OPEN MEETING:

1. **Approval of February 10, 2014 College Council Minutes**
   - Passed without objection to approve the February 10, 2014 College Council minutes, as amended. Two minor corrections (added Leta Stagnaro to those present on 2/10 and noted that Dean Mark Lieu is on the Basic Skills committee, not the Student Success committee).

2. **Board of Trustees Updates**
   - At their February 12th Board meeting, they approved a non-binding letter of intent (LOI) for the process of developing frontage property. Means we have a letter of agreement which allows us to accept bids (we know we have at least one, Clark reality, proposing mixed use & small amount of retail for frontage space).
     - Timed so as to not have negative impact on Ohlone Measure G construction. Bid deadline scheduled so Board can then accept a bid and move forward in April.
   - LOI states minimum terms of the bid so any other bids will have to be as good or better.
     - Question: In the past, we have considered more retail than housing and now it seems to have gone the other way. Response: Depends on the market, which has shifted. Our goal is to have non-apportionment funding, separate from the state funding.
     - Question: The City of Fremont does not intend to widen Mission Blvd. so doesn't it seem that residential will impact traffic more than retail? Can we stipulate that some housing will be for international students? Response: If we set conditions, that makes it more difficult for any developer to make money and to make it profitable. Need to best benefit the college. Talked about it up front.
     - Question: Assume there will be a lot of hearings on this? Response: The Board will look at the offers carefully.
     - Question: Is it better for us if we get more bids? Yes, it would be better. We had two to begin with and we’ve moved forward with the LOI for the better of the two. At this point, it’s pretty unlikely that we'll get other bids. If someone is really interested, they could see if they could match the Clarke's economic model; they could try. Unlikely.
3. **College Council By-Laws Updates**

- College Council sub-committee was tasked with reviewing by-laws: Mike Holtzclaw, Dave Schurtz, and Jeff O'Connell. Met several times to review bylaws, kept refining for best fit.
- Review of proposed changes to College Council by-laws as well as annual calendar for committees' reporting schedule for reporting to Council.
- Will bring back for 2nd reading. Thanks to sub-committee for work/efforts.
  - Comment: Intent of calendar is to schedule and track committee updates reporting to College Council. Will help committees to be ready/plan as well.

4. **Diversity Study**

- AVP Shairon Zingsheim provided a Human Resources update regarding current recruitment practices.
- We have had a lot of classified staff hires as compared to faculty. How wide do we cast our net and how deep do we go for recruitment? We do have budget for recruitment.
- Review of distributed document.
- Ohlone a tough name to remember -- need to get our name out there. We do track where people heard of us to see what advertising venues are most effective.
- Two workshops recently "Going from PT to FT", with 50-60 part-time faculty attending. Explained some of the process and they heard from some full-time faculty. People applying for FT jobs received assistance with regard to preparing documents; had open house as well. Making it friendlier.
- A lot we can continue to do.
- What do we do with new employees? Maybe letter from President welcoming & encouraging people to apply. Spend a lot of money & effort drawing from a diverse pool.
  - Question: Advertising for new Associate Dean for Deaf Studies. Notice that you're required to have CA driver's license but not ASL skills. What if a blind person applies -- doesn't that discriminate? Why is a license required? Response: Part of a template. Most government agencies have that requirement as any employee may be called upon to drive a district vehicle. Maybe we can specify when it's not required.
  - Comment: Would think that if I was going to medical school, I'd be required to have the relevant skills -- why can't we be more specific about required skills for some jobs? Response: Chancellor's office has specific guidelines. We have "ideal candidate" description and ASL skills are listed there.
- Yes, there are a lot of things we can improve and we need to put a lot of up-front effort into diversity of pools.
- Diversity of pools -- any studies to come up with data for who in our community is qualified for certain positions? Can approximate, but have not been able to find specific data. Nothing really to go on.
  - Question: Any data out of UC or CSU on Master's degrees and demographic data for graduates? Would that be accurate? If we're going to compare graduates, you don't know exactly what they're planning to do with their degrees.
  - Comment: Have heard that the majority of those obtaining masters and advance degrees are Caucasian.
  - Question: Are we looking at regional candidates (local or state=wide) for data, as opposed to national?
  - Comment: Deaf division is known internationally and our advertising should reflect that. Our deaf programs are unique and well-known.
  - Question: Do we look at degree-producing universities and advertise there, based on the position we're hiring for? Comment: We don't close the door on paying candidates to travel for an interview. Skype is also an option, though not a preferred method, so there is not a barrier to distance.
For Student Success data, we looked at some peer colleges. Can we do a similar thing to see if there are some Bay Area colleges who are having more success, reaching a more diverse pool of applicants -- or are they having similar challenges? Response: Yes, easier to get that kind of data.

Ongoing dialogue; helpful to make this part of a series.

How are we letting candidates know about our culture, what to expect?

5. Standards for Student Success

When we put strategic plan together, established benchmarks for student achievement and institutional operations. Recommended we do this since ACCJC had requested goals/targets reasonable for the institution. Benchmarks approved.

At accreditation pre-visit, Team Chair said that “benchmarks” are not what ACCJC had in mind – they want “floors”.

Asked Mike Bowman to put something together, put before Faculty Senate. Review of chart "Establishing Performance Standards". Comparing current performance as compared to current benchmark.

- Considering "prior 5-year average" as starting point to come up with numbers we consider reasonable "floor". Benchmarking against SSA scorecard. In the process, discovered US Dept. of Education asked for additional categories with benchmarks. Added suggested benchmarks that have not been approved or need revisiting due to changes in CCCCQO metrics.

Faculty Senate had first reading of this document and they will discuss at next meeting. May move forward; may discuss more.

Mistaken notion regarding what ACCJC & US Dept. of Education wanted.

- Question: Does College Council need to approve after Faculty Senate reviews & approves?

Completion, for example, metrics have changed and if we use prior four year average it would come in above our current benchmark. Used peer average instead (taken from scorecard, peer colleges, etc.). Don't want standard that's too high.

These have not been released to the public yet. Most have gone up in past year. ESL improvement, for example, has improved though we're not at state-wide or peer group average.

- Question: Idea of using prior 5-year average, seems like we could put that into place and we're not constantly needing to reevaluate. We always want to be above our five year average. Reply: When we originally did benchmarks, we did compare to state-wide average, but that's a moving target. Will our 5-year average always be our standard? We can revisit every five years.

Look at language and why they want us to do these "floors". If the college falls below the standard, the visiting team is supposed to find that the college is not following their mission. We need to think about floors/standards as being "very bad" if we fell below them. If that's the criteria to determine if we're following our mission...

Team decides if the numbers are reasonable. Seems more like we'd be setting goals that we'd be trying to improve upon. The USDE seems to look at the negative instead.

Some concern that sometimes standards (prior five year average) might be unreasonably high. Right now we might look okay, but if we only need to come up with numbers before the team visits and then look at them every six years, it doesn't make sense.

For example, for under-represented retention, it would not be hard for us to fall below 80.7%.

- Question: What's the reasoning for Department of Ed to set these standards and presenting them the year (or week) before a site visit? Shouldn't we be looking at data that's meaningful for the college? Is there some logical way to establish a floor that's reasonable and reflective?

Need to build a formula that gives us numbers that have some meaning. This is new to Ohlone.

- Question: How many of these are we not meeting? ESL? Even now, we're below the statewide and peer average, but maybe 17.1 is too high?
Comment: Since the purpose is to set a floor below which we don't want to fall, what about looking at the lowest number we've been for the past five years and then set that as our "floor"? It's our job to set the standards and to support why it's reasonable.

Question: Does our current self-study speak to these standards? Yes and no. We set benchmarks but the discussion was not about standards/floors? Isn't it better that we wait until after the site visit to address this? Response: Will make a better impression to the team to say that we looked at the document and have begun discussion to meet the standard. If it's easy to set a floor, then we can make that adjustment and we're done. Either way, it's not going to be added to our current self-study. We thought we met the standard, but our interpretation was different.

For closure, Mike Bowman will update the spreadsheet with the lowest of the prior five years and will distribute to Faculty Senate and CC for review. Discussion, first look, if we get it done, we do. No need to rush but we do need to address.

Staffing issues during the "band aid year' and not counting certificates well enough; a glitch in the data.

6. Parking Update

- Ron Little, VP of Administrative Services reports that estimated that in spring semester, peak of 2,100 spaces needed. Have had surplus of stalls (300 surplus) even with closure of parking Lots MNOP.
- With recent closure of Lots B&C, lost another 450 stalls; still in surplus. Have 1,775 stalls available; surplus of over 200 on a daily basis.
- Currently 262 staff/faculty stalls (same number as before). In fall, challenge will be mitigated by moving 15% of program to Newark.
- Projecting peak need in fall at 1,825 and we will need to add Lot K temp lot (another 50-60 spaces) done over the summer. Will take us to 1830 capacity.
- As we open portables in January 2015, 20-30 stalls to open up.
- Chief Osawa comments:
  - Daily counts / review of PowerPoint & detailed numbers. Most impacted are staff spaces. Staff & faculty can park in student spaces but not the reverse.
  - Review by days. More than adequate parking available. Many don't like walking as far, but difference from Lot D is only an additional 85 yards.
  - Complain about parking far away but you'll walk down to Starbucks during a break. Will make adjustments regarding staff spaces once portables open.
  - Campus police receiving calls from faculty & staff when they have large amounts of materials to carry. Students complain as well when there are 40+ staff spaces open when they can't find a spot. Students complain that they pay for parking and staff do not.
- Question: Disabled spots? Do we have enough? Review of locations. Based on usage of Lot P and Palm Bosque, not usually full. Hyman Hall Disabled spots often full. May need to adjust some of those when swing space is opened up. Constant monitoring & review. More accessible spaces on campus than mandated by law. Sometimes location not as convenient as we'd like, but enough.
- E-mail questions from faculty regarding disabled how many spots and placement. Placement not only based on location but ability to be used (compliant with grade, etc.).
- When swing space opens, will need to reconsider. Issue becomes that usage of disabled spaces varies by day / hour. Delicate balance. Doing the best we can. Lot P, for example, may have less disabled parking when classes move to swing space in January.
  - Question: What will happen when we lose parking to students in Lot D? In Newark, will there be a temporary spot for loading/unloading? Response: Every time we create a special space for particular need, we lose a general space. Will do the best we can to accommodate. When we had short-term parking in Lot N, for example, abuses. When a number of spaces sit fallow for a large number of hours, students complain. Creation of drop-off area, for example, even that contributes to loss of parking spaces.
- We have 15-minute parking space in Lot P for faculty drop-off of items in classroom or office.
7. 2010-15 Strategic Plan Objectives

- Distribution of document for review.
- Proposing quick review of document (objectives and what was presented to CC as response to November/December assessment of strategic plan -- in blue). Objectives listed are not yet met or not completely met. CC task to provide leadership to move forward. Do we roll some over to next strategic plan?
- Editorial comments from M. Bowman in red to prompt discussion in small groups.
- Due to time constraints, brief review, but next meeting break into small groups.
- Discussion regarding Objective 1.2; progress, steps taken, well on our way to addressing. Objective not yet met but being discussed.
- ESL causing consternation when scorecard changed metrics for objective 1.4. Should we rewrite it to align more?
- Objectives 1.10 & 1.11 need to have Student Services folks' discussion.
- Objective 3.2 by June will be met.
- A review on some of these it will be a rewarding project to see our progress. None of these seem particularly insurmountable. well on our way to addressing, but as a group, need to outline plans that are more precise action plans, timelines, discussion regarding of viability of objective, etc.
- Bowman has chosen team leaders for discussion we should have (will have) next time. Need to accommodate Board Meeting set-up.
- Mike Bowman will e-mail composition of the groups and what 3-4 objectives you'll be discussing.
- Red comments on document are "floors" and groups need to go above that.

8. Heard It Through the Grapevine

- March 12 is special College Council meeting during accreditation site visit.
  - Smoking policy ad-hoc committee has met several times and hoping to have presentation ready for 3/12. A lot of interesting data.
  - Follow-up on strategic plan objectives
  - Diversity comparison data (Bay 10) and more recent data? Yes.
  - By-laws approval as well.

- President, VP & Research have moved to Building 27.
- Make Ohlone Beautiful (MOB) planned for Wednesday and rain predicted.

ADJOURNED: 4:25 p.m.

**Future Council Meetings (2014 / Spring & Summer):**
Fremont Campus / Room 7101, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. unless otherwise noted

March 12 (Accreditation team visit)
April 7, 28
May 12
June 9
July 14