deans were notified of their role and responsibility in the review of course syllabi in their respective departments and in verifying the inclusion of stated or linked SLOs from the COR on all course syllabi.<sup>2,3,4</sup> The deans are successfully tracking compliance for each course offered, in a spreadsheet organized by course, division, and semester.<sup>5</sup> In addition, compliance results are a standing meeting agenda item for the Chabot Office of Academic Services Team (COAST), prior to the beginning of and during the semester, as a platform for ongoing suggested improvements.<sup>6</sup>

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 4.**

1. [FA-Contract-9B-Syllabus 2019-2022 pgs-38-39](#)
2. [VP-Email-to-Faculty-RE-WelcomeBackReminders-SLOs 8-5-22](#)
3. [VP-Email-to-Faculty-RE-SLOs-FacultySyllabi 6-1-22](#)
4. [VP-Email-to-Deans-RE-SLOs-FacultySyllabi 5-27-22](#)
5. [COR-Syllabi-Verification-Fall 9-23-2022](#)
6. [COAST-Agendas-SOL-CORS 2021-2022](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

**Core Inquiry 5:** The team seeks evidence of effective use/review of delivery modes and teaching methodologies to reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students.

**Standards or Policies:** II.A.7

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 5.**  
(300 words max.)

Chabot College effectively uses and reviews delivery modes and teaching methodologies to reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students. Since Fall 2017, Chabot's Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (ORPIE) has published student success and retention rates for different delivery modes. Data is available for overall success and retention rates over time, by race and ethnicity over time, and by course for every semester.<sup>1,2,3</sup>

In addition, the Chabot Instructional Technology Department submits an Annual Distance Education Report to the CLPCCD Board of Trustees.<sup>4</sup> The report presented to the Board of Trustees in August 2021 highlights the importance of closing equity gaps in distance education and the work in progress at Chabot through faculty training, the creation of a student support hub within the Canvas system, and the analysis of student success and retention data.

Also in Fall 2021, the Chabot Committee on Online Learning (COOL) reinstated a revised process to help instructors create student-focused, quality DE courses.<sup>5</sup> This revised process includes the completion of an Online Teaching Plan<sup>6</sup> which asks the instructor to provide detailed information on how they will meet regulations such as Virtual Equivalent, Accessibility, and Regular Effective Contact (instructor-student interaction and student-student interaction). Submitted Online Teaching Plans are posted on the COOL website and reviewed by a COOL Support Team.<sup>7</sup> Instructors also complete a Canvas Course Site Review if they have not previously had a site reviewed by the COOL. The COOL provides a Canvas Course Site Checklist<sup>8</sup> which includes a combination of aspects from three established rubrics: the Peralta Equity Rubric, the CVC-OEI Course Design Rubric, and the previous COOL Course Site Review Checklist. The COOL Support Team provides feedback on the course site to support the instructor as they design a quality DE course.

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents pertaining to Core Inquiry 5 which will assist the team to better understand current college processes and outcomes.**

1. [InstitutionalResearch-OverallSuccess-OnlineHybrid-Face-to-Face\\_Fall-2017-Spring-2022](#)
2. [InstitutionalResearch-SuccessRates-Online-FaceToFace-ByEthnicity-Fall-2016-20](#)
3. [InstitutionalResearch-SuccessRates-Online-FaceToFace-ByCourse\\_Fall-2021](#)
4. [InstructionalTechnologyDepartment-AnnualDistanceEducationReport\\_August-2021](#)
5. [COOL-ProcessOverview-Webpage](#)

6. [COOL-OnlineTeachingPlan-Form-Example](#)
7. [COOL-OnlineTeachingPlans Fall-2021](#)
8. [COOL-CanvasCourseSiteChecklist](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

**Core Inquiry 6:** The team seeks clarification on how library and learning support services are evaluated to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs.

**Standards or Policies:** II.B.3

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 6.**  
(300 words max.)

The Bi-annual Library Student Survey supports regular evaluation of Library and learning support services. Data from these surveys assures the adequacy and effectiveness of resources in meeting identified student needs and support changes in policies, and improvements in services. The effectiveness of laptop/hotspot lending was evaluated as part of the 2022 Bi-annual Library Student Survey.<sup>1</sup> TutorTrac, TutorLingo, and online tutorials effectiveness were evaluated in the 2019 Service Area Outcomes Survey.<sup>2</sup>

Results of the Bi-Annual Library Student Survey, 2022 show that students are satisfied with the Library's laptops and hotspots<sup>3</sup> likewise, students are generally satisfied with Library online tutorials.<sup>4</sup> In addition, results from stand-alone surveys, indicate that checking out a laptop and hotspot respectively, helps students to participate in and to complete their coursework.<sup>5,6</sup> More specifically, according to students, library laptops allow them to complete class assignments<sup>7</sup> and library hotspots allow students to maintain internet connectivity with little to no interruptions.<sup>8</sup> Survey results also indicate that students prefer a semester-long checkout period for both laptops and hotspots.<sup>9,10</sup> These data will inform future checkout services and loan period policies. In sum, these evaluation methods, and subsequent results for assessing the effectiveness of laptops, hotspots and online tutorials are helping to gauge the diverse library and technology needs of Chabot students.

The 2019 Service Area Outcomes Survey included questions to assess the effectiveness of TutorTrac and TutorLingo. Results indicated that most students simply preferred to schedule their appointments in person; however, some reported that they found the platform confusing or difficult to navigate or to locate the login online. For those who did use TutorTrac to schedule their appointments, most responses were favorable: 61.7% either agreed or strongly agreed that they were easily able to sign in and navigate TutorTrac. For TutorLingo, tutors provided feedback on each video viewed via the TutorLingo platform. Monthly reports were sent to the TUTOR 1A instructor and LC Administrative Assistant.<sup>11</sup>

Together, these evaluative tools build on the Library and Learning Connection's continuous improvement measures, and more specifically, assure the adequacy of services in meeting identified student needs.

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents pertaining to Core Inquiry 6 which will assist the team to better understand current college processes and outcomes.**

1. [Library-StudentSurvey-Results\\_6-20-22](#)
2. [LearningConnection-StudentSurvey-Responses\\_Spring-2019](#)
3. [Library-StudentSurveyResults-Laptops-Hotspots\\_6\\_20\\_22-17\\_page-17](#)
4. [Library-StudentSurveyResults-OnlineTutorials\\_6-20-22\\_pages-3-4-6](#)
5. [Library-LaptopSurvey-Coursework\\_6\\_20\\_22\\_page-3](#)
6. [Library-HotspotsSurveyResults-Coursework\\_6-20-22\\_page-3](#)
7. [Library-LaptopSurvey-Assignments\\_6\\_20\\_22\\_pages-7-8-9](#)
8. [Library-HotspotsSurveyResults-Interruptions\\_6\\_20\\_22-page-5](#)
9. [Library-LaptopSurveyResults-Semester\\_6\\_20\\_22-2\\_page-2](#)
10. [Library-HotspotsSurveyResults-Semester\\_6\\_20\\_22\\_page-2](#)
11. [LearningConnection-TutorLingo-Survey\\_05-2020](#)
12. [LearningConnection-Accumedia-StudentSurvey-Responses\\_Spring-2022](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

The Learning Connection is no longer using TutorTrac as our scheduling platform for tutoring. During the period of remote instruction and services due to the COVID-19 pandemic, both students and tutors reported anecdotally some frustrations with TutorTrac and Pisces. More specifically, students reported frustrations with having to switch between platforms for online tutoring appointments and online drop-in tutoring.

The Learning Connection began exploring platforms that would: 1) integrate all services together, and 2) better support the 21.3% of students who disagreed or strongly disagreed that they were easily able to sign in and navigate TutorTrac in our 2019 Service Area Outcomes survey. After some research, Accudemia was identified as a potential replacement platform to address these two main issues, and a focus group was conducted to collect tutor feedback on their experiences and preferences.<sup>12</sup> Based on student responses, we began using Accudemia in fall 2021. We are currently conducting our bi-annual Service Area Outcomes student survey, which will include questions to assess the effectiveness of Accudemia. In addition to the bi-annual Service Area Outcomes survey, regular assessments of Accudemia for both face-to-face and online tutoring will be conducted once both services are available again to students.

**Core Inquiry 7:** The team seeks confirmation that personnel are evaluated systematically and at stated intervals, to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement.

**Standards or Policies:** III.A.5

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions, or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 7.**  
(300 words max.)

The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Office of Human Resources (HR) provides leadership, direction, and support for tracking personnel evaluations in coordination with the College for: administrators, classified professionals, classified supervisors, confidential employees, and tenure track faculty. HR also tracks part-time faculty evaluations that result in a less-than-satisfactory rating, as a subsequent part-time faculty evaluation of less-than-satisfactory can result in the employee's removal from the part-time faculty seniority list.

The College is solely responsible for tracking personnel evaluations for tenured faculty, part-time faculty, and temporary faculty. The descriptions of processes and associated forms for all personnel evaluations are located on the CLPCCD Human Resources website.<sup>1</sup> Evaluations are guided by the Collective Bargaining Agreements for classified professionals and faculty.<sup>2</sup>

HR and the College maintain tracking systems to ensure that all personnel classifications are evaluated in accordance with district policies and procedures at stated intervals. For example, HR forwards upcoming administrator evaluation communications in August each year to the president, and/or responsible vice president or dean/manager. The president's email notification includes a four-tab spreadsheet of: 1) Chabot Master Eval List; 2) Chabot 360 Evals; 3) Chabot Annual Evals; and 4) Chabot Contracts Ending at the end of the academic year. At the same time, vice presidents and deans/managers receive similar email notifications of upcoming administrator evaluations in their respective areas. All administrator personnel evaluations are due to HR mid-January.<sup>3</sup>

Typically, one month in advance, supervising administrators are notified by an email with attached spreadsheets of upcoming SEIU Probationary, SEIU Annual, and Classified Supervisors and Confidential employee evaluations, by HR. Responsible administrators may also receive follow-up emails with attached spreadsheets from HR for a status update when evaluations have not been received.<sup>4</sup>

Tenure track faculty evaluations are initiated in accordance with the Faculty CBA, Article 14.<sup>5</sup> Tenure-track faculty are evaluated regularly for four years, at which point they are eligible for tenure.<sup>6</sup> Once tenured, the College is solely responsible for the initiation and tracking of evaluations of tenured faculty (evaluated every three years). Similarly, the College is solely

responsible for the evaluation of part-time faculty (evaluated within the first two terms, and there after once every three calendar years, except for a break in service, then part-time faculty are evaluated in the first semester of reemployment).

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 8.**

1. [CLPCCD-HR-Evaluations-Webpage](#)
2. [CLPCCD-HR-CollectiveBargainingAgreements-Webpage](#)
3. [CLPCCD-HR-Emails-To-President-VPs-RE-Management-Evaluations 2021-2022\\*\\*](#)
4. [CLPCCD-HR-Emails-To-President-VPs-RE-ClassifiedEvaluations 2022\\*\\*](#)
5. [CLPCCD-FacultyContract-Article-14-TenureTrackFacultyEvaluations 2019-2022 page-139](#)
6. [BoardApproval-TenureTrackFaculty-Email 1-21-22](#)
7. [AcademicServices-MasterPersonnel-EvaluationReport\\*\\*](#)
8. [StudentServices-Classified-N-FacultyEvaluationTracking-Masters 2020-21](#)
9. [Deans-ArtsMediaCommunication-ScienceMath-EmployeeEvaluations-Tracking-](#)
10. [CLPCCD-FacultyContract-MOUs 2020-2021](#)

**\*\* Due to confidential personnel information, accompanying spreadsheets for some evidence documents will not be provided in the report, but will be accessible to the team during the site visit.**

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

Whereas district HR spearheads the tracking and notifications for personnel evaluations of administrators, classified professionals, classified supervisors, confidential employees, and tenure track faculty; the College is responsible for tracking tenured and part-time faculty evaluations. To this end, the offices of the vice president of academic services and vice president of student services utilize internal tracking spreadsheets to track personnel evaluations in their respective areas. (Such a spreadsheet is not necessary for the office of administrative services, as there are no tenured and part-time faculty in this area.) The academic services spreadsheet is a comprehensive historical report and tracks tenured, tenure track, and part-time faculty, classified, and administrator personnel evaluations. While this report is not utilized as a predictive tracking tool, completed personnel evaluation in academic services are recorded.<sup>7</sup> Student Services uses internal spreadsheets to track classified staff, tenured faculty, tenure track, and part-time counselor previous evaluations, next evaluations, and evaluation completed dates.<sup>8</sup> In addition, internal division tracking reports are maintained by some deans to monitor evaluations in their areas.<sup>9</sup>



The College makes every effort to complete timely evaluations for all personnel classifications. However, the April 2020 MOU between CLPCCD and the Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association specified adjustments, because of Covid-19 Campus Closures in Articles 14, 15 and 18 of the CBA, in faculty peer, tenure track, tenured, and part-time faculty evaluations. Subsequent MOU addendums updates August 2020, February 2021, and May 2021 also related to faculty evaluations. The February 2021 MOU update outlined the resumption of the Normal Evaluation Cycle (Articles 15 and 16), for faculty evaluations that may have been impacted during Campus Closures. As such, evaluations for some unit members are scheduled to resume between Spring 2021 and Spring 2024.<sup>10</sup>

**Core Inquiry 8:** The team seeks evidence which demonstrates how the College assures safe and sufficient physical resources.

**Standards or Policies:** III.B.1

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 8.**

Chabot College strives to provide a safe environment for all on campus. It does this through coordinated efforts between divisions, the district, outside agencies, and the public. Numerous processes that emphasize safety as a community effort are implemented at the college. Currently, the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) is implementing a new security system that includes HD security cameras, electronic access control, and alarms.

A major process that Chabot College has engaged in relevant to safe and sufficient physical resources is collaborating in developing the Security Master Plan.<sup>1</sup> This comprehensive plan is developed jointly at the district and college level. At the district level, several employees and divisions participate, such the manager of emergency preparedness and workplace safety and the vice chancellor of facilities and bond program. At the college level, senior administrators, the Health and Safety Committee, and Campus Safety are involved. The plan details requirements for physical security, and information regarding the security camera program. The Security Master Plan outlines employee training and programs developed to ensure safety, encourages all employees to submit observations regarding safety issues, and serves as a guide in moving the college forward in safety protocols. The college is constantly reviewing and adapting to the changes implemented from the Security Management System and Security Master Plan.

The College also assures safe and sufficient physical resources through the work of the Health and Safety Committee. This committee meets once a month and provides a forum for safety discussions and interactions between key stakeholders and is a key focal point for the campus safety department to interact with the college community, outside of calls for service. In the Health and Safety committee meetings, the college community raises and addresses ongoing safety concerns.<sup>2,3</sup> The committee also develops plans and actions designed to address potential safety concerns and serves as an information sharing platform. Finally, as mentioned above, the Health and Safety Committee plays a pivotal role in the review of the Security Master Plan.

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 8.**

1. [CLPCCD-SecurityMasterPlan-Final\\_06-13-18](#)
2. [Health and Safety meeting minutes- Injury and Illness Prevention Program \(IIPP\) Update-9-14-21](#)
3. [Health and Safety meeting minutes-E.g. Faculty Safety Concern-2-8-22](#)
4. [Dispatch-InfoCalls 3-19-22-to-4-11-22 pgs 3-5-7](#)
5. [Dispatch-MiscCalls 3-10-22-to-4-7-22 pgs 4-9-10](#)
6. [Campus-Safety-Security-Reporting-Webpage](#)
7. [Various health and safety plans-website](#)
8. [CLPCCD Workplace Safety-District Responsibility-webpage](#)
9. [Health and Safety meeting minutes-E.g. Faculty Safety Concern-2-8-22](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max)**

Safety hazards are identified by college personnel, students, and campus visitors. Additionally, campus safety hazards are identified through routine patrols, maintenance work, or by closed circuit television monitoring. These safety hazards may be reported in-person, through email, or telephone. These reports can come from the person observing the hazard, or second-hand as well. Reports of safety hazards are documented electronically by Campus Safety and evaluated for who is responsible to address.<sup>4,5</sup> If it is determined that the hazard is an emergency or life threatening, then emergency services are contacted via 911. Once the appropriate department is contacted, necessary steps are taken to address the hazard.<sup>6</sup>

The safety plan is part of the Security Master Plan and is developed at both the college- and district level through various employees, including the manager of emergency preparedness and workplace safety, as well as the vice chancellor of facilities and bond program.<sup>7,8</sup> It is developed through several drafts and meetings that determine the needs of the district and colleges. The safety plan is reviewed through several levels of the district's hierarchy. It is first reviewed at the district level by those developing the plan. From there the plan is provided to the administration, Campus Safety, and the Health and Safety committees of both campuses for review and feedback to the District Office.<sup>9</sup> Once elements of the safety plan are implemented, District and college employees conduct an assessment. For example, as the installation of new emergency call towers is assessed by the Campus Safety departments of both colleges, they will provide feedback to the district.

**Core Inquiry 9:** The team seeks to confirm how the College continuously plans for, updates, and replaces technology.

**Standards or Policies:** III.C.2

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 9.** (300 words max.)

Since the Peer Review Team’s review of the Chabot College ISER, the College has reflected on and taken the following measures to strengthen the process to plan, update, and replace technology. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (CLPCCD) contracted with WTC Consulting to develop a District and College Strategic Technology Plan.<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup> WTC’s scope of work included separate but related plans for both the College<sup>6</sup> and District to facilitate a common strategic direction, while recognizing that each is a unique entity. The college plan identifies a long-term initiative to “Maintain a Current Technical Environment” with corresponding projects to replace equipment throughout the campus. The initiative recognizes that while projects will begin and end, the need to update and replace equipment is on-going.<sup>7</sup> Most equipment replacement will be funded via the Measure A Bond. In addition, equipment will be acquired as part of new construction.

The District and College Technology Committees (TCC and IST respectively), reviewed the Board adopted 2017 Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Model in 2021-22.<sup>8,9,10</sup> The TCO Model will be re-benchmarked in Spring 2023 to account for changes in costs and equipment lifespans. While the college maintains detailed records for equipment which include the device name, serial number, purchase date and replacement date, as evidenced in “Chabot College Inventory”<sup>11</sup>, the College has acquired a more feature-rich inventory tool, GigaTrak,<sup>12</sup> which will allow staff to scan equipment in and out of service and maintain more detailed records. GigaTrak will consolidate the current database of in-service computers with the manual lists of decommissioned systems. The system will also track a wider variety of equipment including projectors, network switches, and video screens.<sup>13</sup>

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 1.**

1. [BOT-Agenda-Approval-WTC-Contract 3-15-22 pages-1n3n18](#)
2. [BOT-Minutes-Approval-WTC-Contract 3-15-22 pages-1n29](#)
3. [BOT-Reccords-WTC-Contract 3-15-22 page-10](#)
4. [BOT-Presenation-UpdateBoardOnPlanning-5-17-22](#)
5. [CLPCCD-Tech-Plan 8-25-22](#)
6. [Chabot-Tech-Plan 8-4-22](#)

7. [Chabot-Tech-Plan\\_8-4-22\\_page-3](#)
8. [TCC-Minute-Review-Of-TotalCostOfOwnership\\_11-19-21\\_page-2](#)
9. [IST-Minutes-Report-TotalCostOfOwnership\\_4-12-22\\_page-1](#)
10. [IST-Minutes-Reports-CollegeInput-N-Participation-2-8-22](#)
11. [ComputerSupport-Computer-Inventory](#)
12. [CLPCCD-Gigatrak-Contract\\_7-28-22](#)
13. [Gigatrak-Proposal\\_7-13-22](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

The College adheres to the replacement cycle with some key exceptions. Equipment is kept past the replacement date if it is essential to classes, programs, or services. As an example, a class dependent upon instructor-written programs that only run on a specific piece of hardware would delay the replacement. It should also be noted that the College shifted from replacement to focus on fleet growth due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Rather than replace computers, the college deployed new laptops to students for instruction. Additionally, laptops were assigned, and desktops redeployed to staff to enable remote work. Off-cycle purchases, another exception, can be requested via program and area review, the IST Committee, or with a Help Desk Ticket, in the event of a system failure. As with nearly all electronic equipment, supply-chain issues have delayed the acquisition of some equipment.

**Core Inquiry 10:** The team is interested in learning more about the college's inclusive tri-chair governance process as an innovation leading to institutional excellence.

**Standards or Policies:** IV.A.1, IV.A.3, and IV.A.5

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 10.**  
(300 words max.)

Leadership and decision-making on the Chabot College campus is truly a collaborative effort, as evidenced by the participation of all college constituency groups through our shared governance model. The Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Manual, adopted in 2017, details shared governance processes at the College.<sup>1</sup> This new shared governance model provides the structures for classified professionals to engage in shared decision-making, representation in higher numbers across multiple committees, opportunities for leadership engagement on committees, and the application of expertise on issues affecting student support and success, and issues significantly impacting classified professionals. The shared governance structure was developed in an intentional way, so that classified professionals would be valued and supported by administration to engage and become more involved in the college and decision-making processes.<sup>2</sup> Overall, the process has supported the development of a culture of inclusion and shared leadership of the college.<sup>3</sup>

Classified professionals are appointed to fifty-five seats across fifteen committees on campus and five seats on five district-wide shared governance committees. In addition to representatives, classified professionals are appointed to tri-chair roles for six key decision-making college committees. Furthermore, classified professionals serve in tri-chair roles on district-wide committees, which are appointed by the respective committee's members. Classified tri-chairs are appointed annually, typically in May-June, by the membership of the Classified Senate. Representatives are appointed starting in June for the following academic year.<sup>4,5,6,7</sup> Committee tri-chairs often serve on the committee prior to being appointed to serve as chair. Once appointed, classified tri-chairs typically serve a three-year term, which provides consistency and the capacity to follow through on committee recommendations.

Classified professionals are provided with training and mentoring to effectively participate in the work of shared governance committees. The tri-chair model (classified, faculty, and administration) supports collaborative working relationships, builds trust, and promotes equal distribution of work. The Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (ORPIE) typically provides chair training in early fall, prior to meetings beginning for the academic year.<sup>8,9</sup>

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents pertaining to Core Inquiry 10 which will assist the team to better understand current college processes and outcomes.**

1. [SharedGovernance-Process 2019](#)
2. [Committee-Evaluation-Form-AY-2019-2020](#)
3. [FIT-Meeting-TriChair-Testimonial 6-23-22](#)
4. [ClassifiedSenate-Agenda-Appointment-ClassifiedTri-Chairs 5-20-22](#)
5. [ClassifiedSenate-Agenda-Appointment-Committees 6-23-22](#)
6. [ClassifiedSenate-Agenda-Appointment-Chairs-N-Representatives 6-17-21](#)
7. [ClassifiedSenate-Minutes-Appointment-Chairs-N-Representatives 6-17-22 pages-1n2](#)
8. [SharedGovernance-Training Fall-2020](#)
9. [SharedGovernance-Meeting-pptx Fall-2020](#)
10. [ClassifiedSenateChairSupport-Agenda 11-16-21](#)
11. [PRAC-Recommendation-ChairCompensation 6-9-22](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work. (300 words max.)**

The Classified Senate provides support in numerous ways for classified professional engagement and leadership in shared governance. For example, the senate conducts an annual retreat in July for committee representatives and chairs; one session is specifically dedicated to shared governance. Prior to Covid-19, the Classified Senate provided monthly chair support meetings, especially for new chairs who may need additional support, as well as mid-year check-ins to discuss any areas in need of attention, as well as to celebrate accomplishments. Moving forward, these meetings will be re-instated, as needed.<sup>10</sup>

The compensation structure developed for the tri-chair model includes compensation for classified professional tri-chairs which is equal in number of hours funded to those of their faculty counterparts. The additional hours can be paid out in overtime or added to an employee's leave bank to be used within one year. The compensation model was developed by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (ORPIE) with the support of the College President, and approved by the college's Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC).<sup>11</sup>

In addition to funding for tri-chair work, the College President has approved a tentative compensation/release time structure for the Classified Senate President, which is being piloted in fiscal years 2022-24. This includes sixteen hours of release time per week for the fall and spring, and eight hours per week for the summer term. An hourly substitute is hired to backfill the release time, ensuring the traditional work responsibilities of the Classified Senate President are completed. This system enables a broader segment of classified professionals to serve as president and not just those who are able to do overtime work. In this way, the College administration has been exceptionally supportive and forward thinking in promoting the work of classified professionals in shared governance work.

**District Core Inquiry 1:** The Team seeks clarification of how resources at the district are provided to ensure total cost of ownership (TCO).

**Standards or Policies:** III.B.4

**Briefly describe any institutional improvements, strengthening of processes, documented outcomes, discussions or reflections which have occurred pertaining to Core Inquiry 1.** (300 words max.)

The District has an improved TCO Plan that was accepted by the Board on February 21, 2017.<sup>1,2</sup> Since that time, the District's Facilities Committee has reviewed at least annually the TCO metrics and has used that to inform its requests for additional positions. In addition, the District's Planning and Budget Committee has been in discussions for a new budget allocation model and there is agreement within that committee that within this new allocation model Maintenance and Operations will be funded based upon changes in square footage, separate from the other District locations and irrespective of changes in state apportionment.

**Evidence: Provide the list of evidentiary documents which will assist the team to better understand college processes, outcomes, and activities pertaining to Core Inquiry 1.**

1. [Board-Approved-TCO-Plan 2-21-17](#)
2. [BOT-Minutes-TCO-Plan-Approval 2-17-21\\_page-15](#)

**Context/additional information (if applicable): Please feel free to provide any additional relevant information that provides context for the college's work.** (300 words max.)

The District's approved TCO Plan was the result of substantial work and has been utilized to inform changes in funding through the work of the Facilities Committee. The Facilities Committee makes requests based upon known upcoming changes in facilities and equipment. This has informed the Resource Allocation Process through allocation of incremental resources. Oftentimes, other restricted financial resources are provided outside of the Resource Allocation Process that can provide additional funds to relieve the unrestricted fund, as well.