2010-2015 STRATEGIC PLAN

ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION TOOL


ASSESSMENT PROCESS TIMELINE

2009-10: College-Wide Process to Create Strategic Plan, 2010-15

2010-11: Year 1: Implementation of 2010-15 Strategic Plan

2011-12: Year 2: Approved Annual Assessment of Goals and Objectives
  Conducted 1st Annual Assessment, November 2011 – January 2012


  Spring 2014 Begin Preparation for College-Wide Process to
  Create New Strategic Plan, 2015-20

  College-Wide Process to Create New Strategic Plan, 2015-20

2015-16: Year 1: Implementation of 2015-20 Strategic Plan
GOAL 1: Through innovative programs and services, improve student learning and achievement.

Objective 1. By 2013, have in place an ongoing system will for identifying and assessing student learning outcomes at the program and course levels, which includes faculty dialogue and appropriate improvement plans.

This is New Wording Approved Spring 2012
[Original Wording: By 2013, complete an assessment of student learning outcomes for all courses and programs.]

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 16, 2012
Reported by: Jim Wright and Leta Stagnaro

Assessment Narrative:
Excellent progress has been made on this objective and the desired system is essentially in place. SLOAC continues to be an active hub for SLO and Assessment dialogue; between last year and so far this semester there have been 15 faculty presentations, with 6 scheduled for the remainder of this semester and a goal of another 10 during the spring. This will result in a total of 31 presentations.

On Monday of Learning College this August joint meeting of the Curriculum, General Education, and Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committees, with 40 Deans and faculty participating was conducted. The group explored how curriculum oversight, student learning outcomes assessment, and program review all integrate together within the context of Accreditation Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services, and especially IIA: Instructional Programs. This was an outstanding turn out of Deans and faculty who provide critical leadership on these Committees, all aimed ultimately at improving the teaching and learning process, and student success.

On Tuesday of Learning College Week 74 full time faculty, 13 adjunct faculty and 9 administrators gathered at the Newark Campus for Get It Done Day, a total of 128 participants. The focus of the morning sessions was completing course assessments from last year and planning them for the coming year. In the afternoon the focus was updating program reviews. This great turnout is an indication of the strong commitment to continuous improvement of the teaching and learning process by Ohlone faculty and Deans across all Divisions and Departments.

We now have a structure process for identifying course assessment projects each semester and for follow up and tracking after each semester.

All instructional program reviews, with house program and course SLOs and assessment will be updated this fall, which is part of our college-wide process of annual program review updates.
We are in the second year of our two-year Action Plan (2011-12, 2012-13) and we believe our system is at the Sustainable Level of the WASC Rubric for SLO implementation, and we are nearing 100% of the Proficiency level.

Current evaluation:
This objective has been met.

Source(s) of evidence:
SLOAC Website

January 2013 College Council Action
Objective is being met.
We might want to expand the objective to include Student Services Learning Outcomes.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Mike Bowman
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Proposed wording change approved.

Date of Posting: December 2, 2011
Reported by: Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro, Deb Parziale
Wording change proposed to better reflect the proficiency and sustainability levels defined in the WASC rubric:
By 2013, have in place an ongoing system will for identifying and assessing student learning outcomes at the program and course levels, which includes faculty dialogue and appropriate improvement plans.

Assessment Narrative:
During the preparation of the Accreditation Mid-Term Report (third year of the six year cycle), it was determined that although good progress was being made on the planning agenda items for student learning outcomes and assessment, our efforts needed to be increased to gain the desired level of faculty engagement across the curriculum. During the spring 2011 semester, dialogue took place among faculty leaders and the Faculty Senate and a Two-Year Action Plan was created with the goal of achieving Proficiency and Sustainability levels as defined by the WASC rubric. The focus of the Action Plan is to meet the accreditation standards with a system that is practical and pragmatic, focused on improvement, and of value to faculty.
The Two-Year Plan called for the expansion of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) to include all academic divisions with a Dean and faculty member representing each. The meetings have been well attended, dialogue has been rich, and very good progress is being made. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment faculty coordinator has worked diligently with faculty on their program review and assessment work, during regularly scheduled consulting times (twice per week, one at each campus). Deans are becoming more involved in working with faculty to implement SLOA. Minutes of the SLOAC meetings can be accessed at the SLOAC website. The website also provides access to the Two-Year Plan and a wealth of resources to assist

Current evaluation:
We are on track to be at full proficiency by 2013 and the system is being developed to be sustainable over the long term.

Source(s) of evidence:
Link to SLOAC Website:
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/sloacomm/
Two-Year Action Plan:
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/sloacomm/docs/20112013sloassessmentactionplan.pdf

Objective 2. By spring 2013, increase the college average course retention to a rate at or above the statewide average.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 16, 2012
Reported by: Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro, and Mike Bowman
Assessment Narrative:
The statewide retention rate for all credit students for Fall 2011 was 84.88%. The retention rate at Ohlone for Fall 2011 was 84.24%. While the statewide rate grew by 0.20%, Ohlone’s rate improved by 0.48%, closing the gap between the rates and reflecting gain in achieving Objective #2. There is still less than one percent to make up, and the college should continue to work on improving its retention rate; however, the college appears to remain on track to meet this objective.

Current evaluation:
This is an ongoing objective and currently it is being met.

Source(s) of evidence:
Datamart

January 2013 College Council Action

Specify annual measurement.
Need to explore setting a local benchmark.
Could the statewide average be stated, if it has been fairly consistent over time.
Look where the upper 10% of our peer colleges per ARCC report?
Look at retention rates by areas of the mission: transfer, CTE and Basic Skills?
Disaggregate further?

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: December 5, 2011
Reported by: Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro, Mike Bowman

Assessment Narrative:
The statewide retention rate for Fall 2010 was 84.68%. The retention rate at Ohlone for Fall 2010 was 83.76%. Thus, we are 0.92% below the state average. Although the college is not exactly at the statewide average, it is very close, and the college retention rate has improved above the Fall 2008 rate of 81.42%. We should continue to monitor our rate to make sure we are at or above the statewide average.

Current evaluation:
We are very near the statewide average for retention and have been for a number of years. This is an objective that is never actually “met;” it needs constant attention as our rates can fluctuate over time, as can the statewide average.

Source(s) of evidence:
California Community Colleges Data Mart
Statewide Retention Rate: 84.68%
https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/ret_sucs_rpt.cfm?timeout=800
Ohlone College Retention Rate: 83.76%
https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/ret_sucs_rpt.cfm?timeout=800

Ohlone Research and Planning Website for longitudinal data:
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/research/studentsuccess.html

Objective 3. By fall 2014, increase the success in basic skills courses to a rate at or above the statewide average.
Changes Made Spring 2012
Original Wording Deleted: By fall 2013, increase semester to semester persistence of ESL and basic skills students to a rate at or above the statewide average.
Wording Replaced by Former Objective 4

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 16, 2012
Reported by: Mike Bowman and Mark Lieu
Assessment Narrative:
In Fall 2011 the statewide rate of basic skills success was 62.80%. The basic skills success rate at Ohlone for Fall 2011 was 66.51%. The annual rates, as reflected in the ARCC report, show a 61.7% statewide success rate compared to Ohlone’s 65.8% rate. By either the CCCCCO MIS term data or the annual Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges report, Ohlone is above the statewide average and has met Objective #3. It should be noted, however, that this is an objective that is based on new data every term and, therefore, must be freshly met every term.
Current evaluation:
This is an ongoing objective and currently it is being met.
Source(s) of evidence:
Datamart

January 2013 College Council Action

Specify annual measurement.
Need to explore setting a local benchmark.
Could the statewide average be stated, if it has been fairly consistent over time.
Look where the upper 10% of our peer colleges per ARCC report?

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Mike Bowman

From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Revise to read “By fall 2013, increase improvement in basic skills courses to a rate at or above the state average.”
Rationale: The original wording was tracking persistence of ESL students, but what the college is accountable for in the ARCC is improvement in both ESL and basic skills.
“Improvement” is persistence to the next highest level of ESL or basic skills, but the persistence can be any time within two years rather than semester-to-semester. Objective #5 already asks for the improvement rate for ESL, but the way #3 was worded was tracking semester-to-semester persistence. This new wording will hold the college accountable for improvement in basic skills and will complement Objective #5. Because the two objectives are comparable, it is also suggested that Objective #3 become Objective #4, pairing #4 and #5 on the list.

Date of Posting: January 4, 2012
Reported by: Jim Wright, Mike Bowman
Assessment Narrative:
Recommend combining Objective 3 with Objective 5. For the CCCCO and the ARCC Report, “improvement” is semester to semester persistence to a higher level course in either basic skills or ESL, so there is duplication between objectives 3 and 5 when we track ESL persistence and improvement. The newly-worded objective 5 uses the ARCC term “improvement” and combines both ESL and basic skills in the assessment. As such, this objective can be deleted.

**Current evaluation:**

**Source(s) of evidence:**

[Former Objective 4 became new wording for Objective 3, Spring 2012. By fall 2014, increase the success in basic skills courses to a rate at or above the statewide average.]

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 30, 2012  
**Reported by:** Mike Bowman  
**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**  
Renumber as Objective 3

**Objective 4. By fall 2014, increase the improvement in ESL courses to a rate at or above the statewide average.**

[Originally numbered Objective 5, but became 4 with elimination of original Objective 3 in Spring 2012.]

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** November 16, 2012  
**Reported by:** Mike Bowman and Mark Lieu  
**Assessment Narrative:**

Improvement in ESL and basic skills refers to the successive enrollments of remedial students in successively higher level courses across time. These improvement rates track the percentage of students enrolled in a basic skills or ESL course that is at least two levels below college/transfer level who re-enroll in a higher level course within the same discipline within three years. Ohlone’s basic skills improvement rate is 66.5%. This is compared to a statewide average of 56.2%. Similarly, Ohlone’s ESL improvement rate is 56.8% compared to the statewide average rate of 50.8%. While it appears that the college is doing well compared to the statewide average, it should be noted that Ohlone’s ESL improvement rate fell almost 5% from the prior year while the statewide average reflected a 1% gain.

**Current evaluation:**

This is an ongoing objective and currently it is being met. The lower improvement rate from the prior year should be assessed
January 2013 College Council Action

Specify annual measurement.
Reword to include Basic Skills.
Need to explore setting a local benchmark.
Could the statewide average be stated, if it has been fairly consistent over time.
Look where the upper 10% of our peer colleges per ARCC report?

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Mike Bowman
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Change completion date to fall 2013 to align with new Objective 4

Date of Posting: December 5, 2011
Reported by: Jim Wright, Mike Bowman

Assessment Narrative:
Improvement in ESL and basic skills refers to the successive enrollments of remedial students in successively higher level courses across time. These improvement rates track the percentage of students enrolled in a basic skills or ESL course that is at least two levels below college/transfer level who re-enroll in a higher level course within the same discipline within three years. Ohlone’s basic skills improvement rate is 66.5%. This is compared to a statewide average of 55.9%. Similarly, Ohlone’s ESL improvement rate is 61.7% compared to the statewide average rate of 49.4%

Current evaluation:
We are currently meeting this objective.

Source(s) of evidence:
http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/TRIS/research/ARCC/March%20ARCC%202011.pdf

Objective 5. By spring 2013, increase to 600 the number of students transferring to UC and CSU.

[Originally numbered Objective 6, but became 5 with elimination of original Objective 3 in Spring 2012.]

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 16, 2012
Reported by: Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro, Ron Travenick, and Mike Bowman

Assessment Narrative:
The 2011 transfer data reveals that 203 Ohlone students transferred to a UC campus and 399 students transferred to a CSU campus, a total of 602, meeting the number set forth in the objective. Based on the ARCC report that has one metric measuring degrees and transfer, Ohlone is still above both the statewide average and the peer group average.
However, comparing transfer velocity among peer colleges and Bay 10 colleges, Ohlone fell to fourth best in both lists, still a remarkable achievement, but a decline in transfer velocity from 54% to 50%. New metrics for the ARCC scorecard are currently being developed at the state level as a part of the implementation of SB 1546 and mandate several services and practices designed to increase success and transfer levels. In addition, though not a part of the specific objective, 145 Ohlone students transferred in 2011 to in-state private colleges and universities, and an additional 144 students transferred to out-of-state schools.

**Current evaluation:**
This is an ongoing objective and currently it is being met.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Datamart

**January 2013 College Council Action**

Specify annual measurement.
Compare to peer colleges, possibly ARCC peers?
Compare Transfer Velocity to ARCC peers?
Adding private in-state or out-of-state data.

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** December 5, 2011
**Reported by:** Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro, Ron Travenick, Mike Bowman

**Assessment Narrative:**
Although the college came very close to meeting this objective with 581 UC/CSU transfers following the ’08-’09 year, the ’09-’10 year witnessed a drop in transfer students to 479. This drop included a rate of transfers to CSUs that was more than 30% below the previous year, a trend reflected statewide due, in part, by the CSUs significantly restricting enrollment due to state budget woes. However, Ohlone’s transfer rate still ranks third highest among the 21 colleges within the Bay 10.

**Current evaluation:**
We have not achieved this goal, although we came close in 2009. We continue to promote transfer as a key mission of the college, despite external factors that are lowering access to higher education.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/research/studentsuccess.html

**Objective 6. By spring 2013, increase to 500 the number of students receiving associate degrees.**

[Originally numbered Objective 7, but became 6 with elimination of original Objective 3 in Spring 2012.]

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** November 16, 2012
**Reported by:** Ron Travenick and Mike Bowman

**Assessment Narrative:**
If we continue to use the absolute number of 500, the objective was met for the 2011-12 school year when there were 569 associate degrees awarded. Using the suggested metric of comparing percentage of graduates to FTES of peer colleges, the college has some substantial work to do. Compared to the 22 colleges identified as peers by the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges report, Ohlone ranks 16th in the percentage of graduates to annual FTES. Within a range of 20.19% for San Diego Miramar to 3.28% for
Berkeley City College, Ohlone’s annual graduates constitute 6.58% of annual FTES. This would be below the peer group average of 7.89%. New metrics for the ARCC scorecard are currently being developed at the state level as a part of the implementation of SB 1546 and mandate several services and practices designed to increase degree completion.

Current evaluation:
This is an ongoing objective and currently it is being met. However, we are below the rates of peer colleges and we should continue to promote associate degree completion.

Source(s) of evidence:
Datamart

January 2013 College Council Action

Specify annual measurement.
Next strategic plan, benchmark may need to be increased, especially looking at colleges of similar size.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Mike Bowman

From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Revise to read “By spring 2013, increase the number of students receiving associate degrees to a rate at or above the peer group average.”
Rationale: When using an absolute number as a goal, the college has no idea how that number compares with the rates at which other community colleges graduate students with associate degrees. Perhaps a good metric for measuring success would be the number of degrees awarded compared to FTES. This could be determined for all those peers as identified within the ARCC report for program achievement. That way, someone else has already done the work of identifying colleges with comparable feeder high schools, economic advantages, and all the other variables that affect student success.

Date of Posting: December 5, 2011
Reported by: Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro, Ron Travenick, Mike Bowman

Assessment Narrative:
During the ’10-’11 academic year, Ohlone awarded 424 AA/AS degrees. Although this is not yet as high as the goal set for 2013, it is a significant increase over the previous year, which represented a ten year low in the number of degrees awarded.

Current evaluation:
We are nearing the achievement of this goal. We continue to promote degree completion and streamline evaluation processing in Admissions and Records through the use of technology.

Source(s) of evidence:
https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/awards_rpt.cfm

Objective 7. By spring 2013, increase to 300 the number of students receiving certificates of achievement and accomplishment.

[Originally numbered Objective 8, but became 7 with elimination of original Objective 3 in Spring 2012.]

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment
Assessment Narrative:
For the 2011-12 academic year, the college awarded only 178 certificates, down from the previous year’s 248. Additionally, when compared to peer colleges, Ohlone’s rate of awarding Certificates of Achievement per FTES is last among the 23 peer colleges at 0.38% when the peer group average is 4.30%. For Certificates of Accomplishment per FTES, Ohlone’s rate of 1.68% is right at the peer group average of 1.65%.

Current Evaluation:
Given the reorganization that came with the Band-Aid year, the work of the completions committee lagged, and that could address the decline in certificates of accomplishment. The work of the completions committee in 10-11 was not institutionalized for 11-12, and the members of the committee that had led the work in 10-11 were not available to provide the kind of leadership from the prior year in 11-12. If the recommendations of the committee can be implemented—particularly those that relate to Certificates of Achievement—the college should see gains in rates compared to peer colleges.

Source(s) of evidence:
Datamart

January 2013 College Council Action

Need a more formal Action Plan that is well communicated to faculty and staff.
Possibly refocusing current work to support the Action Plan

Objective 8. By 2015, increase the number of students taking 12.0 units or more per semester to a rate of 30% compared to headcount enrollment.
November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 16, 2012
Reported by: Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro, Ron Travenick, and Mike Bowman

Assessment Narrative:
In Fall 2011, 32.6% of total headcount enrollment was enrolled for 12 or more units. In Spring 2012 the number fell back to 29.5%, but that is a 1.5% decrease over last year. Given the imposed course reductions and subsequent high demand for classes in just the last two years, current figures may be difficult to compare longitudinally.

Current evaluation:
The objective continues to be met but the 1.5% decrease over last year should be watched.

Source(s) of evidence:
Datamart

January 2013 College Council Action

Specify annual measurement.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: December 5, 2011
Reported by: Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro, Ron Travenick, Mike Bowman

Assessment Narrative:
In Fall 2010 Ohlone had 30% of total headcount students enrolled for 12 or more units. In Spring 2011, that rate fell back to 28%, which is where it usually hovers. The 30% rate was also attained in Spring 2009, so the objective can be attained, but it must also be maintained.

Current evaluation:
We continue to be at a bit below this benchmark. Preliminary data indicate we will surpass the benchmark for 2011-12.

Source(s) of evidence:
https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/studdemo_coll_rpt_cube.cfm?RequestTimeout=1000

Objective 9. By 2011, achieve 100% completion of professional development in online instructional methods and online course management for faculty who teach fully online or hybrid courses.

[Originally numbered Objective 10, but became 9 with elimination of original Objective 3 in Spring 2012.]

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: 12/7/12
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro, Lesley Buehler

Assessment Narrative: This objective has been met.
Current evaluation: This objective has been met.

Source(s) of evidence:
Professional Development Database
Attached Title III final report
Learning College Week – (need to locate past workshop schedules

January 2013 College Council Action

Objective has been met.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro, Lesley Buehler
Assessment Narrative:
This objective has been achieved. Professional Development opportunities funded through the Title III grant and through Learning college week have provided workshops for faculty who teach online and hybrid to become proficient in online instructional methods.
Current evaluation:
This objective has been completed.
Source(s) of evidence:
Professional Development Database
Attached Title III final report
Learning College Week – (need to locate past workshop schedules

Objective 10. By 2015, expand the appropriate Student Services available to evening students, part time students, students on the Newark Campus, and students taking courses online.

[Originally numbered Objective 11, but became 10 with elimination of original Objective 3 in Spring 2012].

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: 11/19/12
Reported by: Ron Travenick and Mike Bowman
Assessment Narrative: Continued staffing reductions have made this a difficult objective to meet however the counseling department is in scheduling assessment and orientation workshops at the NCHST site to improve staff visibility. The College Connection cohort, as well as the Puente cohort are planned to be housed at NCHST starting with Fall 21013 and should help with this by. Counseling staff have made evening hours (until 7:30pm) and appointments available Monday-Thursday starting with 2012FA. Continued effort is being put into improvements to electronic services which will improve service delivery for all students during all hours.
Current evaluation: The counseling, orientation and assessment schedules show improvement in these areas.
Source(s) of evidence: Counseling Web page, Puente and College connection webpage, SARS grid shows the actual numbers of evening contacts.
January 2013 College Council Action

Pull together individual projects into one Action Plan with outcomes.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Mike Bowman
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Maintain current wording rather than revising the objective as suggested.
Rationale: While we recognize that progress on this objective has been stymied because of economic conditions and lack of resources, the objective is still valid and should be pursued when conditions permit.

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Reported by: Ron Travenick
Assessment Narrative:
Budget and staffing cuts have set this goal back in terms of the intended expansion of face-to-face services to these specific populations. Four-day scheduling (at NCHST) and reorganization and training of existing staff have allowed for additional cross functionality of staff able to meet student needs. Improvements have been made in electronic services for all students which do affect this goal; however, this goal needs to be reworded to define service improvements to all groups.

Improvements have been made in terms of on-line and web access to student records. Students now have improved access to information to select classes, apply for graduation, request and monitor transcripts, and make counseling appointments. These services improve access to all students 24/7. All financial aid awarding information and correspondence now takes place electronically. Registration appointment letters and communication with students has also been improved. Still in progress is the implementation of the degree audit/education plans and a fuller automation of communications to students.
The refinement of the Waitlist processing and registration of students has greatly improved students' ability to obtain needed classes.
Current evaluation:
This objective is being pursued. The wording of the objective needs review.
Source(s) of evidence:

Eliminated in Spring 2012: Objective 12. By 2015, establish and maintain student mastery of Information Competency Standards at a level at or above the statewide rate.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Mike Bowman
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Eliminate this objective.
Rationale: Because of the vagueness of the “Information Competency Standards” and the lack of statewide data against which rates can be compared, there does not seem to be a valid way of tracking or measuring progress in this area.
**Assessment Narrative:**
The LRC faculty feel this Objectives needs to be reviewed further, as there are no statewide data regarding rates of “…student mastery of Information Competency Standards…” upon which to compare. There also needs to be further exploration about what the Information Competency Standards should be.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective needs to be reviewed for possible elimination.

**Source(s) of evidence:**

**Objective 11. By 2012, implement systems that enable all students to declare an academic goal and are provided with an electronic degree audit, which informs progress towards that goal.**

[Originally numbered Objective 13, but became 11 with elimination of original Objectives 3 and 12 in Spring 2012].

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 14, 2013  
**Reported by:** Ron Travenick  
**Assessment Narrative:**
Declaration of academic goal being met through both the application and Web Advisor technology. The delivery of an electronic degree audit is still in process. Anticipated roll out is expected for Fall 2013. Given new compliance standards set by the state in terms of the Student Success Act, this functionality must be provided by 2014.

**Current evaluation:**
In progress

**Source(s) of evidence:**

**January 2013 College Council Action**

Need a more formal Action Plan with a realistic implementation date.

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 11, 2012  
**Reported by:** Ron Travenick  
**Assessment Narrative:**
Systems are in place through both the electronic application and each students self-update process each term to choose and confirm an academic goal. The next step toward full implementation involves making it possible for students to change or add academic goals and view a degree audit report for themselves via web advisor. The system has been set up to provide staff and counselors with access to the degree audit function and each catalog year has been updated in the system to keep this functional.

The Student Development Committee has reviewed the Degree Audit functionality and added it to it priority list for implementation as soon as possible. What remains is to turn on the functionality for students to view degree audit on web advisor. This can be accomplished in the next term but the tool itself will need refinement before it is effective.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective is well on the way to being achieved.

**Source(s) of evidence:**

---

**Objective 12. By 2012, establish mutual agreements with local school districts to redefine expectations of partnership in light of reduced staffing and budget support while maintaining clear pathways for students.**

[Originally numbered Objective 14, but became 12 with elimination of original Objectives 3 and 12 in Spring 2012].

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** November 5, 2012  
**Reported by:** Jim Wright

**Assessment Narrative:**
A joint meeting between the Ohlone College Board of Trustees and the Fremont Unified School District School Board of Education was conducted on April 13, 2011. A presentation by Ohlone and FUSD staff reviewed the history of our partnership programs. The two Boards jointly approved a Resolution supporting continuing our partnerships, including dual enrollment, 2+2 course articulation, College Connection; and to continue to explore future programs.  
A joint meeting between the Ohlone College Board of Trustees and the Newark Unified School District School Board of Education was conducted on March 28, 2012. A presentation by Ohlone staff reviewed the history of our partnership programs. The two Boards directed college and school staff to follow up and develop an action plan. Follow up meetings have resulted in action plans in the areas of biotechnology pathway, College Connection, and the Puente program.  
A meeting with New Haven Unified administrative leadership was conducted on October 29, 2012. Areas of interest are 2+2 articulation and College Connection.  
The English Department approved the use of the senior year Exploratory Reading and Writing Course developed based on the CSU EAP program for use as placement into ENGL 101A. The ERWC is currently being offered at three FUSD high schools and at for all senior English at Logan High School. Newark Memorial is also exploring use of ERWC. The English Department also approved use of EAP scores for ENGL101A placement; the Math Department had previously approved use of EAP scores for MATH152 placement.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective has been met.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Board of Trustees minutes

---

**January 2013 College Council Action**

**Objective met.**
GOAL 2: Support the economic vitality of the community through educational programs and services that respond to identified employment needs.

Objective 1. By 2011, produce a local strategic plan for Career Technical Education to include an inventory and assessment of our current programs, environmental scan data, a SWOT analysis, and a five-year set of goals, objectives and actions plans.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 16, 2012
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro
Assessment Narrative: This objective has been met.
Current Evaluation: This objective has been met.

January 2013 College Council Action

Objective met.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: December 14, 2011
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro and Jim Wright
Assessment Narrative: Working with the Academic Deans the Workforce and Economic Development has completed a five-year local Strategic Plan for Career Technical Education and Economic Development that includes all the elements described in the objective.
Current evaluation: This objective has been met.
Source(s) of evidence:
Strategic Plan for Career Technical Education and Economic Development
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/academicaffairs/docs/20112016strategicplancareertecheduc.pdf

Objective 2. Within the context of the CTE Strategic Plan, by 2012, identify needs of local employers and and during 2013 – 2015, create responses through our existing programs, contract education, and new program development.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: 12/7/12
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro and Jim Wright
Assessment Narrative:
The director of the One Stop along with the One-Stop staff conducted a needs analysis survey to send to local employers. The results will be shared with the Academic Administrators and faculty to determine if existing employer needs are being met and/or if new program development is needed. It is proposed that the wording of the objective (see above) be updated to identify 2013-13 for follow up. Also, once the college’s Environmental Scan is updated, the results should be integrated into the work under this objective

Current evaluation:
This objective has been partially met and an action plan is in place.

Source(s) of evidence:
Link to survey results:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RCKJXZV

January 2013 College Council Action

Objective met.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: December 14, 2011
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro, Jim Wright and Ron Travenick

Assessment Narrative:
The director of the One Stop along with the One-Stop staff is working on creating a needs analysis survey to send to local employers. This will also be shared with the WEDT committee for input and recommendations. Survey results will then be analyzed to determine if existing employer needs are being met and/or if new program development is needed.

Current evaluation:
An action plan is in place to achieve this objective.

Source(s) of evidence:
Link to draft survey
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RCKJXZV

Objective 3. By 2013 create a curriculum which enhances the availability of programs that focus on emerging industries including green technologies and those identified by the Alameda County Workforce Investment Board and Department of Labor’s high growth, high demand job training initiative.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro and Jim Wright

Assessment Narrative:
Dialogue continues related to emerging industries. Ohlone’s involvement continues in the Home Energy and Retrofit Occupations Grant which is focused on emerging green technologies. As the grant progresses and as economic information becomes available related to green technologies and other emerging industries the Academic Administrators and faculty will respond accordingly. Also related to this objective will be information included in program reviews for CTE programs.
Ohlone’s involvement in the new DOL-funded regional Design It – Build It manufacturing training consortium grant (community colleges and Alameda/Contra Costa County WIBs) award will likely lead to training for emerging industries, including green technologies.

**Current evaluation:**
Good progress continues to be on this objective, particularly given the current economic conditions.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Assessment Narrative:

**Current evaluation:**

**Source(s) of evidence:**

---

**January 2013 College Council Action**

**Curriculum has been created and more is being developed.**

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** December 14, 2011

**Reported by:** Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro

**Assessment Narrative:**
The Workforce and Economic Development Team continues to have dialogue related to emerging industries. Currently Ohlone is a partner in the Home Energy and Retrofit Occupations Grant which is focused on emerging green technologies. As the grant progresses and as economic information becomes available related to green technologies and other emerging industries the WEDT will respond accordingly. Also related to this objective will be information included in program reviews for CTE programs.

**Current evaluation:**
Good progress is being made on this objective, particularly given the current economic conditions.

**Source(s) of evidence:**

---

**Objective 4. By 2013 2014 provide opportunities across the curriculum for students to acquire key skill sets and concepts that will help them succeed in the workplace.**

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:**

**Reported by:** Leta Stagnaro and Jim Wright

**Assessment Narrative:**
An Action Plan is underway to link Program Student Learning Outcomes, which link to all CTE programs similar to the process being developed for GE student learning outcomes. Exploring this concept will require dialogue amongst faculty and Deans who have CTE programs in their departments/divisions. An outcome of this dialogue would be to identify the key workplace learning outcomes and concepts.

The completion date needs to be move ahead to 2014 due to the hiring of two new academic this this year (see proposed change above).
**Current evaluation:**
Good progress is being made on this objective.

**Source(s) of evidence:**

**January 2013 College Council Action**

**The Action Plan needs to be formalized with skills sets clearly specified.**

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:**
**Reported by:** Jim Wright, Leta Stagnaro

**Assessment Narrative:**
Plans are underway to link Program Student Learning Outcomes, which link to all CTE programs similar to the process being developed for GE student learning outcomes. Exploring this concept will require dialogue amongst faculty and Deans who have CTE programs in their departments/divisions. An outcome of this dialogue would be to identify the key workplace learning outcomes and concepts.

**Current evaluation:**
Good progress is being made on this objective.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
GOAL 3: Promote continuous, needs-based, learning and professional development opportunities for all district personnel.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: February 5, 2012
Reported by: Shairon Zingsheim
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
There should be an objective that allows for continual overall improvement:
For example: Establish an annual general training plan for all employees each fiscal year and ensure at least 50% attendance/completion.

Objective 1. By 2011, establish an IT training program for staff and full and part time faculty, enabling them to be more self-directed and capable in IT applications/maintenance.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 13, 2012
Reported by: Shairon Zingsheim
Assessment Narrative: Although the report in January 2012 noted that this objective has been met, the implementation continues. In February 2012, the district purchased the following licenses for the E-Learn portal for all employees: 30 - Business; 300 Desktop; and 15 IT Professional licenses.

SkillSoft/Business (30 Licenses)
This suite of courses is specifically for employees interested in enhancing their job skills. Examples of courses are: Improving Customer Service, Developing Excellent Communication skills, Project Management skill building, Leadership Development etc. The audience for these courses would be managers and other staff interested in developing their skills.

SkillSoft/Desktop (300 Licenses)
All employees have access to the Desktop trainings as it offers a wide variety of computer courses such as: Adobe, Microsoft Office products and Apple/Mac software programs. The intent of this suite of courses is to enable all end users to learn beginning to advanced techniques in navigating and using computer software. The courses are self-directed and could be accessed from anywhere. Learning could be done as needed to solve a particular problem or the employee can determine if he/she wants to learn a new software program. Managers can also assign coursework to their employees as part of a professional development plan.

SkillSoft IT (15 Licenses)
This set of courses is particularly geared for the district’s IT staff. The list of courses provide continuous development of IT professionals.

The HR department has been slowly unveiling the E-Learn portal to various employee groups. To date the following employee groups has been provided hands-on demonstration and given their user IDs and passwords: classified staff on Classified Professional Development Day; Adjunct Faculty in August 2012, Academic Deans in May 2012. The other employee groups: full time faculty and managers will be trained prior to the end of spring 2013. The strategy of a slow roll-out was deliberate. The hope was that employees would become proficient and encourage others to use the portal. So far this strategy has worked but in a recent License Consumption Report dated October 31, 2012 (see below) the number of users indicate that more work needs to be done to encourage usage.
Current evaluation:
There is still a lot of work to be done to introduce employees to this learning portal. As the report indicates the licenses that are specifically for IT staff has not been used, while the SkillSoft Business consumption is almost half. More marketing needs to be done to encourage employees to use the Desktop suite of courses.

Source(s) of evidence:

January 2013 College Council Action

Assessment narrative clear
Narrative is clear and precise in number of licenses, users, etc.

Eval Adequate
Eval needs to address the programmatic portion of the objective. Usage of the tools available need to be tracked and reported.

Source of Evidence Adequate
Comprehensive.

Lagging behind require an action plan, and what does it entail
As stated in the assessment more marketing needs to occur.

Should a wording change be made
Should consider a metric to track or verify success toward the objective.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Reported by: Shairon Zingsheim

Assessment Narrative:
A team of district employees spent approximately four months testing an E-Learning product that the district is considering for continuous IT/Desktop training for all employees. The team was made up of managers, faculty and classified staff. The company, SkillSoft, is a leader in the education environment and agreed to pilot their E-Learning “university” with this “test” group. SkillSoft provided a representative who came to assist the team with navigating through the many courses offered. SkillSoft offers host of IT, Desktop and business courses. Employees would be able to update their technical skills at their desks or in a classroom setting. The learning objects include interactive lessons, workshops, task-based simulations and assessments. SkillSoft was impressed with the team’s interest and thorough evaluation of its product and is willing to continue to pilot the courses for a greater number of employees. The next step is to determine the number of licenses to purchase and have employees begin to utilize the system.
Current Evaluation:
The objective to establish a training program has been met. Now implementation is underway.

Source(s) of evidence:
List of Trainings for all employees
List of Trainings for managers
SkillSoft Course list
Classified Professional Development Day agenda
SEIU Professional Development

Objective 2. By 2014, establish an application/selection process for interested faculty and staff for training opportunities in to have access to a leadership development program.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change and completion date extension:
By 2014, establish an application/selection process for interested faculty and staff for training opportunities to have access to a leadership development program.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 13, 2012
Reported by: Shairon Zingsheim

Assessment Narrative:
Since the update provided in January 2012, no progress has been made on this objective. This is still a viable and much needed objective but funding and time to devote to developing a program is limited.

Current evaluation:
This objective should be extended to 2014. There is a suggested change to the wording of this objective. This change will be proposed to the Board of Trustees.

Source(s) of evidence:

January 2013 College Council Action

Assessment narrative clear
Assessment is clear.

Eval Adequate
Yes.

Source of Evidence Adequate
Should include budget information on the training funding line to demonstrate the lack of resources.

Lagging behind require an action plan, and what does it entail
Yes. Identify funding sources. Survey staff/faculty for a needs assessment and integrate with an analysis of campus-wide and anticipated future needs.

Should a wording change be made
As stated the wording change should be made to extend the date to 2014.
By 2014, establish an application/selection process for interested faculty and staff for training opportunities to have access to a leadership development program.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: February 5, 2012
Reported by: Shairon Zingsheim

From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Add the word "a cohort of" in between "for" and "interested"...so the objective should read:
By 2014, establish an application/selection process for a cohort of interested faculty and staff for training opportunities in leadership development.

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Reported by: Shairon Zingsheim

Assessment Narrative:
No action has been taken to investigate a concentrated leadership program for faculty and staff. A lunch-time Leadership discussion group has been meeting since November 2010. This is a small group of administrators and classified staff. The members of this group is very interested in working on researching and developing a formal Leadership Development Program.

Current evaluation:
Work on this objective has yet to be started. Setting a new target date of 2014 is proposed.

Source(s) of evidence:

Objective 3. By 2012, establish a process whereby all classified staff may access professional development identified in the professional development plan.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 15, 2012
Reported by: Shairon Zingsheim

Assessment Narrative:
The HR department continues to work with employees to provide training opportunities that they identify for themselves through their Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP). The Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) was used in the spring 2012 in conjunction with the spring 2012 performance evaluation process. Approximately 12 employees submitted IPDPs with their performance evaluations and indicated that they are working with their supervisors to complete their Plans.

One classified employee who is actively working on a IPDP has been placed to work in the Human Resources department for 20 hours as she continues to pursue her bachelor degree in Human Resources.

The Interpreting department has developed a “group” professional development plan, rather than individual. They formed a discussion group focused on learning more about cultural mediation. In their work as Interpreters, they navigate between two cultures on a daily basis and are expected to provide cultural mediation. The group chose a book that is about the clash of two cultures: The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down: A Hmong Child, Her American Doctors, and the Collision of Two Cultures by Anne Fadiman.

In fall 2012, the Professional Development Committee divided into two separate committees: faculty development and staff development. Dividing the committees will ensure focus on the unique needs of each group. The Staff Development committee will be responsible for reviewing staff requests for training and conferences and planning on-site, district-wide employee trainings for classified employees.

Current evaluation:
Good progress is being made to meet this objective.
Source(s) of evidence:

January 2013 College Council Action

Assessment narrative clear
Yes.
Eval Adequate
Narrative could be moved to evaluation for greater detail.
Source of Evidence Adequate
None. Should list more detail employees participating in the IPDP. More communication should occur with managers to develop the plans. This communication and a plan template should be included.
Lagging behind require an action plan, and what does it entail
Yes. Lagging because the plan seems to lack a communication component.
Should a wording change be made
No.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Reported by: Shairon Zingsheim
Assessment Narrative:
At last Classified Professional Development Day (April 2011), a tool, Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) was introduced to classified staff for use their optional use. The tool is meant to facilitate a discussion between the employee and his/her supervisor about the employee’s professional development goals. A copy of the IPDP would be sent to the AVP of HR for review. The AVP of HR would in turn identify training opportunities that would assist the employee(s) to reach their goals. If IPDPs reflected that a group of employees are interested in the same training, then the AVP would determine the feasibility of having it conducted on site rather than having the employee attend off-site training.
The next step is implementation. Two employees used the IPDP as a trial last year. One employee entered into a Human Resources Certificate program on her own time and then requested through the IPDP to work in the Human Resources department on her own time. The HR department developed a structured program that parallel the courses the employee enrolled in for fall 2011. The employee still enrolled in the HR certificate program and continues to work with the HR department for hands-on training.
Current evaluation:
This objective is on schedule to be completed on time
Source(s) of evidence:
Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) form.
Classified Professional Development Day Flyer

Objective 4. By 2015, improve satisfaction rate with customer service in all service areas of the college, provide district-wide customer service training for all employees.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
By 2015, improve satisfaction rate with customer service in all service areas of the college, provide district-wide customer service training for all employees.
**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** November 13, 2012  
**Reported by:** Shairon Zingsheim

**Assessment Narrative:**
Nothing has been done with this objective. See suggested re-write of the objective below. Assuming that the change to the objective will be made and accepted by the board, the next step will be to develop a training program for the front-line departments by spring 2015.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective is in progress. Wording change submitted.

**Source(s) of evidence:**

---

**January 2013 College Council Action**

**Assessment narrative clear**
No. Were unable to find the proposed re-write.

**Eval Adequate**
Yes. Given lack of progress.

**Source of Evidence Adequate**
Lagging behind require an action plan, and what does it entail

**Source of Evidence Adequate**
Yes

**Should a wording change be made**
Language is too vague and doesn’t measure against the level by which it is compared.

---

**February 2013 College Council Action**

Wording change:
By 2015, improve satisfaction rate with customer service in all service areas of the college. provide district-wide customer service training for all employees.

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** February 5, 2012  
**Reported by:** Shairon Zingsheim

**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**
What are we improving from? We need baseline data. The team who reviewed this objective felt that customer service expectations should include internal customers as well. So a suggested rewrite:
Develop a customer service training program for all front-line departments (Student Services, Administrative Services, and Human Resources).

**Date of Posting:** January 11, 2012  
**Reported by:** Shairon Zingsheim

**Assessment Narrative:**
No action has been taken to measure overall customer service satisfaction in the past two years. This objective will be difficult to measure. However, the intention is continuous improvement in customer service throughout the district. Training should be developed and provided on a regular basis for front-line staff and other service intensive areas. The HR department has been exploring district-wide training options for customer-service for employees. The AVP of HR is currently working with the Contract Education department to explore options that are cost effective as well as appropriate for community college staff.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective is in progress.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
GOAL 4: Use human, fiscal, technological, and physical resources responsibly, effectively, and efficiently to maximize student learning and achievement.

Objective 1. Annually sustain the fiscal health of the district

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 30, 2012
Reported by: Ron Little

Assessment Narrative:
Given the District’s proactive and fiscally prudent budget strategies implemented over the past few years, noted below, and the November 6, 2012, voter approval of Proposition 30, the District’s financial health remains solid. Although anticipating a current year operating deficit of nearly $2.6 Million, the passing of Prop 30 has reduced the District’s operating deficit to approximately $750k, based on preliminary assumptions. To resolve this current year budget deficit we anticipate no staff or salary reductions. Rather, the deficit will be backfilled by District Reserves, which currently represent over 15% of total General Fund Expenditures. While the District’s Reserves are healthy at this time, 2012/13 represents the second year of deficit spending—expenses exceeding revenues—by the District, reflecting an ongoing structural deficit (general fund-unrestricted) that will need to be resolved in the near future.

Current evaluation:
This objective continues to be met.

Source(s) of evidence:
Budget Updates to the Board
State Reports 311 and 311Q’s
Community Budget Forums
Budget Committee Meeting Minutes
Audit Reports

January 2013 College Council Action

For each Objective involved the review groups should address the following questions:

- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? Yes
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? Yes
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? Yes
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set by Ohlone?) Not sure
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? None
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? None

The report out should include the following for each Objective:

- A summary assessment of progress made.
November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: February 28, 2012
Reported by: Kathleen Schoenecker
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012

Add to Source(s) of evidence:
- Budget Updates to the Board
- Budget Forums
- Budget Committee Meeting Minutes
- Audit Reports

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Reported by: Scott Thomason

Assessment Narrative:
Despite unprecedented instability of state funding, our District has maintained a strong financial position avoiding layoffs, and attempting to minimize the use of reserves. A variety of proactive strategies have been use including restructuring the Budget Committee as a subcommittee of the College Council charged with integrating budget planning with program review and college planning, a series of early retirement incentives, ongoing budget analysis and planning, ongoing enrollment analysis and planning, and a spirit of collaboration amongst all interest groups.

Current evaluation:
This objective continues to be met.

Source(s) of evidence:

Objective 2. By 2013–2014, increase to 50% the number of faculty and staff who report understanding that budget priorities are established through systematic planning.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change and completion date extension:
By 2013–2014, increase to 50% the number of faculty and staff who report understanding that budget priorities are established through systematic planning.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: November 30, 2012
Reported by: Ron Little

Assessment Narrative:
In the past few years there have been numerous campus wide efforts to increase awareness of the connection between budgeting and planning. This past year witnessed revisions and “upgrades” to the college’s PIO process to more effectively delineate the nexus between strategic planning and budget / resource allocation. Additionally, this year as the Vice President of Administrative Services and the Dean of Business Services met with Budget Managers, PIOs and strategic planning were reviewed and how they relate to resource
allocation at department and division levels was discussed. The District’s Budget Committee continues to meet and analyze the relationship between the District’s budget(s), strategic planning and college priorities. We anticipate much greater levels of understanding measured by the 2013 survey.

**Current evaluation:**
The achievement of this objective is well underway.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Community Budget Forums
College Council Meeting Minutes
PIO Process Revisions
Budget Manager Meeting Agendas

**January 2013 College Council Action**
- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? Yes
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? Yes
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? Yes
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set my Ohlone?) - None that we could think of. This is a nice goal to have.
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? No
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? Just to change from 2013 to 2014 – we should keep this going instead of giving it an end date… so duration of the strategic plan

The report out should include the following for each Objective:
- A summary assessment of progress made:
- Any wording changes recommended. – Yes… change by 2013 to by 2014
- Recommended Action Plan, if one is needed. No

**February 2013 College Council Action**
Wording change;
| By 2013 to 2014, increase to 50% the number of faculty and staff who report understanding that budget priorities are established through systematic planning.

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** February 28, 2012
**Reported by:** Kathleen Schoenecker
**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**

**Assessment Narrative:**
In the past few years, there have been numerous campus wide efforts to increase awareness of the connection between budgeting and planning, including recurring budget forums, the formation of the Budget Committee, and the establishment of the PIO process. The annual campus climate survey is used to measure this objective. The percentage of faculty and staff who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with the statement “Budget priorities are determined by systematic planning” has risen steadily since 2007 (34%).

**Current evaluation:**
The achievement of this objective is underway. The 2011 results of the campus climate survey report that the percentage of faculty and staff who report understanding the connection between budgeting and planning has risen to 45%.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Survey of Faculty/Staff regarding budget/planning
Budget Forums
Budget Committee Meeting Minutes
College Council Minutes discussing the PIO process

**Date of Posting:** January 11, 2102

**Reported by:** Scott Thomason, Joanne Schultz

**Assessment Narrative:**
Part of our efforts this year is setting up processes and planning and linking this to budget. The newly constituted Budget Committee began operating, during the second half of the 200-11 fiscal year. The agendas are published and the meetings are open to all and are recorded so those with conflict in their schedule can listen to the meeting when convenient. The President holds budget forums quarterly or as information becomes available from the state sources. The opening convocations for each semester also provide an opportunity to update the campus on budget topics.

In 2009 and 2010 there were three budget workshops offered to the campus community two were to support budget managers and a third was how to use the reports with in Datatel to assist review of the budget.

The District also rolled out the “My Budget” functionality within WebAdvisor so that there was more universal and simpler access to the budget information.

There has also been in roads made into bringing consistent budget information into the negotiations forum so that all units are hearing the same information. This begun in the Spring of 2011.

**Current Evaluation:**
This objective is being pursued. A review of the objective is in order to clarify the benchmarks.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Budget Committee agendas, handouts, minutes
Budget Forums
Training sessions dates and handouts
The objective needs to be reviewed and clarified.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Objective 3. By 2015, increase non-apportionment income by $2.5M from baseline of $2.5 million in 2011.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
By 2015, increase non-apportionment income by $2.5M from baseline of $4,326,011 $2.5 million in 2011.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Gari Browning and Susan Houghton
Assessment Narrative:

Current evaluation:

Source(s) of evidence:

January 2013 College Council Action

For each Objective involved the review groups should address the following questions:

- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? **No new narrative**
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? **No current evaluation**
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? **Updated sources of evidence needed**
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set my Ohlone?) **Not sure**
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? **YES – maybe an action plan would help get this objective more focused.**
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? **No**

The report out should include the following for each Objective:

- A summary assessment of progress made:
- Any wording changes recommended. –
- Recommended Action Plan, if one is needed

**NOTES:** The President’s speech revealed a number of steps taken or in the process to reach this goal. Hiring of a new ED for the Foundation, RFP for the Frontage property; savings from the solar project; international program income, etc. This information needs to be included here.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
By 2015, increase non-apportionment income by $2.5M from baseline of $4,326,011 $2.5 million in 2011.
November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: February 28, 2012
Reported by: Kathleen Schoenecker
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012

Change wording: By 2015, increase non-apportionment income by $2.5M from $X.XM in 20XX.  We were not sure what this is.

Add to Sources of Evidence: International Program Strategic Plan

Date of Posting: December 22, 2011
Reported by: Gari Browning

Assessment Narrative:
Measure G funds are being expended to create solar generation capacities and both the Fremont and Newark Campuses. By 2012, we project annual savings of $700,000, which allows these funds to be directed to other needs. Although not a direct increase in non-apportionment income, it does have a similar positive impact.
The Executive Director of the Foundation has retired. In preparation for filling this position a comprehensive assessment of the Foundation was completed. The new Executive Director will be actively engaged in generating non-apportionment funding.
As reviewed in Objective 8 below, the Mission Boulevard development planning is again underway.
International Program and Services continues to increase the number of international students coming to Ohlone, thereby increasing this source of non-apportionment revenue.
Ohlone for Kids and the English Language Institute are also increasing the amount of revenue they are generating.
Restructuring Civic Center Rentals promises to result in increased revenues from this source.
Current evaluation:
The achievement of this objective is in process.
Source(s) of evidence:
Board minutes, August 2011
Program Review, Ohlone College Foundation
Job Announcement, Ohlone College Foundation Executive Director
Measure G webpage Link
2010-11 and 2011-12 budget reports to the Board of Trustees

Objective 4. By 2010, define categories of technology-enabled classrooms to establish and maintain minimum technology levels within each category.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Bruce Griffin

Assessment Narrative:
In April 2010, the Technology Committee reviewed the categories as defined by the Information Technology Department. These categories were available for comment via the CTO Blog. Maintaining minimum technology levels within each category was accomplished by repair or replacement of equipment deployed across the District. Advancing rooms from one category to another was limited by a lack of funds. Large scale advancement of rooms will occur as Measure G new construction comes online.
In 2012 Measure G funds afforded the opportunity to maintain the technology standards in the classrooms. Over the summer 200 computer replacements were deployed in classrooms and labs, primarily in Hyman Hall as a response to numerous requests. Approximately half of all faculty computers were replaced as well. The wireless network was expanded in Fremont and 16 data projectors were replaced throughout the campus. In fall 2012 an updated A/V cart was presented to the Technology Committee and tested in the classroom by one of the members. The faculty member and students were pleased with the test results and additional, slightly modified units will be purchased to provide A/V services in non-smart classrooms.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective is being met.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/minutes/techcomm12_13/20121127techminutes_draft.pdf
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/minutes/techcomm12_13/20120918techminutes.pdf
http://ohlonecollegecto.blogspot.com/2012/01/learning-space-standards-proposed.html
http://ohlonecollegecto.blogspot.com/2010/04/tech-committee-item-strategic-goal-4_23.html
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/minutes/techcomm09_10/4_20_10.pdf
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/docs/other/categories_and_lifecycles.pdf

**January 2013 College Council Action**

- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? **No. We could not tell what “categories” of technology-enabled classrooms were, and did not see the evidence to support this**
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? **Clarify “categories” and how do we know that the faculty member and students were pleased with the AV cart**
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? **No**
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set my Ohlone?) **No**
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? **Not sure**
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? **Should be worded clearer**

The report out should include the following for each Objective:

- A summary assessment of progress made:
- Any wording changes recommended. Define “categories”
- Recommended Action Plan, if one is needed. **No**
- **NOTE:** We know lots have been accomplished for this objective, but the report is not clear. The info contained in the President’s speech was very clear and should be incorporated here

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 10, 2012  
**Reported by:** Bruce Griffin  
**Assessment Narrative:**
In April 2010, the Technology Committee reviewed the categories as defined by the Information Technology Department. These categories were available for comment via the CTO Blog. Maintaining minimum technology levels within each category was accomplished by repair or replacement of equipment deployed across the District. Advancing rooms from one category to another was limited by a lack of funds.
In the Fall of 2011, the Tech Committee began the process to define standards for the design of new and retrofitted classrooms to be funded through Measure G Bond funds. The process started as a series of online meetings facilitated through the e-Campus Blackboard learning management system. Committee members, interested faculty and staff engaged in online discussions of the following topics: Learning Space Technology, End Point Technology, Telecom, Networking and Security. A draft proposal of Learning Space Standards was created through a survey of faculty with the others to follow in early Spring 2012. These standards will be incorporated throughout Measure G projects and serve as a baseline for user groups supporting facility design.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective has been met.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
http://ohlonecollegecto.blogspot.com/2012/01/feedback-from-tech-committee-survey-on.html
http://ohlonecollegecto.blogspot.com/2012/01/learning-space-standards-proposed.html
http://ohlonecollegecto.blogspot.com/2010/04/tech-committee-item-strategic-goal-4_23.html
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/minutes/techcomm09_10/4_20_10.pdf
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/docs/other/categories_and_lifecycles.pdf

**Objective 5. By 2010, define appropriate life cycles, fund, and implement a systematic updating of technology to support college-wide effectiveness.**

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:**
Reported by: Bruce Griffin

**Assessment Narrative:**
This objective was addressed by the Technology Committee in April 2010. Life cycles for various categories of IT equipment were posted the CTO blog. Funding and implementing a systemic updating of technology, however, was not accomplished due to budget constraints. In 2012 Measure G funds were used to advance this objective across the Fremont campus. Equipment was updated in response to faculty requests and trouble tickets. Upgraded technology included personal computers, lab and classroom computers, data projectors, wireless access points and A/V carts.

The initial round of Measure G funding also created a “Technology Endowment” that sets aside $10 million for use in 2017. These funds accrue interest and will be used to acquire state-of-the-art technology upon maturity. Replacements will also occur as part of the Measure G building program. New buildings will feature new equipment that replaces older units in buildings that are replaced.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective is currently being met.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/minutes/techcomm12_13/20121127techminutes_draft.pdf
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/minutes/techcomm12_13/20120918techminutes.pdf
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/docs/facultycomputers/FacultyPersonalComputerReplacementProposal.doc
http://ohlonecollegecto.blogspot.com/2010/04/tech-committee-item-strategic-goal-4.html
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/minutes/techcomm09_10/4_20_10.pdf
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/docs/other/categories_and_lifecycles.pdf

**January 2013 College Council Action**
For each Objective involved the review groups should address the following questions:

- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? Yes
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? Yes
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? Hard to tell without seeing the evidence
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set my Ohlone?) No
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? Might be useful
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? Suggestion for reword: Continuously update and maintain technology based on continuous review of life cycles and available funding. (This is an on-going and continuous objective, so an end date just does not seem applicable)

The report out should include the following for each Objective:

- A summary assessment of progress made:
- Any wording changes recommended. See suggestion above
- Recommended Action Plan, if one is needed. Yes… annual milestones for the duration of the strategic plan

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 10, 2012
Reported by: Bruce Griffin
Assessment Narrative:
This objective was addressed by the Technology Committee in April 2010. Life cycles for various categories of IT equipment were posted the CTO blog. Funding and implementing a systematic updating of technology, however, was not accomplished due to budget constraints. The Technology Committee has primarily focused personal computer replacement for faculty and staff. At one time Ohlone had developed a computer replacement plan based on a 3 year cycle to ensure that no machine reached 4 years of age. This plan was unsustainable due to budget constraints. The plan was modified to rank faculty machines from the oldest to the newest machines, allowing for replacement of aging machines as funding allowed. Many staff computers were upgraded as part of the Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) included in the construction of Building 7 during the Measure A bond. Some IT equipment was replaced through Measure A or Title III projects. Computer networking equipment (firewalls, switches and routers) were funded through both Measure A and Title III. The Datatel Server environment was upgraded through Measure A. A new Storage Area Network (SAN) was also acquired as part of Measure A. Measure G represents the best opportunity in recent years to fund and implement a systematic update of technology at Ohlone. Measure G includes funding to replace “outmoded” technology. The District has also created a Technology Endowment from bond funds to provide a stream of funding for ongoing replacement costs.

Current evaluation:
The appropriate life cycles have been defined and there is a plan in place to implement a systematic updating of technology through the Technology Endowment, Measure G projects, and ongoing Fund 10 support.

Source(s) of evidence:
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/docs/facultycomputers/FacultyPersonalComputerReplacementProposal.doc
http://ohlonecollegeceto.blogspot.com/2010/04/tech-committee-item-strategic-goal-4.html
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/minutes/techcomm09_10/4_20_10.pdf
http://www2.ohlone.edu/people2/rsmedfjeld/tech/docs/other/categories_and_life_cycles.pdf
Objective 6. By 2011, create organizational structures and procedures to continually improve efficiency and effectiveness of services to students through technology.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Bruce Griffin- Ron Travenick
Assessment Narrative: Progress has been made supporting the two dean model however budgetary and accreditation demands may make it very difficult to maintain. Technology priorities were identified and vetted through the Student Development Committee and new processes have been implemented to support a student debit card which streamlines Financial Aid disbursements as well as student IDs and refunds and accounts. Greater progress is proposed in terms of providing on line student support, electronic transcript service and student accessible degree audits and education plans. SB 1456 also mandates that most of these services be instituted by 2014-15 to be eligible for funding. Current evaluation: This objective has been met in that organizational structures and procedures have been created. These will be used to continually improve efficiency and effectiveness of services to students through technology.
Source(s) of evidence:

January 2013 College Council Action

- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? No. Explain why the 2-Dean model is relevant; what is the 2-dean model? Need to simplify the wording.
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? No – it states that “this objective has been met” but could not find evidence.
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? No
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set my Ohlone?) Possibly – what are other schools doing?
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? This one screams for an action plan
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? Should be worded clearer

The report out should include the following for each Objective:

- A summary assessment of progress made:
- Any wording changes recommended. Suggested change: Change to wording of the objective: change date and add “college” between create and organizational
- Recommended Action Plan, if one is needed. Define the technology that improve efficiency and effectiveness and map out steps to implement. EG. Develop on-line interactive support for new students by August 2013.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: February 28, 2012
Reported by: Kathleen Schoenecker
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012

Add to Sources of Evidence: Description of CCT and a list projects with completion dates for projects affecting

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Assessment Narrative:
Vacancies and/or Interim leadership have existed in the Dean of Counseling and the Director of Admissions and Records over the last 3 years. During that time the VPSS and SS staff has stretched to cover these vital areas as well as address this goal. Organizational structures have been shifted to improve efficiency in Interpreting Services, Admissions and Records, Financial Aid and Counseling. A new Organizational Structure, including two Deans in the SS area have been proposed and will be implemented by 2/15/12. A Student Development Committee was reactivated in Fall 2011, to review, evaluate and propose changes to student services processes and procedures. This group has developed a priority list of technological improvements that is helping focus staff.

Utilizing the electronic tools available to track Deaf and of Hard of Hearing Student enrollments allowed the Interpreting Services office to develop a more effective way to plan for and register students needing interpreters and note takers into class sections. A&R has conducted a full process mapping study for the processing of electronic applications, wait listing and priority registration. Registration rules are currently simplified and documented into a desk manual. A three year calendar of registration dates has been developed and will allow students, faculty and staff to operate from a single source document. Financial Aid and DSPS have shifted most if not all student communications to email, greatly speeding up communication to students.

Current evaluation:
This objective has been met in that organizational structures and procedures have been created. These will be used to continually improve efficiency and effectiveness of services to students through technology.

Source(s) of evidence:
DSPS Budget and reduced cost for Interpreters
Registration Operational Calendar
Student Development Committee web page and meeting minutes

Objective 7. By 2015, upgrade the Fremont campus, including functionality, sustainability, safety, accessibility, and aesthetics.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 3, 2012
Reported by: Ron Little and Thomas Moore

Assessment Narrative:
With the selection of a District Master Architect in the fall of 2012 and the current forward progress of the Measure G projects, college-wide planning around functionality, sustainability, accessibility and aesthetics is well underway. District-wide Focus Groups, comprised of subject matter experts, were formed in seven distinct areas: Fine Arts; Learning Commons; Math; Science; General Academics; Sustainability; and Central Plant analysis. Technology and Accessibility are considered across all these groups. Workshops, consisting of 40 to 50 regular participants, representing a diverse cross-section of the college, provided input and specific recommendations concerning the campus palette and district aesthetics.

Current evaluation:
In Progress.

Source(s) of evidence:
District Facilities Master Plan
Meeting Minutes from Facilities Committee
Master Architect Agreement with Cannon/ABA
Notes from Measure G Focus Group Meetings (September 2012 to January 2013)
Notes from Measure G Workshop Groups (September 2012 to January 2013)
January 2013 College Council Action

- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? Yes
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? Yes
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? Yes
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set my Ohlone?) No
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? NO
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? No

The report out should include the following for each Objective:

- A summary assessment of progress made:
- Any wording changes recommended. Suggested change: No
- Recommended Action Plan, if one is needed. No

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: February 28, 2012
Reported by: Kathleen Schoenecker
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012

Add to Sources of Evidence:
District Facilities Master Plan
Meeting Minutes from the Facilities Committee
Gilbane presentation from the President’s Speech

Date of Posting: December 16, 2011
Reported by: Gari Browning

Assessment Narrative:
Following extensive communication to the community about our facility needs and a comprehensive facilities planning process for the Fremont Campus, a campaign for passage of a $350 million facilities bond measure (Measure G) was conducted. This campaign led to passage of Measure G with a 63% favorable vote. Measure G specifically addresses functionality, sustainability, safety, accessibility, and aesthetics.
Gilbane and Associates has been hired as the bond management group and the Facilities Committee is actively working on a District Facilities Master Plan (bringing together the Facilities Master Plans for the Newark and Fremont Campuses together into one document). The District Facilities Master plan will provide the framework for implementing the Measure G projects.
Other non-apportionment sources of revenue continue to increase.

Current Evaluation:
The achievement of this objective is well underway
Source(s) of evidence:
Measure G webpage Link
2010-11 and 2011-12 budget reports to the Board of Trustees
Objective 8. By 2015, maximize the use of campus property and develop the Mission Boulevard frontage property as an income source

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: December 1, 2012
Reported by: Gari Browning and Ron Little

Assessment Narrative:
Much progress was made over the past year on the Frontage Property efforts. An informal feasibility study was conducted by consultants to assess the viability, given the current real estate market, of the Frontage Property project. The impacts of Measure G Academic Core Project construction on the Frontage Property development was assessed by staff and timelines refined. Site survey maps were completed to reflect the encroachment of the Fremont solar array, current & proposed easements, and existing utilities. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was developed and issued publicly in October 2012. Two pre-proposal meetings were held; attendance at each exceeded twenty participants. Proposals from interested developers are due to the District in late-January 2013.

Current evaluation:
The achievement of this objective is well underway.

Source(s) of evidence:
Board Agendas
Feasibility & Current Market Study
Request for Proposal

January 2013 College Council Action

- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? Yes
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? Yes
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? Yes
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set my Ohlone?) No
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? NO
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? No

The report out should include the following for each Objective:

- A summary assessment of progress made:
- Any wording changes recommended. Suggested change: No
- Recommended Action Plan, if one is needed. No

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: February 28, 2012
Reported by: Kathleen Schoenecker
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Regarding wording of Objective: Could define “maximize”. Is that accepting the highest offer? Utilizing all available parcels? Both?

Add to Sources of Evidence: Contracts with developers if available or appropriate.

Date of Posting: December 16, 2011
Reported by: Gari Browning

Assessment Narrative:
The development of the Mission Boulevard frontage property has been an integral part of the Fremont Campus Facilities Master Plan, and will continue as such in the District Facilities Master Plan. This objective is included in the President’s Goals for the coming year. The Board of Trustees has had initial discussions on moving forward. Attorneys are preparing a new RFP to seek interest in the property.

Current evaluation:
This objective is still central to the future planning of the college and movement toward meeting the objective in underway.

Source(s) of evidence:
Board workshop agendas
Draft RFP

Objective 9. By 2015, achieve long-term campus maintenance and capital improvements necessary to increase effectiveness of learning and support services for facilities improvement while promoting efficient and responsible use of the land, sustainability.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
By 2015, achieve long-term campus maintenance and capital improvements necessary to increase effectiveness of learning and support services for facilities improvement, while promoting efficient and responsible use of the land sustainability.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Ron Little and Thomas Moore

Assessment Narrative:
The projects of Measure G classified as “Quick Fix “projects-- a list of smaller, more urgent, projects-- is well underway. These projects were selected from a larger list of projects proposed by the campus community. The projects selected for this list all meet the criteria of imminent failure, safety, signage and way-finding. In addition to the Measure G funded projects, the Facilities Department is committed to provide custodial services that are more environmentally friendly; reduce waste products; increase recycling efforts; and to support low or zero emission vehicles in our fleet. This will directly impact the campus community and enhance our effectiveness of learning and support services and to improve facilities in a responsible way. An Action Plan from VPAS/ Facilities is being developed.

Current evaluation:
Ongoing and part of PIO assessment.
Source(s) of evidence:
Program Improvement objectives,
State of California solid waste report and toxic waste reports.
Fleet inventory
January 2013 College Council Action

- Is the Assessment Narrative clear? Yes
- Is the Current Evaluation accurate? Yes
- Are the Sources of Evidence adequate and are there others needed? Yes
- Is there a need for a local benchmark (e.g. If we say we want to achieve something at the state average, would it be better to have a specific target set my Ohlone?) No
- If we are lagging behind on an Objective, is there a need for an Action Plan to be developed to move things along? No
- Are there any wording changes needed in the Objective? Yes: reword: By 2015, achieve long-term campus maintenance and capital improvements necessary to increase effectiveness of learning and support services for facilities improvement, while promoting sustainability

The report out should include the following for each Objective:

- A summary assessment of progress made:
- Any wording changes recommended. Suggested change: No
- Recommended Action Plan, if one is needed. No

February 2013 College Council Action

Wording change:
By 2015, achieve long-term campus maintenance and capital improvements necessary to increase effectiveness of learning and support services for facilities improvement, while promoting efficient and responsible use of the land sustainability.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

**Date of Posting:** February 28, 2012  
**Reported by:** Kathleen Schoenecker  
**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**

**Add to Sources of Evidence:**
District Facilities Master Plan  
If available architectural plans and project documentation on Solar, building cost saving systems and landscape improvements.

**Date of Posting:** December 16, 2011  
**Reported by:** Scott Thomason  
**Assessment Narrative:**
The assessment of this objective is the same as that stated for Objective 7. It may be that the two objectives should be combined.  
**Current evaluation:**
The achievement of this objective is well underway.  
**Source(s) of evidence**
GOAL 5: Lead and educate the community in environmental sustainability.

Objective 1. By 2013 employ sustainability principles in all college facilities and operations using the President Climate Commitment California Community College Sustainability Plan Guidebook as a guideline.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording Change:
By 2013 employ sustainability principles in all college facilities and operations using the President Climate Commitment California Community College Sustainability Plan Guidebook (July 2012) as a guideline.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Ron Little and Thomas Moore
Assessment Narrative:
Since the publication of the President Climate Commitment the State of California, the CCC Chancellors Office and many other have issued refined guidelines, challenges and commitments in the area of sustainability and greenhouse gas reductions.
We recommend that this Objective be rewritten to utilize the California Community Colleges Sustainability Plan Guidebook, published in July 2012 by the Chancellor’s Office, as a framework for the district’s continued education and implementation of sustainability principles. The intent of the Sustainability Plan Guidebook, is “to serve as a roadmap and a toolkit to guide the CCC Districts toward a sustainable future. It can be deployed at either the District level, by creating a Sustainability Plan that would apply across each campus within the District, or at the campus level, thereby creating a plan that is more tailored to the specific conditions and needs at each campus. has been deemed critical to develop an organized, comprehensive approach for the CCCs that incorporates the elements of sustainability, satisfies state regulations, takes advantage of available resources and complementary programs, and adopts the best practices of others who are further along this path.”

Current evaluation:
The recommended change will permit the District to continue to be at the forefront of sustainability efforts compared to fellow CCCs.

Source(s) of evidence:
CCC Chancellors Sustainability Plan Guidebook and Template
http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/CFFP/Sustainability/CCCStnbityPlanTemplateFiles/California_Community_Colleges_Sustainability_Template_FINAL_v3_PDF.pdf

January 2013 College Council Action

Assessment narrative clear
Yes.
Eval Adequate
No, more detail needs to be given to the issues with the President’s Climate Committee Guideline and their shortcomings.
Source of Evidence Adequate
Yes if wording changes are accepted.
Lagging behind require an action plan, and what does it entail
Yes, action plan is included in the narrative.
Should a wording change be made
As stated in the Evaluation a change should be made to include more current standards.
February 2013 College Council Action  
Wording Change:  
By 2013 employ sustainability principles in all college facilities and operations using the President Climate Commitment California Community College Sustainability Plan Guidebook (July 2012) as a guideline.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012  
Reported by: Scott Thomason  
Assessment Narrative:  
Sustainability is a central theme of Measure G and the District Facilities Master Plan and will be pursued vigorously. A major initial project of Measure G is to significantly increase solar generation of electricity at both campuses. This project is underway and planned to be completed with this calendar year at Fremont and to be underway by the end of this year at Newark. The filling of key leadership positions in Administrative Services and Facilities are in progress and both positions are to be focused on this objective. We are optimistic that Ohlone will continue its commitment to environmental sustainability and the principles of the Presidents’ Climate Commitment.  
Current evaluation:  
This goal is being actively pursued.  
Source(s) of evidence:

Objective 2. By 2015 educate students, staff and community about the value of sustainability using the framework of the California Smart Growth Initiative as a model and having 75% of the Ohlone employees annually sign the college’s green pledge.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 3, 2013  
Reported by: Ron Little and Thomas Moore  
Assessment Narrative:  
Staff research has been unsuccessful in identifying the content of the California Smart Initiative. Nor has any Ohlone staff member been able to shed light on this proposed framework. Therefore, we recommend utilizing campus events—such as Earth Week clean-up—, Professional Development for staff, and an improved nexus between the Sustainability Committee and the District’s Facilities Team to increase campus awareness around the “green pledge” and its principles. The Sustainability Committee may assist in creating a revised action plan.  
Current evaluation:  
Good progress continues to be made on this objective.  
Source(s) of evidence:  
http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/envstudies/  
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/sustainability/  
http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/envstudies/20111115americarecyclesday.html  
http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/envstudies/organicgarden.html  
http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/envstudies/urbanfarmresearchlab.html
January 2013 College Council Action

Assessment narrative clear
Adequate.
Eval Adequate
Conflicts with the Assessment
Source of Evidence Adequate
Yes.
Lagging behind require an action plan, and what does it entail
Yes, need an action plan that includes a wider range of stakeholders and the Sustainability Committee’s participation.
Should a wording change be made
Yes, we should be re-examine the use of the Caliornia Smart Growth Initiative. We should re-examine the 75% goal as it seems arbitrary, and should consider adding student participation to the objective.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 5, 2012
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro, Scott Thomason
Assessment Narrative:
The growth and development of the Environmental Studies Department over the past four years has provided numerous opportunities for educating students and community members about the values of sustainability. Activities provided during Earth Week, National Recycle Day and through the Environmental Studies curriculum have all contributed toward achieving this goal. When this goal was initially written the California Smart Growth Initiative was identified as a framework for this objective. During the 2012 Spring semester the Sustainability Committee will revisit this objective and discuss the relevance of the continued use of the Smart Growth Initiative and will provide recommendations and/or revisions to the current objective framework. There is no current data as to how many college employees have signed the green pledge.
Current evaluation:
Good progress is being made on this objective.
Source(s) of evidence:
http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/envstudies/
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/sustainability/
http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/envstudies/20111115americarecyclesday.html
http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/envstudies/organicgarden.html
http://www.ohlone.edu/instr/envstudies/urbanfarmresearchlab.html

Objective 3. By 2012 support innovation in sustainability and environmental friendliness by providing professional developmental opportunities and fiscal resources through the Ohlone Foundation Sustainability Endowment.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro
Assessment Narrative:
Current evaluation:
This objective has been met.

Source(s) of evidence:
See below

January 2013 College Council Action

Assessment narrative clear
Assessment is clear, but should provide more detail such as the amount of funding in the endowment.

Eval Adequate
No. Need more detail beyond “Good progress is being made”.

Source of Evidence Adequate
No. Unable to find the information on the endowment. Need information on the referenced industry partners and contributors to the fund.

Lagging behind require an action plan, and what does it entail
Yes. There is no mention of professional development.

Should a wording change be made
No.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 10, 2012
Reported by: Leta Stagnaro

Assessment Narrative:
An endowment through the Foundation has been established. Employees and industry partners can make contributions to this fund. The fund has dollars available for distribution however no requests have been submitted.

Current evaluation:
Good progress is being made. We would like to see this endowment continue to grow to further sustainability efforts at Ohlone.

Source(s) of evidence:
Endowment link:
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/foundation/employeegiving.html

Objective 4. By 2011 model environmental sustainability in all college policies, procedures, and practices through adherence to board policy 6650 and Board Regulation 9.2.3.3 Environmentally Preferred Purchasing Procedures.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Ron Little and Thomas Moore

Assessment Narrative:
This objective has been met.

January 2013 College Council Action
Assessment narrative clear
Yes.

Eval Adequate
No. Need more detail supporting the completion of the objective.

Source of Evidence Adequate
Need to cite the BP’s and AP’s and link to them on the website.

Lagging behind require an action plan, and what does it entail
No. Has been met.

Should a wording change be made
No.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Reported by: Scott Thomason

Assessment Narrative:
Board Policy 6650 and Board Regulation 9.2.3.3 are followed for all college purchasing activities.

Current evaluation:
This objective has been met.

Source(s) of evidence:
GOAL 6: Enhance college-wide interaction with, and acceptance of, diverse peoples, cultures, arts, and perspectives.

Objective 1. By 2015, increase the number of course offerings which meet the General Education Plan A Intercultural/International Studies requirement.

This is New Wording Approved Spring 2012
[Original Wording: By 2015, increase the number of course offerings that specifically address issues of cultural diversity and ethnicity.]

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 4, 2013
Reported by: Eddie West
Assessment Narrative:
Currently, 39 courses meet this requirement. Formerly termed Cultural Diversity, the GE Committee has revised this title of this area; it is now called Intercultural/International Studies. The definition of what renders a course eligible to be included in this category has also been updated. The GE Committee is currently soliciting and evaluating courses for continued or new inclusion in this General Ed Plan area. 4 new courses have been added.

Current evaluation:
The College is on track to fulfill this Objective, but additional work is needed.

Source(s) of evidence:

January 2013 College Council Action

- Status: In Progress
- The recently updated (Spring 2012) Objective language is good
- Sources of evidence are adequate
- An Action Plan is recommended. The College is on track to fulfill this Objective but a baseline needs to be confirmed, and a benchmark established
  - 41 courses met this definition effective Spring 2012 when the language of the Objective was officially updated. 39 do now, reflecting 4 new courses being added to the list but others since becoming ineligible (I presume).
  - Benchmark could be specific number of courses to aim for, OR % of all courses.
  - Related: it’s recommended that Study Abroad program participation by students also fulfill this Intercultural/International General Education requirement

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Eddie West
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012

Change Objective, from "By 2015, increase the number of course offerings that specifically address issues of cultural diversity and ethnicity" to "By 2015, increase the number of course offerings which meet the General Education Plan A Intercultural/International Studies requirement"

The International Education Committee and General Education Sub-Committee will collaborate to determine what the increase ought to be. As of the moment it appears that 41 courses meet this requirement. Perhaps an attainable, solid increase is 20%. Whatever the target, progress toward it will be helped by the recent reformulation of that General Ed requirement (on balance, making more courses eligible for inclusion).

Date of Posting: December 8, 2011
Reported by: Jim Wright
Assessment Narrative:
This objective needs to be reviewed and clarified. What are we increasing from? What is the baseline and intended increase? And what is meant by “specifically address issues of cultural diversity and ethnicity”? Until there is more clarity, it will be difficult to assess this objective.
Current evaluation:
This objective should be reviewed and clarified by the International Education Committee.
Source(s) of evidence:

Objective 2. By 2015, increase the number of opportunities for cultural enrichment and study abroad for faculty, staff, and students from 1-2 programs per year to 3-4 programs per year.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
By 2015, increase the number of opportunities for cultural enrichment and study abroad for faculty, staff, and students from 1-2 programs per year to 3-4 programs per year.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Eddie West
Assessment Narrative:
The International Education Committee has identified the following baseline and benchmark:
- Increase from historical average (1990-2010) of 1-2 programs per year, to 3-4 programs per year (see proposed wording change above)
- If appropriate (and time-allowing) we may propose a rewording of this Objective, so that it also captures other faculty overseas and exchange experience
Current evaluation:
Good progress is being made on this objective.
Source(s) of evidence:
International Education Committee minutes

January 2013 College Council Action

- Status: In Progress
- Need to ask College Council to endorse change in Objective wording proposed by the International Education Committee (IEC).
• Sources of evidence are adequate, but we need to confirm what constitutes “opportunities for cultural enrichment and study abroad”. Study Abroad programs should be included, as should faculty teaching overseas programs (1 such “opportunity”, involving many faculty, run each Summer, mainly in China). If definition is broadened, then perhaps Objective should be made more ambitious, accordingly.
• An Action Plan is recommended: Identify and allocate resources (i.e. reinstituting a formal Study Abroad Coordinator assignment) to support this effort.

February 2013 College Council Action

Wording change:
| By 2015, increase the number of opportunities for cultural enrichment and study abroad for faculty, staff, and students from 1-2 programs per year to 3-4 programs per year. |

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Eddie West
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
Convert from 1 objective to 2 separate ones, adding an Objective 3 (see below). Change from "By 2015, increase the number of opportunities for cultural enrichment and study abroad for faculty, staff and students" to "By 2015, increase the number of opportunities for study abroad for faculty, staff and students, from the historical average of 1-2 programs per year."
The International Education Committee will confer to determine an attainable benchmark.

Goal 6, Objective 3:
Formulate objective as "By 2015, increase the number of extracurricular opportunities - i.e. events, programs and/or clubs - for learning about cultures other than one's own, for faculty, staff and students."
The International Education Committee, Campus Activities, and the Smith Center, would come together to establish a baseline and benchmark for this Objective.

Date of Posting: January 11, 2012
Reported by: Ron Travenick
Assessment Narrative:
This seems to be two separate objectives. The issue with the first is, “What constitutes an opportunity for cultural enrichment?” and “What is baseline from which to increase?”
The second is a bit clearer but still lacks a baseline.

Current evaluation:
The objective should become two separate objectives, one focused on cultural enrichment opportunities and one focused on study abroad for faculty, staff and students. The International Education Committee should review and clarify the cultural enrichment opportunity objective.
Good progress has been made on study abroad for faculty, staff, and students. The International Education Committee is working to create baselines and benchmarks for this within the International Education Strategic Plan.

Source(s) of evidence:
International Education Strategic Plan
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/internationalcomm/docs/20112015intlprogsservicesstrategicplan.pdf
Objective 3: By 2015, increase the number of extracurricular opportunities – e.g. events, programs and/or clubs – for learning about cultures other than one’s own, for faculty, staff and students, from 6-7 opportunities per year to 9-12 opportunities per year.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
By 2015, increase the number of extracurricular opportunities – e.g. events, programs and/or clubs – for learning about cultures other than one’s own, for faculty, staff and students, from 6-7 opportunities per year to 9-12 opportunities per year.

This was a new objective approved in Spring 2012.

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

Date of Posting:
Reported by: Eddie West

Assessment Narrative:
The International Education Committee has identified the following baseline and benchmark:
- Increase from historical average of 6-7 opportunities per year, to 9-12 (see proposed wording change above)

The International Education Committee, Campus Activities and the Smith Center have had some preparatory dialogue about Objective 3, and our intention to aim for more planning and coordination among us moving forward.

Current evaluation:
Good progress is being made on this objective.

Source(s) of evidence:
International Education Committee minutes

January 2013 College Council Action

- Status: In Progress
- Need to ask College Council to endorse change in Objective wording proposed by the International Education Committee (IEC).
- Sources of evidence are adequate – but we should specify what constitutes opportunities that should be included in the tallies. Examples: ASOC activities, Club activities, performances and what else?
- An Action Plan is recommended: identify ownership / clearinghouse for Objective 3 contributions. Efforts should include the International Education Committee (IEC), Campus Activities (Clubs / Inter-Club Council – ICC), ASOC, and Smith Center. Who else? Devise mechanism to coordinate this effort among these groups.
- Consider recommending another objective, for current and/or next Strategic Plan, which would more broadly address diversity, inclusiveness and openness to differing viewpoints (as stated in College Core Values)

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
By 2015, increase the number of extracurricular opportunities – e.g. events, programs and/or clubs – for learning about cultures other than one’s own, for faculty, staff and students, from 6-7 opportunities per year to 9-12 opportunities per year.
GOAL 7: Increase access to higher education of under-served and under-represented demographic groups in the District and local communities.

Objective 1. By 2013, increase the enrollment of under-represented groups to approximate the demographic percentages of the district population.

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

*Date of Posting: 1/15/13*

*Reported by: Mike Bowman*

**Assessment Narrative:**

Based on the most recent census data, Hispanics comprise 18.5% of the district population. Hispanic enrollment at the college has consistently increased over the past five years and in 2011-12 Hispanics made up 16.2% of Ohlone College students. The gap between district population and college enrollment for Hispanics has now shrunk to only 2.3%, compared to gaps of 4.8% for 2010-11 and 6.6% in 2007-08. Clearly the college is making progress to remove Hispanic students from the “under-represented” designation.

**Current evaluation:**

Good progress being made.

**Source(s) of evidence:**

Research and Planning website

**January 2013 College Council Action**

- **Status:** Met. No Action Plan needed
- **Objective language is clear.** Worth noting different demographic groups, and increase in students self-reporting their ethnicity as “Other”, i.e. multi-ethnic/no category. Big gap between Ohlone and District totals in this category, respectively.
- **Sources of evidence adequate –** census data and District population.

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

*Date of Posting: February 8, 2012*

*Reported by: Eddie West*

**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**

Per the Current Evaluation, progress is being made on this objective. However, although the gap between Hispanic student representation on campus vis-à-vis local community demographics has shrunk by 1.9% over the last few years, bridging the remaining 4.8% gap would probably require a concerted effort, via Puente and/or alternative programs and efforts.

*Date of Posting: December 5, 2011*

*Reported by: Ron Travenick, Mike Bowman*

**Assessment Narrative:**
Currently the only under-represented group within the district is Hispanics, who comprise 18.5% of the district population while making up only 13.7% of Ohlone students. This gap of 4.7% is below the 6.6% gap three years ago and indicates that the college is making strides to achieve this objective.

**Current evaluation:**
Progress is being made on this objective.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
http://www.ohlone.edu/org/research/envscan/

---

**Objective 2. Annually increase retention and success rates of traditionally under-served demographic groups to approximate statewide level.**

**February 2013 College Council Action**
Wording change:
Annually increase retention and success rates of traditionally under-served demographic groups to approximate statewide levels.

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:**
**Reported by:** Ron Travenick and Mike Bowman

**Assessment Narrative:**
Traditionally, under-served groups have included Hispanics, African-Americans, and Native Americans. In Fall 2011 Hispanic students had a retention rate of 81.6%, identical to Fall 2010 but below the college-wide retention rate of 84.2%. The Hispanic success rate for Fall 2011 was 65.9%, slightly lower than the Fall 2010 rate of 66.1% and below the college-wide success rate of 72.3%. Statewide, Hispanic retention is at 84.1% and success is 65.2%, so Ohlone remains above the statewide success rate but below the statewide retention rate.

In Fall 2011 African-American students had a retention rate of 77.6%, which was below the college-wide retention rate of 84.2% but an increase over the Fall 2010 rate of 77.0%. The African-American success rate for Fall 2011 was 57.2%, also below the college-wide rate but again above the Fall 2010 rate of 55.8%. Compared to statewide averages of a 79.1% retention rate and a 55.9% success rate, African-American students are also above the success rate but below the retention rate.

In Fall 2011 Native American students had a retention rate of 87.1%, above the college-wide retention rate of 84.2% and also above the Fall 2010 rate of 83.9%. The Native American success rate for Fall 2011 was 77.6%, also above the college-wide success rate of 72.3% and the Fall 2010 success rate of 71.0%. Statewide Native Americans had a retention rate of 83.8% and a success rate of 65.5%, so Ohlone Native American students are above both statewide averages.

**Current evaluation:**
Objective is being met.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Research and Planning website

---

**January 2013 College Council Action**

- **Status:** In Progress
- A change to the Objective language is recommended: “Annually increase retention and success rates of traditionally underrepresented demographic groups to approximate statewide levels”
- **Sources of evidence adequate – census data and District population.**
- **An Action Plan is recommended, regarding retention and success efforts for African-American and Hispanic students. Examine sources of evidence in Program Reviews, etc. to confirm retention and success rates of students in special programs for underrepresented demographic groups (examples: Puente, Nishati, EOPS, etc.). If these students’ success and retention rates are higher than average, identify best practices which affect retention and success, and build on those.
February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
| Annually increase retention and success rates of **traditionally under-represented** demographic groups **to approximate statewide levels**.

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

**Date of Posting:** December 5, 2011  
**Reported by:** Ron Travenick, Mike Bowman  
**Assessment Narrative:**  
In Fall 2010 Hispanic students at Ohlone achieved an 81.6% retention rate and a 66.1% success rate. This compares with Fall 2007 rates of 78.3% and 62.0% respectively. The Fall 2010 success rate is also above the statewide average for Hispanic students of 64.5%, but below the retention rate of 83.9%.  
**Current evaluation:**  
This objective is being met.  
**Source(s) of evidence:**  
https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/ret_sucs.cfm

**Objective 3.** By **June 2015,** **increase the percentage of under-represented groups among faculty and staff to approximate the demographic percentages of the district population.** I implement an **EEO Plan** that will ensure employment opportunity access for under-represented demographic groups and will attract and retain quality employees with diverse characteristics.

February 2013 College Council Action
Wording change:
| By **June 2015,** increase the percentage of under-represented groups among faculty and staff to approximate the demographic percentages of the district population. **I implement an EEO Plan that will ensure employment opportunity access for under-represented demographic groups and will attract and retain quality employees with diverse characteristics.**

November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

**Date of Posting:** November 17, 2012  
**Reported by:** Shairon Zingsheim/Mike Bowman  
**Assessment Narrative:**  
The district is in the process of establishing an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) model plan that is mandated by the State Chancellor’s office. The plan must be submitted to the CCCO by June 30, 2013.  
The **Model Plan** addresses the requirements of Education Code section 87106(b) by providing a **Model Plan** for compliance with the Board of Governors regulations on equal employment opportunity hiring and applicable state and federal nondiscrimination statutes, and for guidance in improving the equality of opportunity. California community college districts are responsible for the preparation of an equal employment opportunity plan to be submitted and approved by the Chancellor’s Office. “Equal Employment Opportunity” means that all qualified individuals have a full and fair opportunity to compete for hiring and promotion and to enjoy the benefits of employment with the district. Equal employment opportunity should exist at all levels and in all job categories listed in section 53004(a) of title 5. Ensuring equal employment opportunity also involves

56
creating an environment that fosters cooperation, acceptance, democracy, and free expression of ideas and that is welcoming to all individuals. An “Equal Employment Opportunity Plan” is a written document in which a district’s workforce is analyzed and specific plans and procedures are set forth for ensuring equal employment opportunity. This Model Plan will allow for efficient reviews of district plans by the districts and the Chancellor’s Office.

**Current evaluation:**
Good progress is being made to meet this objective.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Model Plan

**January 2013 College Council Action**

- **Status: In Progress**
  - This is a very difficult objective to make progress toward presently. In last few years we’ve gone through SERPS which have depleted staff in an unplanned way, and there has been very little hiring happening which might otherwise proactively impact these demographics.
  - Much broad College Council discussion about whether to keep or modify this Objective.
- **Action Plan / TO DO:** Shairon Z to bring recommendation to College Council as to the updating/elimination/reformulating of this Objective.

**February 2013 College Council Action**

Wording change:
By June 2015, increase the percentage of under-represented groups among faculty and staff to approximate the demographic percentages of the district population - implement and EEO Plan that will ensure employment opportunity access for under-represented demographic groups and will attract and retain quality employees with diverse characteristics.

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** February 8, 2012

**Reported by:** Eddie West

**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**

The Current Evaluation gets at the heart of the difficulty of fulfilling this Objective thus far: making progress on it is a function of hiring opportunities, and those have been in short supply over the last few years. Further, it was acknowledged that the successive waves of early retirement incentive programs resulted in non-strategic (i.e. difficult to predict and plan for) retirements. The consequence of this was uncontrollable flux in District employee demographics.

**Date of Posting:** January 4, 2012

**Reported by:** Mike Bowman

**Assessment Narrative:**
The two ethnic groups that are under-represented by faculty and staff (compared to district population percentages) are Asians and Hispanics; marginally under-represented are Filipinos. African-Americans are over-represented and Whites are significantly over-represented among all levels of staffing. Native-Americans and Pacific Islanders represent a very small percentage of the district (less than 1% each) and do have representation at some staffing levels.

Asians constitute the largest plurality within the district (35.8% of residents), yet only 9.5% of administrators, 17.2% of full time faculty, 16.3% of adjunct faculty, and 23.5% of classified staff are Asian. Since 2007 the percentage of Asian classified staff has increased 2.3% and Asian full time faculty has increased 1.1%; however there has been no change in administrator percentages, and Asian adjunct faculty have declined 4.6%.

Hispanics make up 18.5% of the district population but only 9.5% of administrators, 9.0% of full time faculty, 8.9% of adjunct faculty, and 15.1% of classified staff. Since 2007, Hispanic full time faculty have increased 1.0%, adjuncts have increased 1.6%, administrators have remained the same, but Hispanic classified staff have decreased by 1.0%.
By comparison, Whites represent only 28.7% of district population but constitute 66.7% of administration, 64.8% of full time faculty, 63.2% of adjunct faculty, and 41.3% of classified staff.

**Current evaluation:**
District population has changed over the past decade with increases in both Asian and Hispanic populations and decreases in White population. Given the attraction of the area for Asian immigrants and the burgeoning Hispanic population statewide, these ethnic groups have increased within the district and have minimized the percentage of White residents proportionally. Population groups tend to be more fluid than staff, and increasing representation is a function of hiring opportunities. Given the recent economic trends, employees are more likely to remain at the college and, lacking positions to be filled, the college is hindered in making progress on changing ethnic representation among staff. As the economy improves and new staff are hired, progress can be made, but currently a goal of equity in staffing by 2015 seems unreasonable.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Research and Planning Website
[http://www.ohlone.edu/org/research/](http://www.ohlone.edu/org/research/)
GOAL 8: Engage all members of the college community in active, continual institutional improvement.

Objective 1. By 2011, create benchmarks for student learning, student achievement, and institutional practices

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 9, 2013  
**Reported by:** Gari Browning  
**Assessment Narrative:**  
The college has adopted and achieved the ACCJC benchmark for SLOAC to meet the Sustainable Level on the Commission’s rubric. The College has met or exceeded the ARCC comparisons with peer colleges and statewide averages. The college has updated a large portion of its Administrative Procedures, which describe many institutional practices.  
**Current evaluation:**  
Benchmarks for student learning are complete.  
Because the ARCC comparisons vary from year to year, the college needs to engage in a dialog about its own standard, i.e., what it considers a high but realistic level of attainment and the achievement variables it considers important. An action plan for this portion of the objective should be developed.  
It is not apparent from the assessment of objectives related to institutional practices that there has been any work done to identify performance benchmarks in these areas. An action plan for this portion of the objective should be developed. Updating of A Ps is moving forward on schedule.  
**Source(s) of evidence:**  
Assessment of Strategic Goals and Objectives; SLOA reports, ARCC reports; Administrative Procedures  

**January 2013 College Council Action**

Recommended action plan: Rethink the benchmarks for student achievement—should we stay with the statewide averages as benchmarks, which we have consistently met, or set benchmarks for ourselves. If the college has been consistently above the statewide average and peer colleges, the college should set its own its benchmark to challenge the college to improve. Look carefully at certain groups, such as Deaf population, that Ohlone is known for and set benchmarks for these groups.  
See Goal 1 for statewide achievement benchmarks  
Need an action plan for creating benchmarks for institutional practices.

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 30, 2012  
**Reported by:** Tim Roberts  
**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**  
Keep the objective as is, and change the target date to 2012. Reassess next year.  
**NOTE:** The term “continual” in Goal 8 is the operative word in all of the related Objectives.

**Date of Posting:** December 22, 2011  
**Reported by:** Gari Browning  
**Assessment Narrative:**  
Nearly all of the objectives of the Strategic Plan have been refined to include baselines, benchmarks and targets dates for completion. There are still several that need to be refined. Benchmarks for institutional practices have yet to be established.
**Objective 2. By 2012, develop and implement strategies to optimize communication processes for all shared governance committees.**

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 9, 2013  
**Reported by:** Gari Browning  
**Assessment Narrative:**  
Achievement of this objective will continue to be in process. College Council has instituted reports from the various shared governance committees. College Council co-chair reports the minutes of the meetings via Announcements to the college community; the College Council minutes are sent out to all faculty, staff, administrators, and ASOC reps. in a timely manner. Upcoming agenda indicates the topics of agenda items.

**Current evaluation:**  
College Council needs to constantly reassess its effectiveness in representing the College’s constituent groups. Achievement of this objective is ongoing.  
**Source(s) of evidence:**  
College Council minutes

---

**January 2013 College Council Action**

**Recommended Plan:** Have a College Council report as a standing agenda item on constituent based groups and committees.  
Have faculty members represent academic divisions.  
College Council should prioritize certain objectives—ones that are areas that need improvement or that we can improve—for each year and communicate those priorities to the rest of the college. Focus on strategies and a plan for meeting those objectives.
During the fall 2011 semester, the College Council review the college committee structure to determine which committees fall into the shared governance definition and should be reporting to the Council periodically. The committees newly identified have begun making reports. The Council has instituted the practice of publishing drafts of its meeting minutes before they are approved in order to increase timely college-wide awareness of the Council’s activities. Appropriate committees are also involved in the implementation and evaluation of college goals.

**Current evaluation:**
Achievement of this objective is ongoing.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
College Council meeting minutes
Emailed draft College Council minutes

**Objective 3. By 2011, pursue potential areas for partnership and collaboration with the community.**

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 9, 2013
**Reported by:** Gari Browning

**Assessment Narrative:**
There are continual reports to community groups regarding Measure G progress. The RFP for the frontage property has been issued, and once negotiations are underway, we will want to seek input from the community at large. Efforts to increase other areas of partnership and collaboration with the community are in progress within the Foundation, but it is too early to assess their impact.

**Current evaluation:**
Reassess next year.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
RFP for frontage property; draft of Foundation strategic goals

**January 2013 College Council Action**

None noted.

---

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 30, 2012
**Reported by:** Tim Roberts

**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**
Achievement of this objective was accomplished with the passage and implementation of Measure G. But this objective will again be targeted should we develop the frontage property, or need to make use of other community meeting places as swing space during Measure G projects on campus.
Keep the objective as is, and change the target date to 2012. Reassess next year.

**Date of Posting:** December 22, 2011
**Reported by:** Gari Browning, Jim Wright

**Assessment Narrative:**
The actual intent of this objective was to work with the community to articulate the facilities needs of the District and garner support for the passage of Measure G. Measure G passed in November 2010 with a 63% yes vote.

**Current evaluation:**
This specific intent of this objective has been achieved. However, partnership and collaboration with the community is an ongoing college pursuit.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Measure G webpage Link

**Objective 4. By 2012, revise and update the Research and Planning website so data is more accessible to the community for planning and decision-making.**

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

Objective was met as of last year. However, it’s problematic to get data not on the website in a timely manner.

**November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 30, 2012  
**Reported by:** Tim Roberts  
**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**

This revision is complete as of 2012. Ultimate achievement of this objective will continue to be in process. Keep the objective as is, and change the target date to 2013. Reassess next year.

**Date of Posting:** December 22, 2011  
**Reported by:** Gari Browning, Mike Bowman

**Assessment Narrative:**
Websites are dynamic and should be ever-changing; whatever the Research and Planning website is in 2012, it will still need constant updates and revisions. Nonetheless, there has been some progress made in culling out much of the older data into an archive and updating significant data—the environmental scan, for instance. More can always be done and the goal will always be to make the website as user-friendly and robust as possible.

**Current evaluation:**
The Research and Planning website is now updated on a regular basis and is available to all members of the college and general community. This objective has been achieved.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Research and Planning website LINK

**January 2013 College Council Action**

Recommendation: Check website content to be sure it’s user friendly and searchable. Create links to accessible databases, such as the Basic Skills Cohort tracker and DataMart.

**Objective 5. By 2013, integrate specific area plans into the strategic plan.**
November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment

**Date of Posting:** January 9, 2013  
**Reported by:** Gari Browning

**Assessment Narrative:**
With the planning phase of Measure G underway, the integration of the EMP, DFMP, Technology Plan, International Plan, and some aspects of the budget planning process have been operationally and meaningfully integrated.

**Current evaluation:**
By creating action plans for objectives that have not yet been implemented, the integration of Program Reviews/PIOS will become clearer. The Staffing Plan remains to be integrated with the Strategic Plan, the DFMP, and multi-year budget planning.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
Process documents for Measure G; Design Standards draft

---

**January 2013 College Council Action**

Recommendation: Examine the area plans to determine how they integrate with the strategic plan and revise area or strategic plans as needed.

---

November 2011 – January 2012 Assessment

**Date of Posting:** January 30, 2012  
**Reported by:** Tim Roberts

**From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012**
This objective has been met. However, implementation of a new District Facilities Master Plan is still in process and will have significant impact on this objective. This objective needs to reappear at least every 5 years. Best to keep the objective as is, and change the target date to 2016, after the next strategic plan cycle. Reassess next year.

**Date of Posting:** December 22, 2011  
**Reported by:** Gari Browning

**Assessment Narrative:**  
The Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Master Plan and all Program and Services Reviews intentionally and specifically link with the Strategic Goals and Objectives of the college.

**Current evaluation:**
This objective has been met.

**Source(s) of evidence:**
LINKS to the Various Plans

---

**Objective 6. By 2015, structure processes that promote informed college-wide discussion leading to integrated, evidence-based decisions**

**November 2012 – January 2013 Assessment**

**Date of Posting:** January 9, 2013  
**Reported by:** Gari Browning and Alison Kuehner
Assessment Narrative:
The assessment of these strategic objectives provides a foundation for college discussion on evidence of their completion and areas in need of action plans. The use of enrollment projections, state space standards, and related staffing needs in implementation of Measure G is an excellent example of the consideration of evidence in college decisions. The consistent use of data in Program Review and the reliance on the ARCC indicators as measures of the achievement of our goals is another example of how the college uses data in its decisions. The PAC analysis and resulting improvements to college processes is another.

Current evaluation:
Staffing data beyond the area of fulltime faculty needs collegewide discussion. An analysis of available data compared with key decision areas would be a good step in moving this objective forward.

Source(s) of evidence:
Assessment of strategic goals and objectives, Process Assessment Committee assessments; Program Reviews, resulting PIOs, and allocation of resources for PIOs; DFMP and resulting decisions on construction; adjustment of college objectives based on ARCC results

January 2013 College Council Action

Recommendation: Educate College Council about data relevant to college goals and objectives, and discuss these data. Would be helpful to educate College Council on use of data—what it is, how it can be used, what types of conclusions can be drawn from it. A possible College Council workshop? (ie: on the Environmental Scan data)

Date of Posting: January 30, 2012
Reported by: Tim Roberts
From College Council Retreat, January 18, 2012
This objective is underway and ongoing as evidenced by this assessment.
Leave as-is. Reassess next year.

Date of Posting: January 2, 2012
Reported by: Gari Browning
Assessment Narrative:
To date, the College Council and the Board of Trustees have received regular reports about the ARCCC data for Ohlone and the update of the Environmental Scan undertaken to account for the dramatic changes in the economy since its creation in 2008-09. Assessment of college goals is expected to lead to discussion and consideration of evidence in prioritizing goals for achievement between 2012 and 2015.

Current evaluation:
This objective is underway.

Source(s) of evidence:
College Council and Board of Trustee meeting minutes
Environmental Scan, updated fall 2011