

ACCREDITATION FOLLOW-UP REPORT
OF CHABOT COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Submitted by:

Chabot College

25555 Hesperian Boulevard

Hayward, California 94545

To:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	2
Certification of Follow-Up Report.....	4
Statement of Report Preparation.....	5
Background.....	6
Response to Recommendation 2.....	7
Resolution of Recommendation	7
Analysis of Results Achieved to Date	9
Evidence of Results.....	10
Additional Plans Developed	11
Appendices.....	12
Appendix 1: Program Review and Action Planning Document	
Appendix 2: Program Review and Budget Process Diagram	
Appendix 3: IPBC Revised Charge	
Appendix 4: Faculty Prioritization Process	
Appendix 5: Classified Staff Prioritization Process	
Appendix 6: Budget Request Summary Sheets	
Appendix 7: Program Review Time-lines	
Appendix 8: Course Level SLO List	
Appendix 9: SLO & Assessment Time-line	
Appendix 10: SLO Development & Assessment Progress Chart	
Appendix 11: Program Level Curriculum Alignment	
Appendix 12: Program Level Outcomes Progress	
Appendix 13: Faculty SLO Inquiry Groups	

Appendix 14: Program Review Data

Appendix 15: Program Review College-Wide Data

Appendix 16: Program Review Presentation College Day 8/17/2010

From:

Chabot Community College
25555 Hesperian Boulevard
Hayward, California 94545

The institutional Follow-Up Report is submitted to provide information regarding the specific recommendation identified by the Commission in its evaluation of Chabot Community College based on a site visit from October 19-22, 2009. This report serves to report Chabot College's progress in meeting the recommendation.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe that this report accurately reflects the progress made in responding to the Commission's Recommendation.

Dr. Celia Barberena, President, Chabot College

Date

Dr. George Railey, Vice President of Academic Services,
Chabot College

Date

Dr. Joel Kinnamon, Chancellor, Chabot-Las Positas
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

Date

Donald L. "Dobie" Gelles, President
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
Board of Trustees

Date

STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION

On October 19 through the 22, 2009, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges conducted a site visit. Subsequent to the site visit Chabot College received a letter dated January 29, 2010, from the Commission for Community and Junior Colleges reaffirming Chabot College's accreditation with the requirement that the college submit a Follow-Up Report focused on one recommendation from the evaluation site visit.

At the direction of our college president, the Program Review Steering Committee and Academic and Student Services Deans held meetings during the months of December, January, February, March and April to evaluate our current program review and unit planning processes in order to simplify and combine them into a streamlined, integrated whole, per the visiting team's recommendation.

A draft of the Follow-Up Report was reviewed by the college shared governance committees and the college president. A copy of the Follow-Up Report was posted on the Chabot College web for campus-wide comment and revised accordingly. In September the Follow-Up Report was presented to the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Board for first reading and submitted for second reading and approval at its September board meeting.

BACKGROUND

Chabot College administrators and representatives from its shared governance, Curriculum, and Student Learning Outcomes committees held meetings with the Program Review Steering Committee on December 10 and 15, 2009. The meetings, moderated by Julie Slark of California Community College Brain Trust (CCBT), were held to develop processes that more clearly and effectively combine the results of program review, unit planning, student learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional planning and budget.

Following the review of our program review and unit planning processes, ten recommendations were brought forward; (1) congratulate the college community for well-deserved program review success at every opportunity; (2) enhance the role of student learning outcomes (SLOs); (3) streamline and simplify program review web materials and process documents; (4) refine the program review cycle and timelines; (5) re-build strong program review committee participation, leadership and strength so that the committee can fulfill its role in providing structured review and feedback of one-year program review reports; (6) further develop our SLO model and integrate it into program review to insure that SLO assessment is an ongoing and continuous process; (7) conduct a communication campaign about program review and planning by all college administrators; (8) document administrator/dean roles in program review support, communication and feedback; (9) examine program review measures for completeness and consider adding additional components, such as workforce training, staff development, interdisciplinary activities, articulation issues, technology and pedagogical inquiry; and (10) maintain a group of SLO, program review, and institutional leaders to oversee, refine, and coordinate program review with unit planning, student learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional planning and budgeting.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation 2

In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college develop processes that more clearly and effectively combine the results of program review with unit planning, student learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional planning and budgeting. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.I.a, II.A.I.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.I.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.I, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, II.C.2)

Resolution of Recommendation:

The college has developed processes to more clearly and effectively integrate its program review results with unit planning, student learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional planning and budgeting. The process, which occurs over three years, features, in the first year, a deep data program review from which an action plan for program improvement is developed. Creation of the action plan is informed by college wide planning and budgeting priorities. (These priorities are developed in the Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC), formerly the Institutional Planning and Budget Committee. See page 8.) The data is comprised of reports on success and equity, follow through in course sequences, course currency, budget history, enrollment data, student learning outcomes and assessments, and relevant external data from constituent communities. Program review analysis lays the foundation for every request for program resources, supplies, equipment, and personnel. (See Appendices 14 & 15) The action plan is implemented in the second and third program review update years. The third year program review plan also includes an assessment of the entire three-year cycle.

In the second program review year the program updates its program review action plan, citing accomplishments by comparing year one's program review data with data from year two, and detailing the status of SLO development on the course and program levels. The program also articulates how its activities harmonize with college planning and budgeting goals as part of its request for physical and personnel resources. (See Appendix 7)

The third program review year follows through with year two's implementation of the action plan and offers a time to reflect on the entire process. The program completes a progress summary, which includes a description of its successful strategies and best practices, along with a discussion of the challenges and barriers to success it has encountered. Budget requests in the

third year are supported by this discussion and reference back to the original year one program review action plan and year two and three implementation efforts. (See Appendix 1, pg. 13)

To improve the integration of program review with unit planning, student learning outcomes and assessments, and institutional planning and budgeting, the Institutional Planning and Budget Committee (IPBC) was reorganized to include the chair from every shared governance committee, as well as administrators, students, and classified professionals.. The IPBC was renamed the Planning, Review and Budget Council (PRBC) to more accurately reflect its pivotal role at the college. (See Appendix 3)

Data, analysis, action planning, and evidence of successful implementation are used in the allocation of physical and personnel resources in every area of the college. For example, when programs ask for additional faculty, a proposal is made before the Faculty Prioritization Committee, which is comprised of administrators, faculty, classified professionals, and students. Only requests already included in program review and unit planning documents are considered by the faculty prioritization committee. This insures that there is a documented history of need and program planning for any new faculty positions added at the college. The hiring process requires the presentation of data, analysis, and action planning contained in program review and unit planning documents. Program review and unit plans are reviewed and discussed with program faculty during prioritization committee meetings and deliberations. This helps insure that requests are reviewed using the same criteria for all programs, that there is an existing plan and rationale in place (program review and unit planning documentation) for the addition of faculty to a specific program, and that the plan harmonizes with institutional planning and budgeting priorities. After reviewing and prioritizing the requested positions, the committee forwards its recommendations to the PRBC for additional recommendations based on institutional strategic planning priorities, next to the College Council, and then to the college president for final approval. (See Appendix 4)

The same requirement of data, analysis, and action planning, as evidenced in program review and unit planning documents, exists in considering the addition of classified professional positions, which are reviewed by college deans, vice presidents, the PRBC and the Classified Senate President. This group forwards its recommendations to College Council and then to the college president for final approval. (See Appendix 5)

When it comes to requests for physical resources, such as supplies, equipment or facilities, yet again the same requirement of data, analysis, and action planning as evidenced in program review and unit planning documents applies. These requests are reviewed by the college Budget Committee, which is comprised of faculty, classified staff, students, deans, and the Vice President of Administrative Services. Budget Committee recommendations are forwarded to the PRBC for review and forwarded to the college president for final approval. (See Appendix 6)

To summarize our process, the PRBC develops institutional planning and budgeting priorities, programs in their program review and unit planning process analyze relevant data, formulate and submit to the PRBC action plans for improvement informed by institutional priorities, implement their plans, and assess the results. Analysis, action planning, implementation, and assessment occur over three years, and each program undertakes this process in successive three year cycles, creating an ongoing regimen of data gathering, analysis, planning, implementation, and assessment. Our program review in the first year requires data gathering, analysis, and planning based on that analysis and informed by college wide goals. Program review planning decisions are reviewed and implemented in the second year unit planning process. In the third year of the program review/unit planning cycle, the implementation is finalized, reviewed and assessed, setting the stage for a new three-year cycle.

The Chabot College Academic Senate reviewed the revised processes, and the proposed IBPC membership structure and name change, voting to support them all during its May 2010 meetings. The revised program review process was implemented fall 2010. A list of programs and a time-line has been developed, so that programs can know in advance which semester their program review is to be conducted. (See Appendix 7)

The program review process was presented at our Fall 2010 College Day, reviewed at division level meetings, posted on the Chabot College Web for college wide review and comment, and revised accordingly. (See Appendix 16)

The College Council reviewed all of these processes, including the Program Review and Budget Committee reconfiguration for approval and recommendation to the president. Following approval by the Chabot College Council the president submitted the proposal to the Chabot-Las Positas Board on September 21, 2010, for approval.

Analysis of Results Achieved to Date:

A schedule of programs to conduct program review was developed, and the identified programs are conducting their program reviews in fall 2010. (See Appendix 7) Those programs that have already completed their program review year are continuing the process in the second or third year in accordance with whether they are in the implementing stage (year two) or the findings and results stage (year three).

College leadership is informing faculty and staff of the program review process through shared governance, division, and program level meetings and through the use of email and online resources.

The college has added two additional flex days to its spring 2011 calendar to make progress developing course and program level learning outcomes, as well as assessing existing ones, essentially closing the loop on the SLO cycle. We have been successful in having program level outcomes (PLOs) developed for 50% of all college programs. In our regularly scheduled fall

2010 flex day (October 26, 2010), there will be training on how to incorporate SLOs and budget requests into the revised program review and unit planning processes in order to eliminate the confusion cited in the accreditation evaluation report. We have added two flex days for spring 2011 to continue our support of faculty in the development of PLOs and in the incorporation of student learning outcomes and institutional planning and budget into their program reviews and unit plans. (See Appendices 8-13)

Evidence of Results:

The combining of the results of program review and unit planning are reflected in Section A of the Program Review and Action Planning -Year One document (Appendix 1), where programs are asked to conduct a deep data review and analysis of student success and equity data from three previous years. In Section II, Strategic Plan Goals and Summaries, page six, the program is asked to identify which of the college's four strategic planning goals and strategies are supported.

Student learning outcomes and assessment are addressed in section VI. - Student Learning Outcomes Inventory, where programs conduct an inventory of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels. Programs are asked to provide the percentage of discipline courses that have learning outcomes and assessment rubrics developed, course level outcomes (CLO) assessment schedule, percentage of CLOs assessed in the past year, percentage of courses at the discipline level that have been mapped to program level learning outcomes (PLOs) and college wide planning goals. In Section B - Data Summary, page 4, programs are asked to cite relevant data in their discussion of course and program level assessment results.

In Section C - Action Planning, page four, programs propose a two-year plan to address any immediate/long-term concern(s) including CLO assessment/improvement activities.

In program planning and budget Section A.IV, Budget Summary, page 2, programs are asked to review budget trends of the past three years in their disciplines, assess whether the budget was adequate to meet discipline/program needs and provide short-term and long-term budget needs in the action plan, Section C.I, page five. In Section C.II. - Strategic Plan Goals and Summaries, all program review activities including budget are linked with the four college-wide Strategic Plan goals.

Budget requests are submitted every year and align with the program review planning process. Resource allocations are prioritized at the program/division level, submitted to the college Program Review and Budget Committees for review and recommendation.

Additional Plans Developed:

As noted above, two additional flex days are scheduled for Spring 2011 that will focus on institutional planning and student learning outcomes development and assessment. These flex days will allow faculty the needed time to focus on course and program planning needs and follow-up on closing the assessment loop with course-level learning outcomes.

There was a need to address the ease of faculty access to program review data. The Office of Academic Services has developed and will maintain program review data on the college web site. Faculty can access program review data by going to the program review web site, clicking on their program/discipline and downloading all the program review data needed to conduct their program review.

Communication about our program review process was conducted in our shared governance committees, flex day activities and division meetings to communicate how the college conducts planning.

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee has developed plans to continue its efforts to meet the 2012 student learning outcomes accreditation timeline that works in parallel with our program review process.

The college will initiate the first phase of implementing CurricuNET in Fall 2010 with full implementation in Fall 2011. The program will support the college in streamlining its curriculum processes, aligning course review with program review, and facilitating the incorporation of student learning outcomes development into program review and unit planning processes.

APPENDICIES

Appendix 1	Program Review & Budget Document	Pdf
Appendix 2	Program Review & Planning Process Diagram	Pdf
Appendix 3	IPBC Revised Charge	Pdf
Appendix 4	Faculty Prioritization Process	Pdf
Appendix 5	Classified Staff Prioritization Process	Pdf
Appendix 6	Budget Request Summary Sheets	Pdf
Appendix 7	Program Review Time-lines	Pdf
Appendix 8	<u>Course Level SLO List</u>	Web Link
Appendix 9	<u>SLO & Assessment Cycles Timeline</u>	Web Link
Appendix 10	<u>SLO Development Progress Graph</u>	Web Link
Appendix 11	<u>Program Level Curriculum Alignment</u>	Web Link
Appendix 12	<u>Program Level Outcomes Progress</u>	Web Link
Appendix 13	<u>SLO Faculty Inquiry Groups</u>	Web Link
Appendix 14	<u>Program Review Data</u>	Web Link
Appendix 15	Program Review College Wide Student Success Data	Pdf
Appendix 16	Program Review Power Point College Day 8/17/2010	Power Point

APPENDIX 1

Program Review and Action Planning Document

Program Review and Action Planning – YEAR ONE

Division	
Program	
Contact Person	
Date	

Section A – Data Review and Analysis

I. Basic Success and Equity (Data from 3 previous years)

- What trends are you seeing over time? How does the basic success data compare to the college as a whole and to statewide average success rates, if available? What might explain the differences?
- What courses in your discipline show the greatest/least amount of success? What accounts for success in these courses? How could you improve success in the less successful areas?
- What do you see in the comparisons between men and women and between different ethnicities? What accounts for differences? What concerns you? How could you strategically address the concerns?
- What inferences can you draw from the data correlating the highest level of Math/English completed and success in your discipline's courses?
- If you have online courses, do the success rates differ from the same courses offered on-campus? If so, should the success rates be the same, why are they different, and is this a cause for concern? What areas of inquiry does this raise about either the online or the on-campus courses?

Explain:

II. Course Sequence (Data from 2 previous years)

Note: Answer these questions if you have been provided data about course sequences in your discipline.

- Is success in the first course a good indicator of success in the second course? What are the curricular, pedagogical, and/or methodological implications of what you see?
- Do your successful students in the first course enroll at a high rate in the second course within two years? What are the implications of what you see?

Explain:

III. Course Review (Data from 5 previous years)

- Ed. Code requires that all courses are updated every five years. Are all of your courses updated? If not, do you want to maintain or continue these courses? Please indicate your plans in terms of curriculum. Have all of your courses been offered recently? If not, why? Are students counting on courses to complete a program or major when these courses are not being offered?

Explain:

IV. Budget Summary (Data from 3 previous years)

- What budget trends do you see in your discipline? What are the implications of these trends?
- Where is your budget adequate and where is it lacking? What are the consequences on your program, your students, and/or your instruction?
- What projected long-term (5-10 years) budget needs do you see? You will detail your short-term needs in the action plan that follows. You do not need to cite them here.

Explain:

V. Enrollment Data (Data from 2 previous years)

- Please provide a brief description of: overall enrollment trends; enrollment trends by course; and enrollment trends by time of day and Saturday.
- Describe what your discipline has done in terms of curriculum or scheduling in the last two years that has affected enrollments.
- Describe plans or strategies that you have for the near future in terms of curriculum or scheduling that could impact your enrollments.
- Lastly, look closely at whether the schedule you currently offer provides access to the broader community that your discipline serves at Chabot College—day time, night time, Saturday, distance education, special or targeted communities that would or do enroll in your courses.

Explain:

VI. Student Learning Outcomes Inventory

Acronym Key:

SLO = Student Learning Outcome is a general term, for the following three levels of outcomes:

CLO = Course-level Outcome, i.e., what a student can do after completing a course

PLO= Program-level Outcome, i.e., what a student can do after completing a sequence of courses

CWLG = College-wide Learning Goal

- Percentage of courses in your discipline that have CLOs and rubrics developed: _____%.
For this information, please see the list of which courses do and do not have CLOs on the SLOAC's main webpage:
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/default.asp>
- Percentage of courses in your discipline that have the minimum number of CLOs developed:
(1 unit = 1 or more CLO, 2 units = 2 or more CLOs, 3 or more units = 3 or more CLOs) _____%.
For this information, please see the CLO spreadsheet on the SLOAC's main webpage:
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/default.asp>
- Date the CLO Assessment schedule was submitted: _____%.
For this information, please see the Course-level Outcomes assessment schedules list from the Assessment Progress and Plans webpage:
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/progress.asp>
- Percentage of courses in your discipline that have had all the CLOs assessed within the past three years, as per Chabot's Assessment policy: _____%.
For this information, please see Chabot's Assessment Policy from the SLO/Assessment Guidelines webpage:
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/guidelines.asp>
- Percentage of courses in your discipline that have had all the CLO assessments reflected upon, or discussed with colleagues, within the past three years _____%.
What questions or investigations arose as a result of these reflections or discussions?

Explain:

- What actions has your discipline determined that might be taken as a result of these reflections, discussions, and insights?

Actions planned:

- What course-level and programmatic strengths have the assessment reflections revealed?

Strengths revealed:

- Percentage of programs within your discipline that have established at least two PLOs, and mapped appropriate CLOs to them: _____%

For this information, please see the Program-level Outcomes progress page from the Assessment Progress and Plans webpage:
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/progress.asp>

- Which of the CWLGs (<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/institutional.asp>) do your discipline's CLOs address? _____

VII. External Data

- Cite any relevant external data that affects your program (e.g., labor market data, community demand, employment growth, external accreditation demands, etc.).

Section B – Data Summary

- From what you have learned in your basic data review, what does the information tell you about your program?
- Overall, what improvements would you like to make to your program? How do you plan to address these concerns? Are there any immediate issues that require immediate attention (e.g., outdated course outlines)?
- Where appropriate, please cite relevant data in your discussion (e.g., efficiency, persistence, success, FT/PT faculty ratios, SLO/PLO assessment results, external accreditation demands, etc.).

Data Summary and Plan of Action Description/Rationale:

Section C – Action Planning

Please propose a two-year plan of action and timeline to address any immediate and/or long-term concern(s). This includes activities to assess the CLO(s) to discover a plan of action. It may also include specific activities that address improving CLO(s) and their assessment, that is to say evaluating the CLO(s) and the assessment activities.

Examples of activities include:

- Research and inquiry project – *why is this happening?*
- Innovation and Pilot Projects – *this is something I want to try*
- Intervention activities such as support services – *this is what I want to do about it*
- Program and curriculum modification – *this is what I want to do about it*

I. Action Plan Timeline: Detail the timeline for accomplishing your goals

PLOs and/or Program Goal(s)	Timeline	Activity	Support Needed to Accomplish These Activities*	Outcome(s) Expected	Person(s) Responsible	Accomplished? Yes/No/In Progress
						YEAR ONE
						LEAVE BLANK

Definitions of terms:

Program Goal = A general statement of what the program hopes to accomplish, for the long-term. It may be in qualitative (narrative) rather than quantitative (numeric) terms. It may include the integration of several program outcomes, or relate to class scores, credits, units, course completion, retention term to term, progression to next course/level, program completion, degree and certificate completion, transfer, success/scores on licensure exams, job placement, attitudes, fundraising, media promotion, etc.

PLO = Program-level Outcome, i.e., what students can do, what knowledge they have, after completing a sequence of courses. It is a subset of the Program Goals, related to student learning.

*Types of Support Needed to Accomplish Activities:

- Training or workshops
- Publications, library, resources
- Guidance to support research and/or inquiry projects
- Technology

II. Strategic Plan Goals and Summaries: Which Strategic Plan goals and strategies does your action plan support?

- Awareness and Access
 - Increase familiarity with Chabot
 - Reach out to underrepresented populations
 - Promote early awareness and college readiness to youth and families
 - Multiple ways to deliver instruction and services for all
- Student Success
 - Strengthen basic skills development
 - Identify and provide a variety of career paths
 - Increase success for all students in our diverse community
 - Assess student learning outcomes to improve and expand instruction and services
- Community Partnership
 - Increase experiential learning opportunities
 - Initiate/expand partnerships among the college, businesses and community organizations
 - Promote faculty and staff involvement in college and community activities
 - Engage the community in campus programs and events
- Vision Leadership and Innovation
 - Improve institutional effectiveness
 - Streamline academic and student support services
 - Professional development to support teaching, learning and operational needs
 - Support effective communication both in the college and the community
 - Provide safe, secure and up-to-date facilities and technology

Program Review and Action Planning – YEAR TWO Action Plan Progress Report

Division	
Program	
Contact Person	
Date	

***Audience:** Program Review and Budget Council; Deans/Unit Administrators; College Budget Committee*

***Purpose:** To provide evidence of progress on from previous year and to provide input into planning for subsequent years.*

***Instructions:** If you have completed your unit plan last year, please update your timeline and answer the questions below. If you are updating/changing your timeline, list the appropriate year in which revisions were made.*

IA. Problem Statement: Summarize your Program Review Year One conclusions.

IB. Analysis: If there are any new data or conclusions, what is the basis for these new conclusions?

II. List your accomplishments: How do they relate to your program review and PLO work? Please cite any relevant data elements (e.g., efficiency, persistence, success, FT/PT faculty ratios, SLO/PLO assessment results, external accreditation demands, etc.).

III. Student Learning Outcomes Inventory Update

Acronym Key:

SLO = Student Learning Outcome is a general term, for the following three levels of outcomes:

CLO = Course-level Outcome, i.e., what a student can do after completing a course

PLO= Program-level Outcome, i.e., what a student can do after completing a sequence of courses

CWLG = College-wide Learning Goal

- Percentage of courses in your discipline that have CLOs and rubrics developed:

_____ %

For this information, please see the list of which courses do and do not have CLOs on the SLOAC's main webpage:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/default.asp>

- Percentage of courses in your discipline that have the minimum number of CLOs developed:

(1 unit = 1 or more CLO, 2 units = 2 or more CLOs, 3 or more units = 3 or more CLOs) _____ %

For this information, please see the CLO spreadsheet on the SLOAC's main webpage:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/default.asp>

- Date the CLO Assessment schedule was submitted: _____ %

For this information, please see the Course-level Outcomes assessment schedules list from the Assessment Progress and Plans webpage:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/progress.asp>

- Percentage of courses in your discipline that have had all the CLOs assessed within the past three years, as per Chabot's Assessment policy: _____ %

For this information, please see Chabot's Assessment Policy from the SLO/Assessment Guidelines webpage:

<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/guidelines.asp>

- Percentage of courses in your discipline that have had all the CLO assessments reflected upon, or discussed with colleagues, within the past three years _____ %

What questions or investigations arose as a result of these reflections or discussions?

Explain:

- What actions has your discipline determined that might be taken as a result of these reflections, discussions, and insights?

Actions planned:

- What course-level and programmatic strengths have the assessment reflections revealed?

Strengths revealed:

- Percentage of programs within your discipline that have established at least two PLOs, and mapped appropriate CLOs to them: _____%
For this information, please see the Program-level Outcomes progress page from the Assessment Progress and Plans webpage:
<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/progress.asp>
- Which of the CWLGs (<http://www.chabotcollege.edu/sloac/institutional.asp>) do your discipline's CLOs address? _____

VIII. External Data

- Cite any relevant external data that affects your program (e.g., labor market data, community demand, employment growth, external accreditation demands, etc.).

V. Action Plan Timeline Update: Cut and paste your previous timeline from Year One and update the "Accomplished?" column. List any new PLOs or program goals and activities you may have in the second chart.

PLOs and/or Program Goal(s) from Year One	Timeline	Activity	Support Needed to Accomplish these Activities*	Outcome(s) Expected	Person(s) Responsible	Accomplished? Yes/No/In Progress

New PLOs and/or Program Goal(s)	Timeline	Activity	Support Needed to Accomplish these Activities*	Outcome(s) Expected	Person(s) Responsible	Accomplished? Yes/No/In Progress
						YEAR TWO
						LEAVE BLANK

Definitions of terms:

1. Program Goal = A general statement of what the program hopes to accomplish, for the long-term. It may be in qualitative (narrative) rather than quantitative (numeric) terms. It may include the integration of several program outcomes, or relate to class scores, credits, units, course completion, retention term to term, progression to next course/level, program completion, degree and certificate completion, transfer, success/scores on licensure exams, job placement, attitudes, fundraising, media promotion, etc.

PLO = Program-level Outcome, i.e., what students can do, what knowledge they have, after completing a sequence of courses. It is a subset of the Program Goals, related to student learning.

*Types of Support Needed to Accomplish Activities:

- Training or workshops
- Publications, library, resources
- Guidance to support research and/or inquiry projects
- Technology

Program Review and Action Planning – YEAR THREE Final Summary Report

Division	
Program	
Contact Person	
Date	

I. Reflect upon the last three years' analysis and activities.

II. Briefly summarize the accomplishments of the discipline, and how they relate to the review of the program, the program-level outcomes (PLOs) and course-level outcomes (CLOs).

--

III. Please list what best practices (e.g., strategies, activities, intervention, elements, etc.) you would recommend? What was challenging? Was there a barrier(s) to success?

Best practices:
Challenges/Barriers to Success:

IV. Next Steps: Recommendations for program and institutional improvement.

Program Improvement:
Institutional Improvement:

Unit Plan: Full-Time Faculty/Adjunct Staffing Request(s) [Acct. Category 1000]

Unit:

Division or Area to Which You Report:

Author(s) of this Unit Plan:

Date:

Audience: Faculty Prioritization Committee and Administration

Purpose: Providing explanation and justification for new and replacement positions for full-time faculty and adjuncts

Instructions: Please justify the need for your request. Be sure to include reference to Goals/Objectives from Part II, and Strategic Planning Priorities. Please cite any evidence or data to support your request, including enrollment management data (EM Summary by Term) for the most recent three years, student success data (EM Success report), and any other pertinent information. For EM data, go to <http://help/EMC/> (from on campus—college intranet). If you have not worked with EM data previously, seek assistance from your division dean or CEMC rep.

1. Number of new faculty requested in this discipline: _____
2. Rationale for your proposal. Include such things as enrollment, persistence, FT/PT faculty ratios, SLO assessment results, external accreditation demands, etc. Anything that led you to request this position should be included.

3. Statements about the alignment with the strategic plan and program review are required. Indicate here any information from advisory committees or outside accreditation reviews that is pertinent to the proposal.

4. Attachments:
 - EM Summary by Term report for the appropriate discipline or cluster of disciplines.
 - EM Success report for the appropriate discipline or cluster of disciplines.

Unit Plan: Classified Staffing Request(s) [Acct. Category 2000]

Unit:

Division or Area to Which You Report:

Author(s) of this Unit Plan:

Date:

Audience: Administrative Staff

Purpose: Providing explanation and justification for new and replacement positions for full-time and part-time regular (permanent) classified positions (New, augmented and replacement positions)

Instructions: Please justify the need for your request. Be sure to include reference to Goals/Objectives from Part II, and Strategic Planning Priorities. Please cite any evidence or data to support your request. If this position is categorically funded, include and designate the funding source of new categorically-funded position where continuation is contingent upon available funding.

Justifications should include rationale for requesting the position. Rationale should include specific reference to, where necessary and appropriate:

- Data from student learning and service area outcomes
- Connection to program review
- Relationship to institutional priorities
- Impact on enrollment and revenue
- Safety
- Mandates
- Workload distribution (impact on other's work)

1. Rationale for your proposal. Please include the rationale from your program review and unit plan. Rationale should include things such as student learning and service area data and outcomes, difficulty in serving students, health and safety concerns and/or any other information that speaks to the criteria listed previously.

2. Statements about the alignment with the strategic plan and program review are required. Indicate here any information from advisory committees or outside accreditation reviews that is pertinent to the proposal.

Unit Plan: Enrollment Requests

Unit:

Division or Area to Which You Report:

Author(s) of this Unit Plan:

Date:

Audience: Budget, Deans, CEMC, PRBC

*Purpose: To recommend changes in FTEF allocations for subsequent academic year and guide Deans and CEMC in the allocation of FTEF to units.
Instructions: In the area below, please list your requested changes in course offerings (with reference to corresponding change in FTEF) and provide your rationale for these changes. Be sure to analyze enrollment trends and other relevant data (<http://help/EMC/>). Please seek your dean's assistance as needed.*

Unit Plan — Proposal for New Initiatives

Unit:

Division or Area to Which You Report:
Name of Person Completing this Form:

Date:

Audience: Deans/Unit Administrators, PRBC, Foundation, Grants Committee, College Budget Committee

Purpose: A "New Initiative" is a new project or expansion of a current project that supports college goals. The project will require the support of additional and/or outside funding. The information you provide will facilitate and focus the research and development process for finding outside funding.

Instructions: Please fill in the following information.

Educational Master Plan and/or Strategic Plan Goal/Objective Addressed:

Project Description:

Project Objective: (include goal & outcome from Part II of your Unit Plan for reference)

Expected Project Outcome:

Activity Plan to Accomplish the Objective:

ACTIVITY NO.	ACTIVITY (simple description)	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE (OR TARGET COMPLETION DATE)

Estimated Resource Requirements:

ACTIVITY NO.	BUDGET CATEGORY AND ACCOUNT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	COST
	Personnel (staffing and benefits for professional experts, reassigned time, classified personnel).*		
	Supplies		
	Other		
	Total		

Proposed personnel workload may be covered by:

- New Hires: Faculty # of positions _____ Classified staff # of positions _____
- Reassigning existing employee(s) to the project; employee(s)' current workload will be:
 - Covered by overload or part-time employee(s)
 - Covered by hiring temporary replacement(s)
 - Other, explain _____

At the end of the project period, the proposed project will:

- Be completed (onetime only effort)
- Require additional funding to continue and/or institutionalize the project (obtained by/from): _____

Will the proposed project require facility modifications, additional space, or program relocation?

- No
- Yes, explain: _____

Will the proposed project involve subcontractors, collaborative partners, or cooperative agreements?

- No Yes, explain: _____

Do you know of any grant funding sources that would meet the needs of the proposed project?

- No Yes, list potential funding sources:

--

Unit Plan: Request for Resources

Unit:

Division or Area to Which You Report:

Author(s) of this Unit Plan:

Date:

Audience: Budget, Deans

Purpose: To be read and responded to by Budget Committee.

Instructions: Please fill in the following as needed to justify your requests. Text boxes below will expand as you type. To list the items you are requesting, please complete the accompanying Excel spreadsheets for the items you are requesting in the 4000, 5000, and 6000 account categories, as needed, along with the justification for these requests below.

Equipment Requests [Acct. Category 6000]

Please note: Equipment requests are for equipment whose unit cost is over \$200

Brief Title of Request (Project Name): _____

Building/Location: _____

Request Amount (include tax and shipping): _____

Description of the specific equipment or materials requested:

What educational programs or institutional purposes does this equipment support?

Briefly describe how your request relates specifically to meeting the Educational Master Plan and the Strategic Plan Goals and support the goals and outcomes detailed in your Unit Action Plan (Part II, Section 2)?

Why is this equipment necessary?

- Immediate health, safety, or security issues
- Increases enrollment
- Prevents further deterioration of facilities
- Replaces deteriorated equipment or facilities
- Shows cost advantage due to rising prices
- Provides visibility for the Bond Program

Briefly describe how the above criteria are satisfied:

What is the consequence of not funding the equipment?

What alternative approaches have been considered to meet programmatic demands for this equipment?

How many students will be impacted by the purchase of this equipment? _____

Do students use this equipment? yes no

Is this equipment a replacement? yes no

Staffing requirements for new equipment (number of staff, are they available, training, etc.):

Number of Staff _____

Are they available _____

Will training be required? yes no

At whose cost?

What are the estimated ongoing costs (for maintenance, etc.)?

Are there potential utility costs/savings?

Is this request CTE (Career Technical Education) Eligible? yes no

Supplies & Services Augmentation Requests [Acct. Category 4000 and 5000]

Note: Augmentations are rarely funded and are based upon available funding.

Definition of Augmentation: A request for additional funds for your current allocated budget (the funds you actually received), over and above the current amount.

Brief Title of Request (Project Name): _____

Last year's 4000 category budget _____

Last year's 5000 category budget _____

Please state why you are requesting these funds in addition to your current allocated budget (the funds you actually received). Why were the funds previously allocated insufficient?