

Standard I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Ohlone College demonstrates at every level its focus on, and commitment to, its institutional mission and the integration of that mission, vision, values, and goals throughout the college's programs and services. Born of a college-wide forum and fine-tuned through several shared governance reviews, the values and goals of the college are truly the products of the entire Ohlone family, reflecting the spirit of its namesake, the Ohlone Indians, known for their emphasis on diversity and for their close bond to the environment.

The college's most current iteration of its mission, vision, values, and goals was developed in 2004, and an additional goal was appended in 2006 to reflect the commitment of the college to stewardship of resources. The Strategic Plan (I.1), the Educational Master Plan (I.2), and the Title III goals and objectives (I.3) all reflect the mission, vision, values, and goals of the college. Regular planning retreats, shared governance assemblies, and assessments provide opportunity to evaluate and update the Strategic Plan and its operational components.

The college's shared governance—from students to faculty, staff, administration, and Board—provides numerous venues for reflective dialogue on policies, procedures, plans, and periodic reviews. These shared governance forums can draw upon a number of regular assessments and evidences of student achievement, program effectiveness, stakeholder satisfaction, and institutional characteristics to evaluate and, if necessary, modify planning decisions and documents.

The college has a commitment to evidentiary planning, and the Office of Institutional Research functions both to gather evidence and to facilitate research by others within the college. Following the Learning College Model, research and investigation are viewed as a corporate responsibility and opportunity. The Office of Institutional Research is responsible for sustaining ongoing cycles of assessment; supporting regular program and services reviews; assessing Title III progress; coordinating student, faculty, and staff satisfaction surveys; and gathering evidence of student achievement in meeting expressed student learning outcomes.

Standard I. Mission and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

Standard I.A. Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

Descriptive Summary:

The mission statement of Ohlone College (I.4) addresses the essential goals of a California Community College: development of basic skills, vocational education, preparation for university transfer, economic development, and lifelong learning. Further, the mission expresses that Ohlone College offers its students an environment in which they feel valued and supported as they learn and succeed, and where these goals are continually assessed. The core values and the college goals provide the meaning and context within which the mission statement is made operational. These core values and college goals demonstrate that Ohlone College is dedicated to student success for all students, and that it is important for the student population at the college to reflect the diversity of the community served by the college.

When the College's Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Core Values, and College Goals were reformulated, an open forum was held in the gymnasium in January 2004 and attended by more than 300 staff, faculty, and students. All were given a voice through small group discussions to express their ideas about vision, mission, values, and goals. Thoughts and opinions at every level—from meeting the needs of the community the college serves, to the content of academic programs, to the state of campus landscaping—were stated and recorded. As the process of sharpening the focus and setting the priorities for this large body of data progressed, all constituent groups—faculty, staff, students—were engaged in dialogue. A second forum was held within a few weeks to give voice to those in the local community. As student learning goals were refined, input was received from both faculty and students. In August 2007 another college-wide forum was held during the college's flex week activities. Almost 300 faculty and staff came together in the gymnasium to discuss the college's success in meeting each of the eight college goals and to brainstorm new or different strategies to further meet the goals.

The Vision Statement (I.4) that emerged from this dialogue enunciates three things for which the college will be known: inclusiveness, innovation, and superior rates of student success. The Mission Statement further focuses the vision by making it clear that student learning can occur in different ways for differently-motivated students. Students can learn basic skills, can develop vocational skills, can prepare for university transfer, or can pursue economic or personal growth opportunities. Regardless of the student goal, the college sees its mission as valuing, supporting, and continually assessing student learning and promoting student success.

Learning—not just student learning—is a value infused throughout the college. The move in 2004 to a Learning College Model has given everyone within the Ohlone family (students, faculty, and staff) the opportunity and motivation to learn. Initially the Learning College Task Force (I.5) worked to create an environment on campus where learning is fostered and facilitated and where student learning outcomes are met by both matriculated students and by employees. Now the maintenance of the Learning College Model is recognized and is sustained college-wide. This model is supported by the administration and by planning and budget priorities.

Self-Evaluation:

Because Ohlone is a learning college, its emphasis on learning and success extends to college personnel and the community as well as to matriculated students. The Core Values and College Goals (I.4) make even more explicit the college commitment to learning. In addition to the initial voice students had in the creation of these values and goals, the college continually assesses the composition of the student body and the community through demographic research, advisory committees, and retreats and forums to insure that its programs and services are relevant and

necessary. Many of the results of those assessments are available on the research wiki for use by the college community and by others (<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com/Demographics>).

Two components of the college vision statement are “innovation” and “superior rates of student success.” Exemplary of the commitment to this vision is the dedication of resources to provide state-of-the-art classrooms for both student learning and for staff development. While students enjoy the enhanced learning environments provided by new technology and classroom furniture, faculty can enjoy the opportunity to learn about the technology and to develop innovative teaching methods in the Innovation and Technology Center.

Institutionally, it is the Curriculum Committee (I.6), General Education Committee, Programs and Services reviews (I.7), and the Student Development Committee that guide the college’s commitment to student learning and the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Every course outline requires measureable student learning outcomes; in 2006, the General Education Committee completed student learning outcomes for the college’s required general education curriculum (I.8; page 40); and as departments go through the program review process they develop student learning outcomes at the program level.

To more closely represent the demographics of the community, the college has made underserved populations a particular focus and has strategically targeted those under-represented Hispanic groups most prominent in the college’s service area. Of particular note should be the National Science Foundation LAB Project (I.9), the Puente Project (I.10), and the emphasis in the Title III goals (I.3) regarding underserved populations. The college continues to implement these goals and to develop more strategic initiatives aimed at the Hispanic population in order to better align district and student rates.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda is needed.

Standard I.A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

Descriptive Summary:

Ohlone College serves a diverse population—diverse ethnically, economically, and educationally. Surrounding the Fremont campus is one of the Bay Area’s most affluent zip code areas with one of the State’s highest ranked high schools. This is also an area of largely Asian and Indo-European population. Elsewhere in the district are far less affluent ethnic groups and less academic preparedness among high school students. To meet the needs of such a diverse student body, the college has developed many programs and opportunities for students. For the university-bound students there are 14 distinct transfer degrees; for the academically under-prepared students there are learning communities and support services specifically designed to facilitate student progress from basic skills to college level classes; for the students who have yet to master the English language there is an integrated ESL curriculum designed to promote English language success. Title III (I.3), the National Science LAB Project (I.9), the Puente Project (I.10), college goals, and the mission statement (I.4) all address the goals of a Learning College—lifelong learning, student success, and collegiality.

Self-Evaluation:

The college consistently evaluates both its programs and the means it uses to deliver them in order to better align itself and its offerings with its students' needs. All of the 14 transfer degrees have been added since the last accreditation visit in 2001 to meet the goal of being a more transfer-centered college. New departments—Computers, Networks, and Emerging Technology (CNET) and Biotechnology (BIOT)—have been developed to address vocational opportunities in the resurgent Silicon Valley. The Title III grant was written to focus on basic skills and learning communities. The Puente Project seeks to address the underserved Hispanic population in the district.

The nearly 300% increase since Fall 2004 in the number of online classes addresses the scheduling needs of both the busy student and the space-challenged college. The Spring 2007 student survey reveals that the most important need as expressed by students was for the college to do a better job of scheduling classes at times that are convenient to students' schedules, and meeting this need is one of the specific goals and strategies of Title III. It is expected that with the opening of the Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology in Spring 2008 and the completion of the Student Support Services building and subsequent reconfiguration of Building 1 to accommodate classrooms, the college will be able to better meet this scheduling need. The move to the 16 week semester was also motivated in large part by expressed student need and was met with acclamation by the students when implemented in Fall 2006.

In a Spring 2007 staff survey (I.11), faculty and staff were asked if "programs reflect the College mission." Faculty response was 3.20 on a four-point scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (4). Staff responded to the same question with a 2.98 on a four-point scale. Of those who expressed an opinion, 96.4 percent of faculty and 84.1 percent of staff agree or strongly agree with the statement that Ohlone College's "programs reflect the college mission." This demonstrates the sense among faculty and staff that the College aligns its programs with its purpose.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda is needed.

Standard I.A.2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.
Standard I.A.3. Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.

Descriptive Summary:

The college's mission statement is periodically reviewed and, as a result of this review, has been revised twice since the last accreditation visit to better reflect the purposes of a student-centered learning college. The review process incorporates all the stakeholders in the college and provokes dialogue at each of the shared governance venues: College Council, Faculty Senate, President's Council, and, if modified, approval by the Board of Trustees. (I.12)

Self-Evaluation:

For Ohlone College, innovation and currency are important characteristics of the college's identity, so the Mission Statement must also be continually reviewed for relevance and propriety. In 2006 the understanding of the Mission Statement was broadened by the addition of an eighth college goal. *“Develop and implement a District-wide facilities plan which encompasses the design, construction (including furnishings and equipment), renovation and major scheduled maintenance of facilities that support programs and enhance student and employee success.”*

To better address both innovation and student learning, this statement was appended to the college's goals. This process of revision itself exhibited the college values of shared governance, dialogue, lifelong learning, high standards, and innovation as the goal was reviewed and refined by constituent groups at every level prior to its submission to, and approval by, the Board of Trustees.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda is needed.

Standard I.A.4. The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.

Descriptive Summary:

The Mission Statement, with its attendant values and goals, is the lens through which the college is viewed, analyzed, and understood. Because it emerged from such a broadly-based stakeholder dialogue, the Mission Statement is also broadly owned by the college community. The same concerns and considerations, values and priorities that were expressed in the 2004 forum when the Mission Statement was conceived continue to be expressed in current planning and decision making. The Learning College model epitomizes that dialogue of 2004 and the resultant mission, values, and goals. Those same values and goals are central to the objectives of the Title III grant, the newly-revised student learning outcomes of the general education curriculum, and the discussions within separate planning retreats held for managers, the Board of Trustees, the Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology, and the College Council.

Self-Evaluation:

The incorporation of off-campus retreats has made the college's planning process democratic and effective. Such meetings allow for focus without distraction, broadly-based sharing of insights, consensus and ownership of decisions, and a more relaxed and honest exchange of ideas.

Not only has Ohlone College made the Mission Statement central to its planning, the college has literally set its Mission Statement in stone—or at least in concrete and steel. The Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology will put into practice what the mission, values, and goals express in words. The new campus has been designed to be environmentally sustainable, to be innovative, to provoke student learning success, to demonstrate stewardship, and to be a Learning College. Even the building itself will be an observable textbook, complete with narration, of environmental sustainability.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda is needed.

Standard I.B. The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

Standard I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

Descriptive Summary:

Ohlone College has a broadly-based, equitable system of shared governance that enables—in fact, welcomes—contributions to the dialogue from every segment of the college. In recent years the trend on campus has been to be more democratic and less top-down administered. The College Council (I.13) is the primary focal point for college-wide policy decisions and includes representation from staff, faculty, administration, and students. It is a representative body that serves as both Strategic Planning and Budget Planning Committees. It is also serving as the Accreditation Steering Committee.

Other shared governance groups involved in dialogue and planning include the Curriculum Committee, the General Education Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the college's other standing committees. Additionally the college utilizes numerous blogs and wikis as means of promoting collaboration among all stakeholders in a virtual setting. Focused retreats have become a standard in the past few years, allowing collaboration among disparate constituents on single topics such as planning for the Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology; budget planning; emergency preparedness planning; dialogue about visions, values, and goals; student learning outcomes; establishing a Learning College model; and the goal of implementing "New Ways to Work," a reduction and democratization of job descriptions.

Several successful results of the dialogue can be cited, although they will be addressed in detail elsewhere in the document. The college established a unique approach to developing student learning outcomes and assessment through program review and the work of the SLOPE (Student Learning Outcomes Professional Enthusiasts) Committee subsequently resulting in the creation of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate. The General Education Committee developed two additional options utilizing CSU-GE and IGETC for fulfilling general education requirements for the associate degree; the GE Committee also created a comprehensive philosophy and student learning outcomes for the general education curriculum. The Curriculum Committee implemented the use of CurricuNET® software for course and program development. Ad hoc and online dialogue among basic skills faculty led to a Faculty Learning Community on Basic Skills and, ultimately, to the creation of the Basic Skills Coordination Team. Dialogue at many levels, both within and without, resulted in the planning, decision, and implementation of a 16-week semester academic calendar. Finally, years of dialogue resulted in Ohlone College becoming one of the first smoke-free campuses in the California Community College system.

The analysis and, to some extent, even the collection of data is also a collaborative, dialogue-producing process. Data is collected by the Office of Institutional Research and made available to everyone on the college Web site (I.14) and the Ohlone College research wiki (I.15). It is organized for easy use by departments undergoing program and services review, by WASC self-study teams, by the Title III committee, by the basic skills work group, and by others. In addition to the data, significant sites enabling further research are also linked so interested individuals or groups can ask and answer questions unimagined by the research office.

Self-Evaluation:

With the introduction of a new President in July 2003 and his goal of promoting the Learning College Model, the college was faced with changing some of the ways it did business. For instance, it moved from a mostly top-down administration to more of a grass roots, shared governance model. Existing venues for shared governance were given a stronger voice, and new, more broadly-based venues such as the College Council were created. Perspectives and ideas on values, goals, and priorities were solicited from all interested constituents in public forums, and a consensus was identified and incorporated into the planning process. Once values and goals were finalized, various task forces were mobilized to transform ideas into action. Many of those initial task forces have become standing committees and continue to express their voices through shared governance. The result has been new energy and initiative directed to such varied issues as student learning outcomes, sustainability, student development, staff development, and innovation.

The willingness of the administrators to democratically share decision making with the entire college community has also engendered a high level of trust and respect throughout the campus among those actively involved in the committees and other shared governance groups. It appears, however, that not everyone feels--or, perhaps, feels the need to be--democratically connected. When faculty and staff were asked (I.11) if they felt involved in the college's decision making process, only 60.4 percent of all faculty and 39.3 percent of all staff agreed or strongly agreed. The staff numbers become even more problematic when the classified staff is separated from management, and only 24.6 percent of classified staff feels involved in the decision-making process. Encouragingly, however, 75.4 percent of full time faculty agreed with the statement that they felt involved in the decision making process, so full time faculty are engaged in shared governance. In a shared governance institution, it is not necessarily assumed that all members of the community will share governance, but it is presumed that everyone's voice can be heard through representatives. Ohlone may need to do a better job of making its constituents aware that representatives welcome their feedback and speak on their behalf, and that their voices are heard.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda is needed.

Standard I.B.2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Descriptive Summary:

Ohlone College has demonstrated its commitment to establishing consensus-based values and goals by seeking as broadly-based input as possible through forums and retreats. By listening to, and valuing, the contributions of faculty, staff, students, and the community, the college is assured that its constituents both understand the values and goals and are willing to work toward achieving them. The January 2004 forum collaboratively established seven specific college goals. The subsequent creation of seven task forces that corresponded to each of the seven initial goals was intended to provide a motivated group of stakeholders the opportunity and resources to plan, monitor, and assess achievement of the goals. Focused dialogue about each goal originated within the task forces and was then shared with the shared governance groups. In this way, each goal was given an advocate group and a voice within the college community.

Each of the task forces produced measurable objectives for each of the college goals (I.5), and these objectives were then assessed. Progress toward achieving the objectives and meeting the goals was discussed within each task force and then shared with the shared governance forums. To provide consistent support for the goals, the task forces themselves became standing committees. The progress report on goals accomplishment demonstrates how these goals are now implemented and evaluated.

An excellent example of how the college's strategic planning leads to goal-setting and achievement is the development of the International Programs Office and the associated international learning experiences for faculty, staff, and students. Prior to the 2004 strategic planning process, international education had not been an institutional priority, despite a good deal of faculty interest. However, the interest of the faculty in international and multicultural education came to the forefront during the 2004 planning effort and resulted in the creation of College Strategic Goal #1, International and Multicultural Education. A task force was formed to shepherd the activities related to the goal. The task force determined that the college needed to devote resources to create an ongoing department and a director to support the objective of Goal #1. In response, the administration developed a three-year financial plan that linked increases in international student enrollment to the allocation of international student tuitions to support a new Office of International Programs. The college then conducted a search for and hired a Director of International Programs. Enrollment of international students in 2007FA is twice what it was in 2006FA. For more details, see the International Education story. (I.23)

Self-Evaluation:

When the college makes its strategic plans and decisions, those plans and decisions are filtered through the vision, mission, values, and goals of the College. The task forces that initially supported and monitored each of the goals were directly responsible to the College Council, which is the primary shared governance group and which also functions as the strategic planning and budget development committees. The work of many of the task forces has been given over to standing committees so the goals have consistent advocate groups. For example, the Student Services Division has chosen to give focused attention each month to specific college values; and within Student Services, the Office of Admissions and Records actually devotes regularly scheduled meeting time to discussing the importance of personalizing each of the college values within the department. Goals, strategic plans, and budget planning all integrate within the College Council. When requests for funds, personnel, or other needs are put forward, they are evaluated on the basis of how such an investment addresses and is consistent with specific college goals. This was certainly evident in the manner in which this year's one-time funds were dispersed based upon goals reflected in program reviews.

Because all meetings of each of the committees and the College Council are open to all Ohlone College employees and students, and because all the meetings are regularly posted on the college-wide events calendar, all college stakeholders have a platform to address goals and objectives, and to be heard. The college has done a good job of collaboratively setting goals through the strategic planning process and through program and services reviews. It will continue to maintain open dialogue and to assess progress toward those goals, revising them as necessary when student needs or college priorities change so as to better serve students, staff, and the community.

Planning Agenda:

The meets the standard. No planning agenda is needed.

Standard I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Descriptive Summary:

The establishment of a more comprehensive, college-wide planning process was one specific area identified by the WASC visiting team following the 2001 site visit. New planning measures were successfully addressed with the focused midterm report in 2004 (I.16), and the planning momentum fostered by these last two WASC visits has not been lost; realistically, it went through a slow period when a very capable researcher resigned and subsequent budget reductions led to the layoff of the research position. Recently the momentum has intensified and the research office has been revitalized. Given the resurgent energy and support by faculty and the administration, the research office has made good progress back to the standards it once maintained. The college understands the cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. For evaluation and re-evaluation, the college now relies significantly, but not exclusively, on the Office of Institutional Research. The data collected by that office is updated each semester and posted in easily understandable formats on the college Web site (I.14) and the research wiki (I.15) for use by any of the college's constituents. That data can then be used in evaluation, planning, or requests for funds. Plans that are created in the focused groups—such as departmental program reviews, Curriculum Committee, or within one of the college's standing committees—are then sent upward to other shared governance groups—Faculty Senate or College Council, for instance—where these plans can be discussed, data can be evaluated, and funds can be allocated.

Self-Evaluation:

Key to both the evaluation and re-evaluation steps within this process has been the renewed support given the Office of Institutional Research. The concurrent establishment of the Institutional Research and Assessment Team creates regular opportunity for dialogue about research and assessment, strategies and analysis. Web sites and wikis make data and resources available, and, in keeping with the Learning College Model, the research office helps individuals and groups become themselves research-capable so evaluation and re-evaluation can go on throughout the college rather than occurring in a single office. Not only can groups such as

program reviewers or Basic Skills Committee members examine pre-existing data on resource Web sites like the Chancellor's Office Data Mart (I.17), but they are also taught how to create electronically-administered surveys to readily collect their own data. Of particular fortuity at Ohlone is the way the college was able to meld the responsibilities of research and curriculum into a single office, fostering a coincident interest in both the development of student learning outcomes and in their evaluation in the same office.

In some departments, program review has itself become an enlightening and meaningful collaborative process. The research office provides standardized data for each department: information about courses, sections, enrollment, FTEF, FTES, WSCH, persistence and success of students, program awards, and the like. Then, since many of the sources of the data have been made available to the departments, some program reviewers have been doing a deeper and more thorough investigation of courses, programs, and student success. Some have also identified needed resources to implement their department or program plans, and the College Council has supported such requests for additional resources and funds when that request has been supported by specific program review findings.

According to the Spring 2007 accreditation survey (I.11), 75.3 percent of faculty agree or strongly agree with the statement "program review effectively evaluates instruction"; 77.2 percent of faculty also agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "program review effectively evaluates student services." 56.3 percent of staff also agreed or strongly agreed with the statement about student services. When both groups were asked in the 2007 survey if program review information was integrated into department planning, 73.2 percent of faculty, but only 56.0 percent of staff, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. So now program review is regarded by at least some of the faculty and staff as a legitimate means of continuous—and funded—improvement.

In 2007 a unique opportunity presented itself which allowed the college to showcase its intent that budget allocations follow planning. One-time funds totaling in excess of \$200,000 were available for immediate expenditure. The basis for approving requests to expend the funds was the identified needs from the 2005-06 program reviews. Only those departments that had successfully completed program review and identified needs consistent with departmental goals and student learning outcomes were eligible to apply for the one-time funds.

The Curriculum Committee regularly monitors the timely submission of program and services reviews, while the Institutional Research and Assessment Team regularly evaluates the data sources and data produced by the Office of Institutional Research. Regular and timely evaluation of programs and services enable the college to better address current student needs and ensure better student success.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda needed.

Standard I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Descriptive Summary:

The initial planning process that led to the new college vision, mission, values, and goals was conducted in two open forums, one for college-wide personnel and students and a second for members of the district-wide community. Subsequent to the planning forums, an assessment forum was held in August 2007. Its purpose was to reassemble faculty and staff to assess progress toward meeting the mission and goals that were produced in January 2004. Insights, concerns, suggestions, and ideas were gathered from each of some 40 small groups and collated by the President's Office for analysis, evaluation, and further dialogue among shared governance groups. Now, through regularly scheduled and publicized open meetings of the College Council and the college's committees, any interested parties may continue to participate in the dialogue related to college planning and resource allocation. Similarly, all program reviews are publicly posted and used in determining asset allocation.

Strategic planning is conducted through the College Council, which annually analyzes the assessment of goals and objectives and allocates budget resources in accord with the college goals. To assure that college goals have adequate and consistent funding, an Asset Management program has been established to supplement State funds. This program has been developed to generate a consistent, long-term revenue source through the lease and development of excess college property. Additionally, the college continues to solicit grants and has also inaugurated a new capital campaign. The current capital campaign is well on its way to achieving its \$10 million goal.

Self-Evaluation:

Ohlone College has gone through numerous changes since the last WASC visit: budget-driven reorganizations, consolidation of divisions, creation of departments, and more; but since the establishment of the new vision, mission, values, and goals there has been more managed, purposeful change. For instance, the reorganized administrative structure and shared governance are more broadly-based and more integrated. 76.0 percent of full time faculty and 58.0 percent of staff feel that the administrative structure of the college is effective in supporting college programs. The College Council—the primary shared governance group—is viewed as an effective channel for ideas regarding institutional decision making and budget prioritization by 73.7 percent of full time faculty and by 61.2 percent of staff.

Although the College Council and the administrative structure are regarded as effective, their budget planning processes are not as well regarded. Only 47.1 percent of staff and 53.4 percent of faculty agreed with the statement, "Budget priorities are determined by systematic planning." Although there are instances—such as the allocation of one-time funds based on department plans included in program reviews—that illustrate the alignment between planning and budgeting, many faculty and staff may not be included enough within departmental budget planning, or they still may have memories of how things used to be and have not yet realized that things are changing. In response, the College Council has incorporated budget planning into its strategic planning role. Shared governance groups will have a presence on the merged committee and will monitor both the regular communication among constituents and the level of cooperation among budget planners and strategic planners.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda is needed.

However, the college should better demonstrate the relationship between planning and budget allocations so its constituents—both internal and external—are aware of and have confidence in both processes. A Planning Agenda to achieve this improvement is presented in the narrative related to Standard III.D.

Standard I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Description:

For collection and dissemination of data related to quality and characteristics of its programs and services, the college relies primarily upon the Office of Institutional Research. On both the research Web site (I.14) and the wiki (I.15), constituents can evaluate data about student success, student and staff demographics, program awards, classroom efficiency, results of satisfaction surveys, or district population trends, just to name a few. Constituents can also use resources on the research wiki to collect and evaluate their own data. Because the data is available to anyone with an Internet connection, any and all groups can use the collected information and the available resources for anything from college-wide planning to satisfying individual curiosities. Similarly, all completed program reviews—along with the data and recommendations—are available on the Academic Affairs Web site (I.18). More widespread distribution also results from public forums and the State of the College address by the President, as well as publications within the local media.

Self-Evaluation:

Recently the release of the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges report and data (I.19) has stirred a renewed interest within the public about community college institutional effectiveness. Not only has this report put data in many newspapers, but it has also provoked reporters to ask for more substantiated claims of quality. This has then enabled the college to highlight its assessments and to get publicity for some of the quality indicators that have languished on the research Web site.

To increase communication among its constituents, the college will do a better job of informing them of the available resources and data and, more importantly, of informing them of what the data says about the quality of Ohlone's programs and services. Additionally, the college will inaugurate a semi-annual data scan (I.20) and dialogue among appropriate guidance and shared governance groups to review and discuss changes and trends in demographics, programs, services, and needs that emerge from the on-going assessments. As the college regularly addresses the issues that arise from analyzing data, it will be both more efficient and more effective in identifying and meeting student—or staff—needs.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda is needed.

Standard I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Descriptive Summary:

Planning at Ohlone College is broadly-based, systematic, and regularly assessed. Many groups representing various stakeholders contribute: College Council; the management group of Deans, Directors, Administrative Staff (DDAS); Faculty Senate; budget and finance planning groups; various committees; the Board. All are engaged in the planning dialogue on a regular, continuous basis. Program reviews, Title III reports, Chancellor's Office accountability reports, surveys, and myriad other data feed into the process and are discussed, evaluated, analyzed, and assigned importance in light of college mission, values, and goals. Planning agendas are integral to budget creation and resource allocation. Each of the college goals and the Title III goals has measurable objectives, and the research office regularly updates progress toward achieving those goals and objectives. The Institutional Research and Assessment Team then meets to address results of such assessments or to refine ways of assessing the progress. Annually the President releases a report to the college (I.21) and the local community explaining progress toward, or attainment of, college goals. Highlights of the report are also presented by the President to faculty and staff at the State of the College address each Fall.

Self-Evaluation:

Two effective methods of assessing the planning cycle have been utilized at the college in recent years. First is the assembling of appropriate groups in a retreat setting that fosters collaboration, transparency, and focus. Such retreats have been used to assess the progress of planning for the Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology, for the Student Support Services building, and for planning by the Board, College Council, and DDAS. The second means of assessing the effectiveness of assessment has been the establishment of the Institutional Research and Assessment Team (IRAT). This research and assessment advisory group plays a pivotal role in assessing assessment; from formulating questions to ask, groups to target, results to analyze, and plans to suggest changing, the IRAT is the overseer of the college's ongoing cycle of evaluation.

The college has demonstrated that it understands the importance of on-going planning and assessment and will continue to foster dialogue, assessment, and planning in collaborative settings. The use of retreats, forums, and other assessment-specific groups such as the Institutional Research and Assessment Team will continue. Additionally, the evaluative teams assembled around the standards within this self-study are planned to remain intact and to provide an additional mechanism for on-going assessment and dialogue, so that the momentum for regular systematic review is not squandered.

Planning Agenda:

The college meets the standard. No planning agenda is necessary.

Standard I.B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Descriptive Summary:

One of the major components of Ohlone College's ongoing cycle of assessment is its comprehensive Programs and Services Review (I.7), which is required not only of instruction, library, and student services, but required of all business services departments (finance, human resources, facilities) as well. Through this process all college programs and services do self-assessment every four years. Instructional departments also do regular course reviews, examining and revising all active course outlines utilizing CurricuNET® (I.22), the college's online course and program development software. Data for programs and services reviews is collected and updated every semester by the Office of Institutional Research, enabling departments to keep program reviews current and to be able to adapt them as necessary between formal review cycles. Program and Services reviews are conducted by each of the departments and then evaluated at the division and administrative level. Instructional program reviews are often presented before the Curriculum Committee, and all program reviews are submitted for review and approval by the Board, then are showcased on the college Web site (I.14).

The Institutional Research and Assessment Team is responsible for supporting and evaluating this program review process, as well as other assessment endeavors. The team helps frame questions, discuss sources of evidence and how to obtain that evidence, evaluates proposed surveys, and analyzes the results of assessments, both those initiated by the college and those collected by agencies such as the CCCCCO.

As the current institutional self study was entering its final stages in the fall of 2007, the college received an excellent assessment tool from ACCJC/WASC entitled, "Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness." This tool provides a framework for the college to assess its level of implementation effectiveness in three important accreditation areas: Program Review, Planning, and Student Learning Outcomes. The levels of implementation include Awareness, Development, Proficiency, and Sustainability. Because it was received as this self study was being finished, it was not possible to integrate it fully into the assessment process. However, the college is committed to using the rubric tool and hopes to have this underway as the comprehensive evaluation visit takes place in March of 2008.

Self-Evaluation:

Student Services has put forth the idea of annual program review within their division, and the same initiative has also been discussed among instructional departments; however, the magnitude of courses that are tied to instructional departments would prohibit attaching the course review process to the program review as has also been suggested.

With its emphasis on the Learning College model and grass roots research and analysis, the college has experienced an increase in data-driven planning, from using faculty surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of general education student learning outcomes, to consistently tracking the effects of the compressed calendar on enrollment, to verifying the accuracy of student placement based on initial entry assessments.

However, the work of the research office and the grass-roots researchers may still be substantially unnoticed. Although faculty and staff responses (I.11) to the statement "College planning decisions are based on research data" were higher in the Spring 2007 survey than they were in the Spring 2001 survey, still less than half of faculty and barely half of staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

To increase its level of good practice, program and services reviews, data from the Office of Institutional Research, and any other evaluative processes will continue to be updated in a timely manner and submitted for review to appropriate constituents. The Institutional Research and Assessment Team is a relatively new college entity and will need time to mature in institutional influence. IRAT needs to review not only the data but the relevance of the processes through which it was collected and recommend improvements as necessary. All of this will be done so that the college can do an even better job of meeting the educational needs of all its constituents and promote even higher levels of student learning and student success.

Planning Agenda:

The college partially meets the standard. The following planning agendas have been developed for improvement to reach compliance:

Planning Agenda #1

Outcome: IRAT will be an active and well acknowledged group that continually assesses the college's evaluation mechanisms.

Tasks: Membership on IRAT needs to be representative and the members need to be active participants in a regular schedule of meetings. The evaluation mechanisms that are being used need to be better communicated to the college community. A quarterly newsletter and the Annual Data Scan are vehicles that can assist with developing higher awareness.

Ensuring ongoing compliance: IRAT will monitor the annual surveys to ascertain if its efforts are yielding higher awareness levels. The Office of Institutional Research will conduct a regular program review of its work using the structure and process of the program review team to assist with the ongoing assessment.

Impact on student learning: A college that has better information about the factors that impact student learning will be able to improve its institutional environment and its teaching and learning processes. Improvements in these areas will definitely lead to improvement in student learning.

Planning Agenda #2

Outcome: The ACCJC/WASC "Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness" will be incorporated into the college planning and evaluation process as an ongoing tool for assessing institutional effectiveness in Program Review, Planning, and Student Learning Outcomes.

Tasks: The President's Institutional Research and Assessment Team will develop a strategy for achieving this outcome.

Ensuring ongoing compliance: The annual review of college accomplishments will include a formal review of this rubric.

Impact on student learning: Continual review and improvement in Program Review, Planning, and Student Learning Outcomes will make the college a more effective learning environment for students and staff. Program Review, Planning, and Student Learning Outcomes

Sources of Evidence:

I.1 Strategic Plan

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/president/docs/20052010strategicplan.pdf>)

I.2 Educational Master Plan

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/instruction/docs/20020306edmasterplan.pdf>)

I.3 Title III Goals and Accomplishments

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/titleiii/docs/200705titleiiigrantreviewmay2007.pdf>)

I.4 Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/core/aboutohlone.html#visionstmt>)

I.5 Task Force Goals

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/taskforces/envfacilities/#meetings>) Campus Environment and Facilities Task Force Meeting Minutes

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/taskforces/commservice/#meetings>) Community Service Task Force Meeting Minutes

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/taskforces/learningcollege/#meetings>) Learning College Task Force Meeting Minutes

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/taskforces/studentdev/#meetings>) Student Development Task Force Meeting Minutes

I.6 Curriculum Committee minutes

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/curriculumcomm/meetings.html>)

I.7 Program Reviews

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/instruction/programreview.html>)

I.8 Ohlone College Catalog

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/2007-2008catalog/home.html>)

I.9 NSF LAB Project Goals

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/biotech/labproject/>)

I.10 Puente Project Goals

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/puente/>)

I.11 2007SP Student-Staff Surveys

Student Survey and results

(<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com/f/All%20Student%20Survey.pdf>)

Staff Survey and results

(<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com/f/All%20Faculty%20Survey.pdf>) Faculty

(<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com/f/Full%20Time%20Faculty%20Survey.pdf>) Full Time Faculty

(<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com/f/Adjunct%20Faculty%20Survey.pdf>) Adjunct Faculty

(<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com/f/All%20Staff%20Survey.pdf>) Staff

(<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com/f/Classified%20Survey.pdf>) Classified Staff
(<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com/f/Management%20Survey.pdf>) Management

I.12 Board of Trustees minutes

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/board/2006/>)

Board Video of Mission Statement Revisions

(<mms://powerhost.PowerStream.NET/003/02419/Boardmeetingclip07122006.wmv>)

I.13 College Council minutes

(<http://www2.ohlone.edu/cgi-bin/htsearch?config=&restrict=org%2Fcouncil%2F2006&exclude=&method=and&format=builtin-long&sort=score&words=Minutes>)

I.14 Ohlone College Web Site

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/>)

I.15 Research Wiki and Website

(<http://ohloneresearch.pbwiki.com>)

I.16 2004 WASC Focused Report

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/academicaffairs/docs/20041015accreditationmidtermreport.pdf>)

I.17 Datamart

(<http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/tris/mis/reports.htm>)

I.18 Academic Affairs Web Site

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/academicaffairs/>)

I.19 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges

(http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/tris/rp/ab_1417/ARCC_2008_Draft_Oct07.pdf)

I.20 Data Scan

()

I.21 Annual Report

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/president/docs/20062007annualreport.pdf>)

I.22 Curricunet

(<http://www.curricunet.com/Ohlone>)

I.23 International Education

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/accredselfstudy/docs/ohlonestory-international.pdf>)

Additional Sources

NCHST Master Plan

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/council/2003/docs/20031205educmstrplanwkgdoc.pdf>)

Frontage Plans

(<http://www2.ohlone.edu/cgi-bin/htsearch?config=&restrict=org%2Fboard%2F2007&restrict=org%2Fboard%2Fpackets%2F2007&exclude=&method=and&format=builtin-long&sort=score&words=Frontage+property>)

2001 WASC Self Study

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/academicaffairs/docs/2001accreditationselfstudy.pdf>)

Faculty Senate minutes

(http://www.ohlone.edu/org/faculty_senate/)

Capital Campaign information

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/foundation/>)

Bond Oversight Committee Minutes

(<http://www.ohlone.edu/org/bond/meetings.html>)