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A. History and Description of the Institution

Ohlone Community College District serves the cities of Newark, Fremont, and part of Union City in the East Bay region of the San Francisco Bay area. Under then-president/superintendent Stephen Epler, classes began at the College in the fall of 1967, serving approximately 1,300 students. Initially classes were held at a rented facility until a new campus was constructed at the present Fremont site, which opened in September 1974. Eventually the College went out to the community for a $10 million bond and in 1972 began construction of the campus on Mission Boulevard in Fremont. Nine academic buildings, built in the mission style and designed by architect Ernest Kump, were located on a 534-acre hillside that overlooks the city of Fremont and the San Francisco Bay. The College was officially named Ohlone College on June 18, 1967, honoring the early native Ohlone Indians who lived in the Fremont and Newark area and much of the San Francisco Bay Area. Later buildings added to the original academic village include the performing arts center, the technology center, the child development center, and the student services center.

In its third year the College developed a Deaf Studies program to serve the Deaf population in the area. Gallaudet University later opened a Regional Center at the College. Ohlone now has one of the largest community college higher education programs for the Deaf in the United States.

Beginning in the 1980s the City of Newark worked to have a college presence in Newark. For several years a rented facility served as the Ohlone College Newark Center. In 2002 a Bond Measure was passed allocating $100 million towards constructing a campus on the present 81-acre site on Cherry Street in Newark. As part of the design process, it was agreed through the existing governance process to build an environmentally sustainable building. The Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology opened in January 2008.

In November 2010 voters approved a $349 million bond measure. Measure G will replace many of the aging original facilities on the Fremont campus as well as providing improvement to the remaining facilities.

The following are significant innovations and changes since the 2008 accreditation visit:

- **SPRING 2008:** Retirement of President/Superintendent Doug Treadway and hiring of President/Superintendent Gari Browning.
- **FALL 2008:** Process Assessment Committee established; Planning and Program Review Process Improvements proposed and approved by Faculty Senate and College Council
2008-2009: Development of a highly improved Enrollment Management tool (xEMGT) connected directly with the Student Module of the Colleague® system, allowing robust capabilities for planning and monitoring enrollment

OCTOBER 2008: Progress Report submitted


Program Review linkage to Strategic Goals/Objectives

Program Review linkage to annual budget planning

Fremont Campus Master Plan development

SPRING 2010: Educational Master Plan updated, 2010-2015

SPRING 2010: Strategic Plan approved, 2010-2015

SUMMER 2010: Process Assessment Committee assessment review of key planning processes

NOVEMBER 2010: Measure G General Obligation Bond passage (with 63 percent of the vote), providing $349 million for facilities upgrades, primarily the rebuilding of the academic core on the Fremont campus

MARCH 2011: Mid-Term Report: Progress reported on use of the CurricUNET® Program Review Module and implementation of the new Planning and Program Review Processes

2011-2012: All Program Improvement Objectives collated in a single report for prioritization

SUMMER 2011: Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education approved

FALL 2011: Annual Assessment of Strategic Goals and Objectives Instituted by College Council

FALL 2011: District Facilities Master Plan revised

2011–PRESENT: Measure G planning and project implementation

SPRING 2012: Comprehensive assessment of the entire planning and program review processes conducted by the Process Assessment Committee. Recommendations to improve PIO prioritization process made to College Council

FALL 2012: Second round of Assessment of Strategic Goals and Objectives by College Council

SEPTEMBER 2012: Improvements to PIO prioritization process approved by College Council

SUMMER 2012: 1.0 Megawatt energy generating solar farm turned on at Fremont campus and officially generating power to the local power grid. This $6.7 million Measure G project completed on time and on budget

FALL 2012: All Program and Services Reviews completed the full approval cycle within the CurricUNET® Program Review module; New approach to handling PIOs implemented

SPRING 2013: Focused assessment of the Program and Services Review process conducted by Process Assessment Committee bringing a series of improvement recommendations to the College Council

MAY 2013: Process Assessment Committee recommendations for improvements and approved by College Council

SPRING 2013: Focused assessment of the Program and Services Review process conducted by the Process Assessment Committee and a series of improvements recommended to the College Council

MAY 2013: The Process Assessment Committee recommendations for Program and Services Review improvements approved by the College Council

FALL 2013: Implementation of three year cycle for Program and Services Review

FALL 2013: Third Annual Assessment of Strategic Goals and Objectives

FALL 2013: The College ranking in the top 10 percent of community colleges statewide for rate of transfer and degree completion by the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report. The College has the
third best rate in the state for students who started a remedial math course and then were successful in transfer level math.

**B. Demographic Information**

This section reports the following demographic information, along with data analysis at various points in the presentation: District Demographics, Student Demographics, Enrollment Data, Course Offerings Data, and Staff Demographics. The findings have also been incorporated into the annual Data Scan, a summary of key data points that has been distributed to College committees and groups for use in their improvement planning.

**District Demographics**

Ohlone College District encompasses three cities within Alameda County: Fremont, Newark, and Union City. Twenty-one point four percent of the county population resides within the Ohlone Community College District, a decline of 0.6 percent since 2007. The population of the District in 2009 was 312,791 residents, also a decline (-2.0 percent) from 2007. The dominant ethnic groups are Asian (35.8 percent) and White (28.7 percent); Hispanics (18.5 percent) represent the third largest ethnic group in the District. There has been growth in the District among Asians (+0.5 percent), but a decline among Whites (-0.5 percent) and Hispanics (-0.9 percent) since 2007.

In the city of Fremont, where 46.8 percent of Ohlone students reside, there is a culture of attainment: of the almost 69 percent of residents age 25 or over, 27.7 percent hold a baccalaureate degree and another 21.2 percent have earned graduate or professional degrees. Additionally, of the employed civilian population over the age of 16, over half (52.0 percent) work as management or as professionals.
### Ohlone Community College District Community Demographics

Source: 2009 American Community Survey

#### TABLE 1 / GRAPH A: Ethnicity (by City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>FREMONT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NEWARK</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UNION CITY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN</td>
<td>5,714</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>82,041</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>7,376</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>22,449</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILIPINO</td>
<td>11,657</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>13,491</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>28,552</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>13,230</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>16,058</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC ISLANDER</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>64,283</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>13,543</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>12,013</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>6,830</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>200,932</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41,617</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70,242</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 1 / GRAPH B: Ethnicity (District Total= 312,791 population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>FILIPINO</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>PACIFIC ISLANDER</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25K</td>
<td>11,341</td>
<td>111,866</td>
<td>29,178</td>
<td>57,840</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>89,839</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1.A: Place of Birth or Citizenship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREMONT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NEWARK</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UNION CITY</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DISTRICT TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>115,972</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>26,145</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>37,329</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>179,446</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign born</td>
<td>84,960</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>15,472</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>32,913</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>133,345</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized Citizen</td>
<td>46,421</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>9,124</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>20,626</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>76,171</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a citizen</td>
<td>38,539</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>6,348</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>12,287</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>57,174</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1.B: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREMONT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NEWARK</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UNION CITY</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DISTRICT TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>101,072</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>21,298</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>35,626</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>157,996</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>99,860</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>20,319</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>34,616</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>154,795</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1 / GRAPH C: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREMONT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NEWARK</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UNION CITY</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DISTRICT TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 5 YEARS</td>
<td>14,904</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5,036</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>22,939</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19 YEARS</td>
<td>39,105</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>60,879</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-64 YEARS</td>
<td>126,061</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>26,341</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>43,775</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>196,177</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 YEARS AND OVER</td>
<td>20,862</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8,105</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>32,796</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN AGE</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 1 / GRAPH D: Income and Poverty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1.C: Educational Attainment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>FREMONT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NEWARK</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UNION CITY</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DIST. TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 and over</td>
<td>137,855</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>27,653</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>47,791</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>213,299</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>26,706</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>7,143</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>11,429</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>45,278</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>21,253</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>7,339</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>33,536</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>9,947</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>16,532</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degree</td>
<td>38,194</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>6,112</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>12,520</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>56,826</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>29,291</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5,107</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>36,579</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% High school graduate or higher</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degree or higher</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.D: Labor and Employment by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>FREMONT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NEWARK</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UNION CITY</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DIST. TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed civilian population 16 years and over</td>
<td>99,773</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>20,243</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>33,990</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>154,006</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, professional, and related</td>
<td>51,853</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>12,901</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>71,964</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10,780</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>18,753</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office</td>
<td>23,382</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>8,788</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>37,319</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, and maintenance</td>
<td>5,356</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9,777</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving</td>
<td>8,336</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>4,748</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>15,851</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed workers</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8,591</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (as of January 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>/10.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>/10.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DATA ANALYSIS:**
Ohlone College generally reflects the ethnic distribution of the District. Asians are the largest ethnic group in both the district and the College (35.8 percent and 32.1 percent). Similarly, Whites are the second largest group (28.7 percent District, 24.1 percent College). Hispanics are the third largest in both the District and the College. In 2007, Hispanics were underrepresented at the College by 6.6 percent; now Hispanics are above the District residence rate by 0.6 percent and are no longer underrepresented. Filipino/Pacific Islanders, with a student population of 9.3 percent, are below the District total of 10.2 percent. African-American students attend at a rate 1.8 percent above the District population.

**TABLE 2 / GRAPH A: Comparison of Ethnicity between Ohlone College & Ohlone College District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fremont</strong></td>
<td>200,932</td>
<td>82,041</td>
<td>11,657</td>
<td>28,552</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>64,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newark</strong></td>
<td>41,617</td>
<td>7,376</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Union City</strong></td>
<td>70,242</td>
<td>22,449</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>13,491</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td>312,791</td>
<td>111,866</td>
<td>11,341</td>
<td>57,840</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>89,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohlone College</strong></td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3 / Graph A: Comparative Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILIPINO</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC ISLANDER</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE, UNDECLARED</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3 / GRAPH B: Comparative Demographics: High Schools

**HIGH SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Irvington</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Robertson</th>
<th>Vista</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Bridgepoint</th>
<th>Newark</th>
<th>Logan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple, Undeclared</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA ANALYSIS:**

Projections for district enrollment growth coming from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office suggest that the College will grow at a ten year rate (14.1 percent) that ranks 65 out of 72 California community college districts. The fact that, over the same time period, county-wide growth among 18-19 year-olds is projected at 39.7 percent suggests Ohlone Community College District is “aging” and families with children are increasingly likely to reside elsewhere within the county.

There are three major high school districts in the College’s service area: Fremont Unified in Fremont, Newark Unified in Newark, and New Haven Unified in Union City. The
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combined student populations for grades 9-12 in those three districts provide a glimpse of prospective students. Notably, 38.6 percent of service area high school students are Asian, up from 26.6 percent in 2007; 16.7 percent are White, down from 26.6 percent in 2007; and 23.7 percent are Hispanic, up from the 2007 rate of 18.0 percent. These numbers represent an important shift in high school demographics in the past six years and suggest that Asian students will continue to be the dominant ethnic group at the College, and Hispanics have supplanted Whites as the second largest group. Numbers of Filipino/Pacific Islander students in area high schools have increased by 1.6 percent, while African American high school students have decreased by 1.8 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>2008-2009 Enrollment/Grads</th>
<th>2011-2012 Enrollment/Grads</th>
<th>3-Year Difference Grad Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>484 / 420 86.8%</td>
<td>447 / 399 89.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>512 / 454 88.7%</td>
<td>490 / 453 92.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy</td>
<td>335 / 271 81.0%</td>
<td>321 / 296 92.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Logan</td>
<td>1001 / 762 76.1%</td>
<td>1047 / 896 85.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission San Jose</td>
<td>540 / 518 95.9%</td>
<td>536 / 529 98.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark Memorial</td>
<td>531 / 455 85.7%</td>
<td>438 / 404 92.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>497 / 419 84.3%</td>
<td>463 / 392 84.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4: Graduation Rates for District High Schools**
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**TABLE 5: Percent of District High School Graduates Completing California State University (CSU)/University of California (UC) Entry Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>2008-2009 Grads Completing CSU/UC Requirements</th>
<th>2011-2012 Grads Completing CSU/UC Requirements</th>
<th>Difference Compared to 2011-12 State Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>195 (48.9%)</td>
<td>381 (84.1%)</td>
<td>+10.6% over state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>295 (65.0%)</td>
<td>381 (84.1%)</td>
<td>+45.8% over state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy</td>
<td>143 (52.8%)</td>
<td>148 (50.0%)</td>
<td>+11.7% over state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Logan</td>
<td>385 (50.5%)</td>
<td>527 (58.8%)</td>
<td>+20.5% over state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission San Jose</td>
<td>341 (65.8%)</td>
<td>456 (86.2%)</td>
<td>+47.9% over state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark Memorial</td>
<td>183 (40.2%)</td>
<td>178 (44.1%)</td>
<td>+5.8% over state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>175 (41.8%)</td>
<td>162 (41.3%)</td>
<td>+3.0% over state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6: Graduates of District High Schools Who Enroll at Ohlone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>June graduates</th>
<th>Grads starting Summer at Ohlone</th>
<th>Grads starting Fall at Ohlone</th>
<th>% of Grads Enrolling at Ohlone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission San Jose</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark Memorial</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3299</td>
<td>3369</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA ANALYSIS:**

Of the seven high schools within the district service area, all have seen an increase in graduation rates over the prior three year period. Additionally, all of the high schools are above state averages for the percentage of graduates who complete California State University/University of California entry requirements. The College not only has a good percentage (24.7 percent) of district high school graduates who enroll at the College immediately after high school graduation, but those students also have a tendency to come to the College appropriately prepared for college-level courses.
Student Demographics

The College serves over 16,000 students in an academic year, down from 20,000 in 2007. Sixty-four point six (64.6) percent of students come from within the District. There are essentially equal numbers of male and female; in fall 2007 there were five percent more female students than male students. There are more than twice as many part-time (68 percent) as full-time (32 percent) students; full-time students have increased five percent since 2007. Almost two-thirds (65 percent) are under the age of 25, with an average age of 28.4, a median age of 23.0, and a modal (most frequent) age of 19.0. Asians comprise the largest ethnic group at the College (32 percent), followed by White (24 percent) and Hispanic (19 percent). Hispanic enrollment is up four percent since 2010 while Asian student population has declined two percent and White student population has declined one percent. Enrollment status divides into approximately one-tenth (11 percent) of students are concurrently enrolled Kindergarten-12th grade students, one-sixth (15 percent) are first time students, and three-fourths (74 percent) are returning or continuing Ohlone students. Only 0.1 percent of students are from outside California. About one-sixth (16 percent) of students are evening students. About a third (37 percent) of the students enroll for less than six units; in 2007, over half (52 percent) of students took less than six units. Of the 32 percent who enroll as full-time students, 19 percent actually complete 12 or more units, a five percent increase in the full-time completion rate over fall 2007.

Ohlone College Student Access

TABLE 7.1: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrecorded</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7 / GRAPH A: Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILIPINO</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC ISLANDER</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OR MORE ETHNICITIES</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRECORDED</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7 / GRAPH B: Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 OR LESS</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Age 28.4
Median Age 23.0
Modal Age 19.0
### Table 7 / Graph C: Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Student</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Transfer</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Student</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Student</td>
<td>6,376</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Admit (K-12)</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrecorded</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 / Graph D: Attempted Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempted Units</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5-2.9</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-5.9</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-8.9</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0-11.9</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0-14.9</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0-17.9</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0-20.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 / Graph E: Earned Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earned Units</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5-2.9</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-5.9</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-8.9</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0-11.9</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0-14.9</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0-17.9</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0-20.9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 / Graph F: Full/Part Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 / Graph G: Day-Evening Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.3: Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alameda County</strong></td>
<td>8,423</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>5,133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Clara County</strong></td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Joaquin Valley</strong></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contra Costa County</strong></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Mateo County</strong></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SF City/County</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacramento County</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other CA Counties</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of State</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment Data
After four years of full-time equivalent students (FTES) enrollment growth, some as much as almost 10 percent annually, the College experienced an 8.1 percent FTES decline during the 2011-2012 academic year in response to state budgetary constraints and mandated workload reductions. Despite a headcount enrollment decline in 2012-2013, FTES grew by 2.3 percent. This FTES growth correlates with the increase in the percentage of full-time students for the same time period. The College remains about 10 percent below its peak FTES levels in 2010-2011 and 25 percent below its highest headcount term in fall 2008.

Table 8: Ohlone College Annual FTES and Fall Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual FTES</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Fall Headcount</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>8,027</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>8,437</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11,640</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>9,276</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>12,842</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>9,269</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>9,401</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>11,801</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>8,642</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
<td>10,381</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>8,840</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the budget-imposed downsizing of the previous Newark site in fall 2003—which at one point generated about 900 FTES—the College found itself without room to grow. One response was to develop distance education learning opportunities for students. Although a new Newark campus opened in spring 2008, the College still had to address the course needs of students who had welcomed distance education classes as a natural component of the collegiate experience. Distance education was increased to meet student needs, and since fall 2004, distance education enrollment has increased 345 percent and now generates over 450 FTES.
DATA ANALYSIS:

Fall 2012 FTES increased slightly from the previous year, but both semesters were substantially (more than 10 percent) below the FTES high of fall 2008. Transferrable credit makes up 77.2 percent of all courses, down slightly from the previous five year average of 77.7 percent. Vocational credit, at 20.5 percent of courses, is down from the previous five year average of 22.5 percent. Basic skills credit at 15.9 percent of courses is higher than the previous five year average of 14.6 percent, and enrollment is up 4.3 percent over the previous five year average despite an equal 4.3 percent decline in FTES over the same period. There are fewer students in fall 2012, but more of them are enrolled in basic skills courses.
### Table 10: Fall Headcount Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 or less</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12,842</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11,524</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11,801</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,381</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11: Fall Headcount Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILIPINO</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AM/ALASKAN</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC ISLANDER</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO OR MORE RACES</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE NON-HISPANIC</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12,842</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11,524</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11,801</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,381</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13: Fall Headcount Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Enrollment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Student Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncollected/Unreported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# TABLE 12 / GRAPH A: Percentage Distribution by Unit Load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 12: Fall Headcount Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Unit Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.1 - 2.9 UNITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.0 - 5.9 UNITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.0 - 8.9 UNITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.0 - 11.9 UNITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.0 - 14.9 UNITS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 UNITS OR MORE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# TABLE 13: Fall Headcount Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13: Fall Headcount Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Unit Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Student Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncollected/Unreported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DATA ANALYSIS:**
Since fall 2008 there has been a 4 percent decline in those students age 19 or less. This reflects a decline in concurrent enrollment courses offered at the high schools due to budgetary constraints and a concentration on serving high school graduates. Nonetheless, a third of enrolled students are age 19 or less. Sixty-five percent of enrolled students are under 25 years of age, and there has been a 12 percent increase in the number of students age 20-29. For all age groups over 30 there has been a 7 percent decline in enrollment. This pattern is similar among the 21 colleges in the ten community college districts (the Bay 10) that surround the San Francisco Bay, where generally there has been a decline in students age 19 or less, an average increase of 7 percent for students age 20-29, and an average decrease by 6 percent among students over 30.

Asians represent the largest ethnic group enrolled at the College, but their numbers have declined by 4 percent; yet at 32 percent of the student population, Asian enrollment at the College is among the highest within the Bay 10, second only to City College of San Francisco’s 38 percent. Hispanic enrollment, at 19 percent, is up 7 percent since fall 2008, and that rate aligns with the district population rate for Hispanics. Despite the gain in Hispanic enrollment, the College has the lowest rate of Hispanic students among the Bay 10 districts. White student enrollment is less than one-fourth of the total student population, a trend mirrored at three other Bay 10 districts.

The percentage of students enrolled full time (12 or more units) has increased 5 percent since fall 2008 and represents almost one-third (32 percent) of enrolled students. This is the fourth highest full-time rate among the Bay 10. Additionally, the percent of students enrolled in 9-11.5 units has increased 5 percent, as well. In fall 2008, more than half of all enrolled students took six or fewer units; currently that percentage has been reduced to just over one-third (37 percent).

Continuing student enrollment (those students enrolled semester to semester) has increased 15 percent since fall 2008, while returning students (those who have returned after a semester or more off) have decreased by 10 percent. Given decreased workload, fewer sections being taught, and earliest registration appointments for continuing students, students are tending to remain in college rather than stopping out. Both the continuing student rate and the returning student rate are consistent with Bay 10 averages. In fall 2012 there were less than half the number of Kindergarten-12th grade students enrolled at the College as there was in fall 2008, yet the Kindergarten-12th grade enrollment rate remains the highest among Bay 10 districts, reflecting the high educational attainment rate for residents within the Ohlone Community College District.
Course Offerings Data

**TABLE 14: Section Offering Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>2008</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010</strong></th>
<th><strong>2011</strong></th>
<th><strong>2012</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>31,896</td>
<td>30,216</td>
<td>30,249</td>
<td>27,571</td>
<td>27,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>3,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES/Section</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>29,077</td>
<td>29,344</td>
<td>30,036</td>
<td>29,157</td>
<td>28,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>4,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES/Section</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER</strong></td>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>5,996</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td>4,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES/Section</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis:**

Given the state-imposed reduced workload, it is not unusual to note that over the five year term since fall 2008, the number of sections offered has declined by 18.0 percent. Over the same period, enrollment has declined 14.4 percent, but FTES has only declined 10.1 percent. The result is that sections have a greater number of enrolled students, with FTES/section increasing 9.8 percent.
### TABLE 15: Summary of Weekly Student Contact Hours, Full-Time Equivalent Faculty, and Load Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>Prior Three Year Average</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WSCH</td>
<td>FTEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Justice</td>
<td>2,110.05</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>521.32</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sign Language</td>
<td>4,496.76</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>4,053.25</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>154.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>9,732.71</td>
<td>17.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>703.55</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>5,397.83</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>10,019.21</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>2,362.33</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>2,780.46</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>10,383.00</td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Supervision and Management</td>
<td>558.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>7,223.23</td>
<td>12.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano Studies</td>
<td>253.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1,673.23</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Applications/Occupational Technology</td>
<td>1,753.85</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Networks/Emerging Technology</td>
<td>7,597.99</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Studies</td>
<td>6,611.40</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent High School Enrollment</td>
<td>13,883.15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Family Science</td>
<td>1,657.00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf Preparatory Program</td>
<td>1,039.85</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Studies</td>
<td>3,302.56</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>160.73</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,177.86</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>45,831.92</td>
<td>55.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>5,086.74</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>1,808.07</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>455.86</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3,405.07</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Mean GPA</th>
<th>GPA SD</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>GPA SD</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1.1537</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>563.37</td>
<td>1,400.36</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>605.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Arts</td>
<td>1.4498</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>746.73</td>
<td>1,031.60</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>510.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1.6657</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>609.42</td>
<td>1,931.98</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>643.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>9.4854</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>869.09</td>
<td>8,915.91</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>815.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>0.9932</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>513.71</td>
<td>995.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>552.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>0.8835</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>362.00</td>
<td>862.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>375.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter Training</td>
<td>0.7507</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>160.16</td>
<td>596.10</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>122.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0.4329</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>568.30</td>
<td>480.10</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>630.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>0.8200</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>392.15</td>
<td>486.68</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>262.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>1.8488</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>699.08</td>
<td>1,954.31</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>827.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Skills Program</td>
<td>0.3047</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>571.80</td>
<td>241.90</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>604.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>0.2448</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>759.57</td>
<td>205.50</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>616.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>30.5077</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>622.41</td>
<td>31,076.08</td>
<td>50.06</td>
<td>620.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia</td>
<td>2.4768</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>484.51</td>
<td>2,005.13</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>390.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>9.6103</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>607.13</td>
<td>8,004.84</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>530.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4.0267</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>201.09</td>
<td>3,675.01</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>225.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>1.6386</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1,179.79</td>
<td>1,896.21</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1,115.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>3.3131</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>818.97</td>
<td>3,351.94</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>761.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>6.9765</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>557.42</td>
<td>4,896.55</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>517.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist Asst</td>
<td>1.7456</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>312.71</td>
<td>1,689.29</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>289.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2.0737</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>461.97</td>
<td>1,911.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>482.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1.4851</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>675.05</td>
<td>1,387.85</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>630.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>7.3792</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>807.94</td>
<td>6,704.72</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>773.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Consortium</td>
<td>7.5167</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5,327.11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>2.9419</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>551.60</td>
<td>257.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>428.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Therapy</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>235.57</td>
<td>1,726.67</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>231.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2.7895</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>737.77</td>
<td>3,610.48</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>794.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.5936</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>644.40</td>
<td>2,061.95</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>451.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>8.9387</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>523.00</td>
<td>8,960.78</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>511.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
<td>8.9804</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>547.17</td>
<td>7,774.62</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>493.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's and Gender Studies</td>
<td>0.9860</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>493.00</td>
<td>115.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>578.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience Education</td>
<td>0.4631</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>985.42</td>
<td>462.48</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>831.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>280,870.03</td>
<td>440.75</td>
<td>637.25</td>
<td>265,913.25</td>
<td>428.06</td>
<td>621.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 16:**
Top 10 Producers of Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>WSCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>47,814.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>31,076.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>10,888.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>9,636.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>8,960.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>8,915.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>8,038.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>8,004.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
<td>7,774.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>6,908.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17:**
Top 10 Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>59.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>50.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>17.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>16.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>15.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
<td>15.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>15.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>15.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>15.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>12.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18:**
Top 10 Most Efficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>1,115.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience Education</td>
<td>831.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>827.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>815.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>805.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>794.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Family Science</td>
<td>786.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>773.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>761.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>742.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis:**

With a 5.3 percent decline in weekly student contact hours (WSCH)—consistent with lower enrollments due to workload reductions—but only a 2.9 percent decline in full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF), overall load efficiency has declined slightly (2.5 percent). It is notable that the current WSCH/FTEF ratio of 621 is not only above the standard benchmark of 525, but well above (24 percent) the same ratio of 501 just a decade prior. Eighteen departments are above the 621 average WSCH/FTEF load efficiency rate; 26 departments fall below the 525 efficiency benchmark.

Several departments had declines in WSCH over the prior three year average that exceeded 20 percent: Broadcasting (BRDC) was down 20.3 percent in WSCH; Interpreter Training (INT) was down 20.6 percent; Computers, Networks, and Emerging Technology (CNET) was down 27.0 percent; Graphic Arts (GA) was down 28.8 percent; and PE was down 29.8 percent. PE was specifically targeted for reduction in response to the smaller workload and after focused dialogue regarding the mission of the College. Sociology (SOC) actually had a 29.4 percent increase in WSCH over the prior three year average.

The top ten producers of WSCH have remained fairly consistent over the past several years. The only notable change is that Physical Education (PE) is no longer in the top ten, replaced by Speech. A change within the College is responsible for this shift; PE, as a department, has been divided and the courses have been dispersed among PE, Kinesiology (KIN), and Athletics (ATHL). Were these three departments still one, PE/KIN/ATHL would produce the third greatest amount of WSCH. The top seven departments produce over 50 percent of the total WSCH (excluding WSCH produced by concurrent high school enrollments, which are multi-departmental). The top ten producers of WSCH account for 60.3 percent of all WSCH, yet only account for 54.4 percent of FTEF.
Staff Demographics for Classified and Management / Fall 2012

### TABLE 19.1: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL STAFF</th>
<th>CLASSIFIED STAFF</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 19 / GRAPH A: Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL STAFF</th>
<th>CLASSIFIED STAFF</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC ISLANDER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILIPINO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INTRODUCTION**

**DATA ANALYSIS:**

The College approximates the statewide average for distribution of staff by gender, but is above the statewide average for Asian staff and below the statewide average for Hispanic staff. White staff is below the statewide average, but in excess by 17 percent of the District White population; Asian staff is below the District by 16 percent and Hispanic staff is below the District by four percent. African-American staff is above the District population by four percent. Distribution of staff by age generally aligns with the statewide averages for each age group, with a slight tendency toward younger classified staff and managers.
Staff Demographics for Faculty / Fall 2012

**TABLE 20.1: Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 20 / GRAPH A: Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DATA ANALYSIS:**

The faculty includes more female instructors than the statewide average, particularly among full-time faculty. Sixty-two percent of all faculty are White, below the statewide average but well above the district White population. As with the staff, the faculty has a tendency to be slightly younger than the statewide average. Fifty-one percent of the faculty is older than 50 years of age, but this is below the statewide average of 56 percent; among the full-time faculty, 53 percent are above 50 years of age, still six percent below the statewide average for full-time faculty.

---

**TABLE 20 / GRAPH B: Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total Faculty Count</th>
<th>Total Faculty Percent</th>
<th>Total Faculty Statewide</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Count</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Percent</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Statewide</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty Count</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty Percent</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 21: Employees by Occupational Category / Headcount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>11,859</td>
<td>11,640</td>
<td>12,842</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>11,801</td>
<td>10,381</td>
<td>10,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Admin</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Man</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Full</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per All</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Class</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 22: Employees by Occupational Category / Full-Time Equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>154.3</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td>135.4</td>
<td>126.6</td>
<td>123.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>120.1</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>126.3</td>
<td>123.9</td>
<td>129.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>175.4</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>190.2</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>172.7</td>
<td>171.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>481.2</td>
<td>507.0</td>
<td>510.9</td>
<td>484.4</td>
<td>477.1</td>
<td>462.9</td>
<td>466.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3,835</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>3,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Admin</td>
<td>239.7</td>
<td>215.5</td>
<td>255.2</td>
<td>241.6</td>
<td>277.4</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>264.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Man</td>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>199.1</td>
<td>182.7</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>147.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Full</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per All</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Class</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per All</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA ANALYSIS:
Over the past several years, staff headcount has remained relatively stable, except for the category of full-time faculty, while student headcount enrollment has declined. This gives the appearance that faculty and staff are serving fewer students and the workload for faculty and staff has been reduced. However, the disproportionate amount of adjunct to full-time faculty skews the workload ratios. Full-time faculty have experienced an increase in the ratio of headcount students to full-time faculty. The increase in faculty and staff workload becomes even more apparent when considering full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent faculty and staff.

C. Longitudinal Student Achievement Data

GRAPH 4: Associate Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>368</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH 5: Certificates Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH 6: Total Program Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 23: Ohlone College Students Transferring to Campuses of the University of California and California State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other University of Californias</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU East Bay</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San José St. University</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco St. University</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Sacramento</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CSUs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSU TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
<td><strong>306</strong></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td><strong>399</strong></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UC/CSU Transfers</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 24: Ohlone Transfers to In-State Private Universities & Out-of-State Universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State Private Universities</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Universities</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total In-State Private and Out-of-State Transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
<td><strong>219</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA ANALYSIS:**

The rise and fall of program awards follows the rise and fall of enrollment, although the peaks and valleys tend to be reflected two to three years after the same peaks and valleys in enrollment. The College has seen a rebound in program awards after an unusually low year in 2009-2010. It is suspected that low reporting in 2009-2010 could be due to delinquent recording of awards, but without a resubmission of MIS for that year that suspicion cannot be accurately verified. It is notable that awards of degrees and certificates have increased in a time of decreasing student enrollment.

An increase in transfers to the University of California system in the past few years, coupled with a relatively steady transfer rate to the California State University system, have also kept transfer rates strong despite decreased enrollment. Data for in-state private and out of state universities is not as timely as that for the University of California/California State University transfers, but it is probably not coincidental that the year (2009-2010) the CSU campuses reduced transfer admissions, student transfer to private and out of state universities increased.
2012 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges Data

**GRAPH 7: Student Progress and Achievement Rate**

- **Ohlone College:** Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who achieved any of the following outcomes within six years: transferred to a four-year college; earned an AA/AS; earned a certificate (18 units or more); achieved “transfer directed” status; or achieved “transfer prepared” status.

- **Statewide Average:**

- **Peer Group Average:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ohlone College</th>
<th>Statewide Average</th>
<th>Peer Group Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAPH 8: Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units**

- **Ohlone College**

- **Statewide Average**

- **Peer Group Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ohlone College</th>
<th>Statewide Average</th>
<th>Peer Group Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who earned at least 30 units while in the California Community College system.
**INTRODUCTION**

**GRAPH 9: Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ohlone College
- Statewide Average
- Peer Group Average

*Percentage of students enrolled in vocational courses and successfully completing with a grade of C or better, excluding K-12 students.*

**GRAPH 10: Persistence Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ohlone College
- Statewide Average
- Peer Group Average

*Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of six units earned in a fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent fall term anywhere in the system.*
INTRODUCTION

**GRAPH 11: Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ohlone College</th>
<th>Statewide Average</th>
<th>Peer Group Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ohlone College: Percentage of students enrolled in basic skills courses and successfully completing with a grade of C or better, excluding K-12 students.
- Statewide Average: Percentage of students who successfully completed a basic skills English or Mathematics course at least two or more levels below college/transfer level, excluding K-12 students, and successfully completed a higher-level course in the same discipline within three years of completing the first basic skills course.
- Peer Group Average: Percentage of students who successfully completed a basic skills course at least two or more levels below college/transfer level, excluding K-12 students, and successfully completed a higher-level course in the same discipline within three years of completing the first basic skills course.

**GRAPH 12: Improvement Rates for Credit Basic Skills Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ohlone College</th>
<th>Statewide Average</th>
<th>Peer Group Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the state-mandated measures of student achievement has been the annual Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report. Not only does the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) present performance indicators for each of the California community colleges and performance indicators for the statewide system, the ARCC report groups like peer colleges and provides a comparison of how each college has performed compared to its peers.

The 2012 ARCC report reveals that the College is above both the statewide average and the peer group average on all seven of the performance indicators; the same was true with the 2011 ARCC report. The College is one of only two colleges statewide to have achieved this level of student achievement two years in a row.

**DATA ANALYSIS:**

Graph 13: Improvement Rates for Credit ESL Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Ohlone College**: Percentage of students who successfully completed a basic skills ESL course at least two or more levels below college/transfer level, excluding K-12 students, and successfully completed a higher-level course in the same discipline within three years of completing the first basic skills course.
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**TABLE 25: 2013 Performance Benchmarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL #1</th>
<th>CURRENT PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PRIOR YEAR PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>STATEWIDE AVERAGE</th>
<th>PEER AVERAGE</th>
<th>APPROVED BENCHMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate (Fall 2012 CCCCO)</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
<td>84.24%</td>
<td>86.59%</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Success (Fall 2012 CCCCO)</td>
<td>65.96%</td>
<td>66.61%</td>
<td>64.49%</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skill Improvement - English (2013 Scorecard)</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>33.70%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skill Improvement - Math (2013 Scorecard)</td>
<td>50.90%</td>
<td>49.90%</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Improvement (2013 Scorecard)</td>
<td>17.70%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>31.90%</td>
<td>25.10%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL #7</th>
<th>DISTRICT AVERAGE</th>
<th>PEER AVERAGE</th>
<th>STATEWIDE AVERAGE</th>
<th>APPROVED BENCHMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented* Enrollment (Fall 2012 CCCCO)</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
<td>21.35%</td>
<td>46.37%</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented* Retention (Fall 2012 CCCCO)</td>
<td>80.70%</td>
<td>80.81%</td>
<td>85.32%</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented* Success (Fall 2012 CCCCO)</td>
<td>63.13%</td>
<td>64.18%</td>
<td>65.24%</td>
<td>71.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORECARD 2013</th>
<th>DISTRICT AVERAGE</th>
<th>PEER AVERAGE</th>
<th>STATEWIDE AVERAGE</th>
<th>APPROVED BENCHMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>61.60%</td>
<td>60.10%</td>
<td>65.80%</td>
<td>64.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Units</td>
<td>67.60%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>66.40%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td>49.20%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Completion</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>46.00%</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes African-American, Native American, and Hispanic

**DATA ANALYSIS:**

Benchmarks have been established for stated measureable objectives within the College Strategic Plan and for those performance indicators mandated by the Student Success Act. Dependent upon where the College’s current performance is, benchmarks have been established to be realistic and attainable, yet challenging. Some benchmarks are set as the performance level of the top 10 percent of community colleges statewide. Other benchmarks are set to move the performance indicator into the top quartile of community colleges statewide, to be at the statewide average, or to show continuous progress toward an eventually higher benchmark.

Currently four of the benchmarks would place the College in the top 10 percent statewide, and two of those benchmarks have already been met.
IntrodUcTion

data anaLySis:
Aligned with the increase in student fees, financial aid awards have significantly increased since 2009-2010. Students receiving financial aid have increased 44.6 percent and the actual aid amounts have similarly increased 44.3 percent. The most dramatic increase is in the Board of Governors Enrollment Fee Waiver, where both increased numbers of students in need and increased amount of fees to be waived have driven the aid amount up over 200 percent.

The number of students participating in new student orientations has remained fairly stable since fall 2008, but there has been an increase in students taking assessment tests as well as an increase in the rate of students who have met with a counselor at some point in the students’ stay at the College.

D. Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes

The 2008 self-evaluation report documented the College’s proactive steps to embrace the 2002 revisions of the ACCJC Accreditation Standards, which brought new focus on developing and assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs). In response to these standards, Faculty Senate and the Curriculum Committee, in collaboration with administration, created a Task Force called Student Learning Outcomes Professional Enthusiasts (affectionately known as SLOPE), chaired by the Faculty Senate president and the Curriculum Committee chair. The SLOPE group developed definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 26: Financial Aid Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL 2009-2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Governors (BOG) Enrollment Fee Waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohlone Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 27: Percent of Eligible Students Receiving Matriculation Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Educational Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and guidance for the College’s implementation of the revised standards and provided leadership in providing professional development activities for faculty. In fall 2005 SLOPE was formalized as a Faculty Senate committee and renamed Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC).

Based on this firm foundation, faculty and academic deans currently engage in an active process of identifying and assessing SLOs at the course, program, and College levels. This process is codified in the “Framework for Course, Program, and College-Level SLO Assessment Including Program Review and Curriculum Processes,” and described in detail within the assessment of Standard II in this report. All courses and programs have established SLOs through the College’s curriculum development and approval system. Course SLOs are stated in the official Course Outline of Record (CORs) and faculty are required to include these Course SLOs in their syllabi. Program SLOs are stated in the College catalog and integrated into the Program and Service Reviews for the instructional and student services areas. SLOs have been established for each of the eight College General Education (GE) areas, which are published in the College catalog.

SLOAC, made up of academic deans and faculty from each of the divisions, actively oversees the assessment process. The committee is co-chaired by the vice president, academic affairs and a faculty member granted 25 percent reassigned time. A Master Course List for SLO Assessment has been created and Course SLO assessments are tracked on a three-year cycle. Program SLO assessments are integrated into Program and Services Review. Faculty make regular presentations of their Course SLO and Program SLO work at SLOAC meetings and also at Board of Trustees (Board) meetings. The GE Committee has worked closely with SLOAC in developing an integrated system for assessing the GE SLOs. Assessment of SLOs is an ongoing activity. Additionally, during Learning College Week of each semester a full day is devoted to SLO assessment work. This “Get It Done Day” has generated great faculty participation and dialogue.

As stated above, the narrative for Standard II of this report provides detailed descriptions of all the work being done in the area of developing and assessing SLOs.

E. Off-Campus Centers and Distance Learning

OFF-CAMPUS CENTERS

Ohlone has one off-campus center located in the city of Newark, California. In actuality, the Newark Center for Health Science and Technology (Newark Campus) is not considered an off-campus site; rather the Educational Master Plan identifies three integrated campuses: Fremont campus, Newark campus, and the eCampus (Distance Education).

The College began offering courses in Newark in 1974. For the first 20 years the courses were mainly offered in the evening at Newark Memorial High School. In 1992, the College began leasing space from Newark Unified School District at the former MacGregor Middle School site on Cedar Boulevard in Newark. Along with evening classes, a handful of day classes were offered. The site became known as the Newark Ohlone Center (NOC). During fall 1994, the citizens and officials in Newark began expressing concerns towards the long-term commitment of the College to provide a strong academic program in their city. At the time, courses at NOC generated a little under 250 FTES per year.

In January 1995 the Board responded to these concerns by passing a resolution unanimously reaffirming their commitment to a strong and long-term presence in Newark.
The Board directed the College administration to increase the resources dedicated to the NOC and to double the enrollment within five years. This enrollment goal was reached within three years in 1998 and by 2001 enrollment had nearly quadrupled to 950 FTES per year.

The strategic planning directions included a recognition of the growth at the NOC and on April 22, 1998, the Board passed a resolution (#22/97-98) concluding, “that the establishment of a permanent Newark Ohlone Center within the City of Newark is the most effective way of meeting the needs of students and providing for the growth that is projected for the western part of the Fremont-Newark Community College District.” In August 1998 the Board submitted “Letter of Intent to Relocate a Previously Grand-Fathered Education Center to be Known as the Newark Ohlone Center” to the California Community Colleges Board of Governors for approval. The proposal was approved by the Board of Governors at their March 9, 1999, meeting.

During the two-year period between 1999 and 2001 a number of significant accomplishments were achieved related to planning and Program and Services Review. On August 11, 1999, an “Educational Plan for the Ohlone College Newark Center, Working Document” was published based on input from College and community reviews. In 1999 the first formal College Strategic Plan was developed and approved by the Board. In 2000 a formal structure and process for Program and Services Review was developed and approved by the Board. This established Program and Services Review as a College wide process, including all areas of the College: Academic Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services. Finally, in January 2001 the first formal Educational Master Plan (EMP) was approved. The 2001–2011 EMP included an Educational Plan for a new center in Newark.

The 2001-2011 EMP served as the driving force behind the planning process in preparation for the 2002 Measure A Bond effort. During 2001 the amount to be raised by Measure A was set at $150 million to fund a new campus in Newark ($100 million); a new Student Services Building on the Fremont campus ($35 million); as well as various facilities improvement projects on the Fremont campus ($15 million). A campaign committee was formed, a political consulting firm was hired, two public opinion polls were conducted, and the Board approved placing Measure A on the March 5, 2002 ballot. An active campaign led to passage of the Measure A just exceeding the 55 percent vote requirement for passage. Following the passage of Measure A, the College purchased from Sun Microsystems an 80 acre property on Cherry Street in Newark as the site of the new campus center.

Over the next six years a robust planning process resulted in the construction of the Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology, which opened in January 2008. A Substantive Change Proposal was submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) as part of the College’s Self-Evaluation Report for its March 2008 site visit. Thus, the site visit for the Substantive Change Proposal was conducted in conjunction with the overall accreditation site visit for the College. The Substantive Change Proposal was then approved by the ACCJC.

Distance Education

Distance Education (DE) classes were first developed at the College in 1998, well before there were federal Department of Education and accreditation commission standards and regulations for DE. From the beginning, DE courses were viewed as integrated into the curriculum development, approval, and oversight of the College. As DE grew over the years and federal and regional accreditation standards and regulations were developed, the College was diligent
in assuring compliance. In 2011 the ACCJC approved the College’s Substantive Change proposal for courses that constitute 50 percent or more of a program offered through a mode of Distance Education.

In several sections that follow, the College’s DE efforts are described in detail and compliance with standards and regulations is demonstrated. The section on “Certification of Continued Compliance with Commission Policies” describes compliance with the Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education. The section on “Certification of Continued Compliance with Selected United States Department of Education (USDE) Regulations” describes compliance with Regulation 602.17(g): Distance Education – Security of Student Identity and Effective Student. Finally, the section on “Special Notes and Principles for Distance Education” describes the College’s compliance with standards in the ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Distance Education.

**F. External Independent Audit and Information/ Required Evidentiary Documents for Financial Review**


**ACCREDITATION QUESTION** Has the College received any qualified or adverse opinions in audit reports in the last three years from district, state, or federal programs?

**RESPONSE** The College has received no qualified or adverse opinions from auditors in the past three years. See III.D.2.a.

**AQ:** Has the College implemented all audit recommendations? Have there been the same recommendations of more than one year? What is the auditor’s response to the management actions taken?

**R:** The College has implemented all audit recommendations in a timely fashion. No recommendation has exceeded one year. The auditors have responded favorably to actions taken. See III.D.2.b.

**AQ:** What is the institution’s unrestricted fund balance and reserves and how has it changed over the last three years?

**R:** The College has maintained healthy reserve levels over the past three years: 25.7% in 2010-2011; 25.5% in 2011-2012; and 22.9% in 2012-2013. See chart in III.D.3.a.

**AQ:** Does the College maintain a minimum 5% unrestricted reserve of cash or cash equivalent?

**R:** Yes. The large unrestricted reserve levels/ fund balances mentioned above ensure cash reserves well in excess of 5%. See III.D.3.a.

**AQ:** Has the State Chancellor’s Office had to intervene regarding fiscal stability or compliance?

**R:** No.

**AQ:** Does the College have long term debt financing?

**R:** Yes. The College has outstanding general obligation bonds. These are serviced with tax revenues, as per approval by District voters, collected by the County of Alameda. See III.D.1.c.

**AQ:** Does the institution have an obligation for post-retirement health benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations? If it does, has it done the actuarial study and identified the liability? Is there a plan for funding them?

**R:** Yes. The College has an obligation for OPEB and for compensated employee absences. The College has a plan for funding both. See III.D.1.c.
AQ: Does the institution have limits on accrual of unused vacation time? Compensatory time? Is the institution enforcing its policy on limits?
R: Yes. Limits exist on the accrual of unused vacation time and on compensatory time. The College enforces its policy. See III.D.3.c.

AQ: Is the fiscal entity self-insured for health benefits, workers compensation, and unemployment? How are reserve levels set?
R: The College is not self-insured for health benefits, workers compensation, or unemployment. See III.D.3.a.

AQ: Does this fiscal entity have obligations for future total compensation expenditures driven by collective bargaining agreements or other agreements (corporate-buyouts, management/employee agreements, etc)? If so, what are they? Of what significance are they? What is the plan for funding these future obligations?
R: None.

AQ: Does the institution and the foundation have an agreement/contract on the role of the foundation? Does it require that the foundation have an independent audit?
R: Yes. The College and its Foundation have a Master Agreement that governs the role of the Foundation and the relationship between it and the College. The Foundation is required to conduct an independent external audit. See III.D.2.c.

AQ: Does the college or district have a Prop 39 bond fund?
R: Yes. Measure A and Measure G. See III.D.3.e.

AQ: Does the college have policies and procedures regarding purchasing? Are they being followed?
R: Yes. The College has purchasing policies and procedures that are being followed. See III.D.3.g.

AQ: Will additional buildings be opened in the next 2-3 years? Is there a plan to fund staff, utilities and operating expenses associated with additional facilities coming online within the next 2-3 years?
R: No additional buildings will be opened in the next two to three years. The College anticipates two new academic buildings to be opened in 2018.

AQ: Is there evidence that planning integrates fiscal and other resources?
R: Yes. See III.D.1.a.

AQ: Is there evidence that the institution monitors student financial aid obligations such as student loan default rates and compliance with federal regulations?
R: Yes. The Financial Aid Office and Business Services Department work collaboratively to monitor student financial aid obligations and ensure compliance with federal regulations. See III.D.3.f.
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Introduction

Ohlone College has a strong institutional commitment to being “A World of Cultures United in Learning.” The Learning College focus on student and employee learning outcomes has deep roots at the College, reaching back to the original statement of educational philosophy over 40 years ago and continuing to this day. A key component of being a Learning College is to “walk the talk” by being a Learning Organization. A Learning Organization views all members of the organization as learners and recognizes that the learning process is central to effective decision making, problem solving, and continuous organizational improvement and renewal. The Self-Evaluation process has been a valuable learning experience for the College community and a chance to celebrate student and employee learning outcomes.

The governance and strategic planning body, the College Council, has served as the Accreditation Self-Evaluation Steering Committee. The College Council created a Learning and Assessment Team for each section of the Accreditation Standards. Team Leaders representing administration, faculty, and staff were selected for each Team to coordinate the learning and assessment work. All Team Leaders completed the ACCJC/WASC Accreditation Basics Online Course prior to the start of the Self-Evaluation work.

The Learning and Assessment Teams conducted the Self-Evaluation and wrote narrative reports based on the Questions and Suggested Sources of Evidence in the ACCJC/WASC “Guide to Evaluating Institutions.” Web-based Word templates were used for analysis and reporting on standards. The Teams prepared interim reports and presentations to the College Council in both the fall of 2012 and spring of 2013. A Board of Trustees Workshop was conducted in May 2013 to review the findings from each of the Teams.

For many of the standards the College is deemed to be meeting the standard and no Actionable Improvement Plans are required. Where the College is not fully meeting a standard, an Actionable Improvement Plan is presented. Also, there are some Actionable Improvement Plans presented to move beyond meeting the standard.
Structure of the Self-Evaluation Process

Membership of College Council
Accreditation Self-Evaluation Steering Committee, 2012-2013

**CO-CHAIRS (2) THE PRESIDENT/SUPERINTENDENT AND ONE MEMBER FROM THE 15 VOTING MEMBERS**
- Gari Browning, President/Superintendent (non-voting)
- Alison Kuehner, Professor, English

**FACULTY (6) FULL-TIME; (1) ADJUNCT; APPOINTED BY FACULTY SENATE**
- Ralph DeUnamuno, Adjunct Instructor, Chicano/Latino Studies
- Margaret Kauffman, Professor, Biology
- Alison Kuehner (co-chair), Professor, English
- Matthew O’Donnell, Assistant Professor, Entertainment Design and Technology
- Timothy Ramos, Assistant Professor, Counselor
- Rosalie (Sally) Scofield, Associate Professor, Medical/Surgical Nursing

**STUDENTS (2) APPOINTED BY ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF OHLONE (ASOC)**
- Nandir Lin, ASOC Legislative Representative
- Jason Trinidad, ASOC President

**STAFF (4) APPOINTED TWO EACH BY CSEA AND SEIU**

**CSEA:**
- Stephanie Pintello, Staff Interpreter II
- Kathleen Schoenecker, Accommodations Services Specialist

**SEIU:**
- Thomas Harchous, Facility Maintenance Mechanic I
- David Schurtz, Facility Maintenance Mechanic I

**ADMINISTRATION (3) ONE EACH APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT/SUPERINTENDENT (ONE EACH FROM ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, STUDENT SERVICES ADMINISTRATION)**
- Academic Administration:
  - Genie Gertz, Dean, Deaf Studies
- Administrative Services Administration:
  - Joanne Schultz, Dean, Business Services
- Student Services Administration:
  - Edward West, Dean, Counseling and International Programs and Services

**EX-OFFICIO (NON-VOTING) (7) THE PRESIDENT/SUPERINTENDENT AND EACH VICE PRESIDENT AND ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT**
- Gari Browning, President/District Superintendent
- Bruce Griffin, Associate Vice President, Information Technology
- Leta Stagnaro, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Scott Thomason, Vice President, Administrative Services (interim)
- Ron Travenick, Vice President, Student Services
- James Wright, Vice President, Academic Affairs/Deputy Superintendent
- Shairon Zingsheim, Associate Vice President, Human Resources and Training

Membership of College Council
Accreditation Self-Evaluation Steering Committee, 2013-2014

**CO-CHAIRS (2) THE PRESIDENT/SUPERINTENDENT AND ONE MEMBER FROM THE 15 VOTING MEMBERS**
- Gari Browning, President/Superintendent (non-voting)
- Alison Kuehner, Professor, English
ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-EVALUATION PROCESS

FACULTY (6) FULL-TIME; (1) ADJUNCT; APPOINTED BY FACULTY SENATE
- Paul Belasky, Professor, Geology/Geography
- Yvonka Headley, Assistant Professor, Counseling
- Sandra (Bunny) Klopping, Professor, Deaf Studies, Deaf Students/American Sign Language
- Alison Kuehner (co-chair), Professor, English
- Lenore Landavazo, Adjunct Counselor
- Jeffrey O’Connell, Associate Professor, Mathematics
- Rosalie (Sally) Scofield, Associate Professor, Medical/Surgical Nursing

STUDENTS (2) APPOINTED BY ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF OHLONE (ASOC)
- Sonam Babu, ASOC Newark Representative
- Mat Weber, ASOC President

STAFF (4) APPOINTED TWO EACH BY CSEA AND SEIU
CSEA:
- Rae Halliwell, Facilities Operations Assistant
- Kathleen Schoenecker, Accommodations Services Specialist
SEIU:
- Thomas Harchous, Facility Maintenance Mechanic I
- David Schurtz, Facility Maintenance Mechanic I

ADMINISTRATION (3) ONE EACH APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT/SUPERINTENDENT (ONE EACH FROM ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, STUDENT SERVICES ADMINISTRATION)
- Academic Administration:
  Mike Holtzclaw, Dean, Science, Engineering, and Mathematics
- Administrative Services Administration:
  Alex Lebedeff, Director, Purchasing, Contracts, and Auxiliary Services

- Student Services Administration:
  Kelly Wilmeth, Director, Interpreting and Accommodations Services

EX-OFFICIO (NON-VOTING) (6) THE PRESIDENT/SUPERINTENDENT AND EACH VICE PRESIDENT
- Gari Browning, President/District Superintendent
- Bruce Griffin, Associate Vice President, Information Technology
- Ronald Little, Vice President, Administrative Services
- Leta Stagnaro, Vice President, Academic Affairs/Deputy Superintendent
- Ron Travenick, Vice President, Student Services
- Shairon Zingsheim, Associate Vice President, Human Resources and Training

Membership of the Learning and Assessment Teams
Team Leaders and Members (as of 12/06/13)

STANDARD I: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION/EFFECTIVENESS
TEAM LEADERS:
- Michael Bowman, Executive Dean, Academic Affairs, Research, and Planning
- Alison Kuehner, Professor, English, College Council Co-Chair

TEAM MEMBERS:
- Rae Halliwell, Facilities Operations Assistant
- Jennifer Harper, Associate Professor, Counseling
- Sheila Holland, Executive Assistant, Arts and Social Sciences
- Isabel Reichert, Instructor, Multimedia
- Jeffrey Roberts, Associate Professor, Physical Education; Athletic Trainer
- Timothy Roberts, Assistant Professor, Music (Commercial)

EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Gari Browning, President/Superintendent
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STANDARD II.A: LEARNING PROGRAMS
TEAM LEADERS:
- Kathleen “K.G.” Greenstein, Associate Professor, Information Literacy/Collection Development Librarian; General Education Committee Chair
- Jesse MacEwan, Assistant Professor, Counselor; Curriculum Committee Chair
- Jeffrey O’Connell, Associate Professor, Mathematics; Faculty Senate President
- Rachel Sherman, Associate Professor, English, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC) Co-Chair
- Leta Stagnaro, Vice President, Academic Affairs/Deputy Superintendent
TEAM MEMBERS:
- Luc Desmedt, Professor, Physics/Astronomy
- Frances Fon, Transfer Center Specialist
- Mary Fontanilla, Instructional Assistant, Reading Lab
- Diana Garza, Executive Assistant to the Associate Vice President
- Laura Martinez, Executive Assistant, Kinesiology and Athletics
- Bernadette Van Deusen, Professor, Nursing
- Jacqlyn Vetter, Schedule Coordinator, Curriculum and Scheduling Office
EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Leta Stagnaro, Vice President, Academic Affairs/Deputy Superintendent

STANDARD II.B: STUDENT DEVELOPMENT
TEAM LEADERS:
- Tina Dodson, Director, One-Stop Career Center
- Dennis Keller, Professor, Music
- Kathleen Schoenecker, Accommodation Services Specialist
TEAM MEMBERS:
- Lesley Buehler, Dean, Business, Technology, and Learning Resources
- Tina Dodson, Director, One-Stop Career Center
- Patricia Leigh-Anne Elizondo, Staff Interpreter II
- Kim Huynh, Accounting Technician III
- Prabhjot Kaur, Senator, Associate Students of Ohlone College (ASOC)
- Santino Martinez, Evaluation Specialist
- Joy Dawn Olla, Program Assistant
- Rosemary O’Neill, Assistant Professor, Counselor
- Amit Patel, President, Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC)
- Wayne Takakuwa, Interim Dean, Counseling
- Terri Taskey, Professor, Learning Disabilities Counselor
EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Ron Travenick, Vice President, Student Services

STANDARD II.C: LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES
TEAM LEADERS:
- Lesley Buehler, Dean, Business, Technology, and Learning Resources
- Kathleen “K.G.” Greenstein, Associate Professor, Information Literacy/Collection Development Librarian; General Education Committee Chair
- Katherine Sparling, Associate Professor, Systems and Technical Services Librarian
TEAM MEMBERS:
- Brenda Ahntholz, Professor, Speech and Communication Studies
- Christina Caratachea, Student Representative
- Sarah Cooper, Associate Professor, Psychology
- Carrie Dameron, Assistant Professor, Medical/Surgical Nursing
- Jeffrey Dean, Associate Professor, English Composition
- Barbara Duggal, Associate Professor, Learning Resource Center
- Jamillah Gabriel, Lead Library Technician/Circulation
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- Emily Grantz, Learning Resources Technician
- Ileen “Sam” Katz, Professor, Mathematics
- Kevin McCue, Biology Science Lab Tech/Tutoring Center Assistant
- Rakesh Swamy, Associate Professor, English

EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Leta Stagnaro, Vice President, Academic Affairs/Deputy Superintendent

STANDARD III.A: HUMAN RESOURCES

TEAM LEADERS:
- Jennifer Druley, Senior Human Resources Specialist
- Kelly Wilmeth, Director, Interpreting and Accommodations Services

TEAM MEMBERS:
- Christopher Booras, Director, Theatre Operations
- Rae Halliwell, Facilities Operations Assistant
- Yvonka Headley, Assistant Professor, Counselor
- Portia Jiang, Accountant
- John Li, Accounting and Budget Coordinator
- Gweneth Murphy, Safety Officer III

EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Shairon Zingsheim, Associate Vice President, Human Resources and Training

STANDARD III.B: PHYSICAL RESOURCES

TEAM LEADERS:
- Thomas Moore, Director, Facilities and Modernization
- Jennifer Parker, Executive Assistant

TEAM MEMBERS:
- Ann Burdett, Director, Disabled Students Program and Services
- Gale Carli, Dean, Health Sciences and Environmental Studies
- Mike Holtzclaw, Dean, Science, Engineering, and Mathematics
- Robert Mitchell, Associate Professor, English
- Steven Osawa, Chief, Safety and Security
- Jill Rojas, Confidential Assistant to the Vice President, Student Services
- Donna Runyon, Professor, Physical Education; Women’s Softball Coach
- Christopher Warden, Dean, Kinesiology, Athletics, and Newark Center

EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Ronald Little, Vice President, Administrative Services

STANDARD III.C: TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES

TEAM LEADERS:
- Don Penrose, Director, Application Services
- Robert Smedfjeld, Associate Professor, Mathematics; Technology Committee Co-Chair (2010-2013)

TEAM MEMBERS:
- Lesley Buehler, Dean, Business, Technology, and Learning Resources
- Kristine Carroll, Adjunct Instructor, Speech and Communication Studies
- Kathleen Johnson, Senior Human Resources Specialist
- Ellen Lane, Senior Information System Engineer
- Deborah Lemon, Associate Professor, Spanish; Technology Committee Co-Chair (2013-Present)
- Heather McCarty, Associate Professor, History
- Mylene Pelimiano, Associate Professor, Mathematics
- Kathleen Schoenecker, Accommodations Services Specialist
- Connie Teshara, Confidential Assistant to the Vice President, Academic Affairs/Deputy Superintendent
- Tracy Virgil, Associate Professor, English

EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Bruce Griffin, Associate Vice President, Information Technology/Chief Technology Officer
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STANDARD III.D: FISCAL RESOURCES
TEAM LEADERS:
- James Andrews, Associate Professor, Accounting/Business Administration
- Ronald Little, Vice President, Administrative Services
TEAM MEMBERS:
- Walter Birkedahl, Dean, Arts and Social Sciences
- Robert Bradshaw, Professor, Mathematics
- Mary Fontanilla, Instructional Assistant, Reading Lab
- Mike Holtzclaw, Dean, Science, Engineering, and Mathematics
- James Keogh, Safety Officer II
- John Li, Accounting and Budget Coordinator
- Lea Witmer, Account Technician IV
EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Ronald Little, Vice President, Administrative Services

STANDARD IV.A: DECISION-MAKING ROLES/PROCESS
TEAM LEADERS:
- Alison Kuehner, Professor, English; College Council Co-Chair
- Mark Lieu, Dean, Language and Communication
TEAM MEMBERS:
- Ann Burdett, Director, Disabled Students Programs and Services
- Jeffrey Dean, Associate Professor, English Composition
- Daman Grewal, Director, Technical Services
- Nam Hoang, Senior Accountant
- Lenore Landavazo, Adjunct Counselor
- David Schurtz, Facility Maintenance Mechanic I; President, SEIU
- Jacqueline Whitehouse, Executive Assistant; President, CSEA
EXECUTIVE CONTACT:
- Gari Browning, President/Superintendent

STANDARD IV.B: BOARD/ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION
TEAM LEADERS:
- Bruce Griffin, Associate Vice President, Information Technology/Chief Technology Officer
- Susan Myers, Associate Professor, Counselor
TEAM MEMBERS:
- Patrice Birkedahl, Director, College Advancement
- Shelby Foster, Confidential Staff Assistant
- Anu Ganguly, Professor, Chemistry
- Gweneth Murphy, Safety Officer III
- Steven Osawa, Chief, Safety and Security
- Barbara Tull, Professor, English Composition
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## Major Milestones of the Self-Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2014 ACCREDITATION SELF EVALUATION PREPARATION TIMELINE (06-11-13)</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Review Timeline with Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Accreditation Overview with Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Team Training at Las Positas College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Accreditation Overview with College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Accreditation Overview with Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Reconstitute President’s Planning and Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Accreditation Overview with Classified Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Reconstitue President’s Planning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Planning and Assessment Review May-August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Website Review May-August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Select and Give Direction to Team Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Planning and Program Review Assessment Review with College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Team Leaders Complete “Accreditation Basics” Online Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Team Leaders Meet to Plan the Work of Their Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Selection of Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
<td>Learning and Assessment Team Leaders will give overviews of their plans (Standard I. October 22; Standard II. November 5; Standard III. November 26; Standard IV. and Distance Education, December 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Evidence Gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Evidence Gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Improvement Plans, Narrative Drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING 2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Feb</td>
<td>Improvement Plans, Narrative Drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>Narrative Writing Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11</td>
<td>Standard I Review by College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Sample Narrative Drafts to Wright/Browning for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Standard III.A, III.C, and III.D Review by College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22</td>
<td>Standard II.B, II.C, and III.B Review by College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>Narrative Writing Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>Standard II.A, IV.A, and IV.B Review by College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>Board Workshop, Preliminary Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24</td>
<td>Final Narrative Drafts Due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Major Milestones of the Self-Evaluation Process (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMER 2013</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Editing for Voice and Consistency</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 10</td>
<td>Board Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Editing for Voice and Consistency</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Working Draft Reviewed at College Council Retreat</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>Board Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 2013</td>
<td>Aug-Dec</td>
<td>Teams Continue to Refine Working Draft</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Working Draft Posted to Website for Review Period</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 11</td>
<td>Board Update</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>First Reading: Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>First Reading: College Council</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>Board Update</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>Second Reading and Endorsements: Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 28</td>
<td>Second Reading and Endorsements: College Council</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 13</td>
<td>First Reading: Board</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 11</td>
<td>Final Approval: Board</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING 2014</td>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>Submit to Commission</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Site Visit Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>ACCJC Pre-Visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 10-13</td>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMER</td>
<td>April - May</td>
<td>Preliminary Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Commission Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Information
Certification of Continued Compliance with Eligibility Requirements
1. Authority
Ohlone College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and is approved under regulations of the California State Department of Education and the California Community Colleges. The Registered Nursing Program is accredited by the California State Board of Registered Nursing and the National League of Nursing; the Respiratory Therapist Program is accredited by the Council on Accreditation of Allied Health Programs; and the Physical Therapist Assistant Program is accredited by the American Physical Therapy Association.

2. Mission
The Board of Trustees publicly affirms the College’s Mission Statement, and reviews and updates it regularly. The Mission Statement appears in the Ohlone College Strategic Plan and is published in the College catalog and class schedule. The Mission Statement is also published on the College website.

3. Governing Board
The seven-member Board of Trustees of the Ohlone Community College District is an independent policymaking board, which ensures that the District’s educational mission is being implemented. The Board also ensures the quality, integrity, and financial stability of Ohlone College. Members are elected for four-year terms, and these terms are staggered. Trustees have no employment, family, or personal financial interest in the College.

4. Chief Executive Officer
Ohlone College has a chief executive officer who is appointed by the Board of Trustees (Board) and whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who possesses the authority to administer Board policies.

5. Administrative Capacity
The number of administrators and managers at Ohlone College supports the services necessary to carry out the institution’s mission and purpose. Their preparation and experience are scrutinized through an open and competitive employment process.

6. Operational Status
Ohlone College is operational, with students actively pursuing credit and not-for-credit programs.
7. Degrees
Eighty-nine percent of all programs and educational offerings lead to associate degrees, certificates of achievement, or prepare students for transfer to a baccalaureate university or college.

8. Educational Programs
The College catalog contains a comprehensive statement of educational purpose and objectives for each of the academic programs offered. Degree programs are in line with the College’s mission, based on recognized fields of study, are of sufficient content and length, and are conducted at appropriate levels of quality and rigor. Every course outline contains course objectives that are achieved through class content, assignments, and activities.

9. Academic Credit
The semester unit is based on 18 hours of student contact for lecture and 54 hours of student contact in laboratory. The College awards academic credit based on this standard of instructional activity. The award of academic credit for each course is clearly delineated in the College catalog.

10. Student Learning Achievement
The College catalog contains a comprehensive statement of educational purpose and objectives for each of the academic programs offered. Additionally, course and program level student learning outcomes are being developed, implemented, and assessed. Every course outline currently includes Student Learning Outcomes that have been achieved and are assessed by a variety of methods. Coordinated by department faculty and administrators, every course, regardless of its location or delivery system, must follow the course outline.

11. General Education
All associate degree programs require a minimum of 18 to 24 units of general education to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. Mathematics and writing requirements are also stipulated in the above requirements. The College’s general education program is scrutinized for rigor and quality by the Curriculum Committee.

12. Academic Freedom
The College’s faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as ensured by the Board Policy 4030 on academic freedom.

13. Faculty
The College employs 113 full-time and 321 adjunct faculty members who are qualified under state mandated minimum qualifications to conduct the College’s programs. Faculty duties and responsibilities are clearly outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the United Faculty of Ohlone.

14. Student Development
Student Development services are comprehensive, accessible to all students, and support student learning. The array of services is provided based on the College mission and on the assessment of student needs.

15. Admissions
The College maintains an open door admissions policy. This policy is consistent with the College Mission Statement, the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, and the statewide mission for California Community Colleges.
16. Information and Learning Resources
The College houses a variety of media collections and is staffed to assist students in their use. Internet access and online computer search capabilities are available without charge to students in the library, in computer labs, and in open media centers. The College is committed to enhancing its learning resources, regardless of location or delivery method.

17. Financial Resources
The College maintains and documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

18. Financial Accountability
Annual financial audits are conducted by externally contracted certified public accountants. The Board reviews these audit reports on an annual basis. The financial audit and management responses to any exceptions are reviewed and discussed in public sessions.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation
The College has continued to foster a culture of evidence that serves as the foundation for the continuous cycle of assessing and improving College programs, services, and policies. Institutional planning and program evaluation are systematic for all departments and divisions of the College, including instruction, student services, and administrative services. The focus in all three areas is to enhance student learning and success.

20. Public Information
The College publishes in its catalog and class schedule and posts on its website precise and up-to-date information on the following: general information (including educational mission; course, program, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; and names of Board of Trustees members); requirements (including admissions; student fees and other financial obligations; and degree, certificate, graduation, and transfer requirements); major policies affecting students.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission
The College and the Board of Trustees hereby affirm by signatures of the official representatives below, that Ohlone College has consistently adhered to the Eligibility Requirements, Standards, and policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The College describes itself in identical terms to all of its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the commission to carry out accrediting responsibilities. All disclosures by the College are complete, accurate, and honest.
Certification of Continued Compliance with Commission Policies
The Self-Evaluation Report contains analysis and evidentiary documentation that substantiate the College’s continued compliance with Commission Policies, particularly those specified in Appendix A of the ACCJC Manual for Institutional Self-Evaluation (September 2012). The following is a summary of conclusions regarding compliance with each of these specific policies and citations of key parts of the Self-Evaluation Report containing analysis and evidence of that compliance.

**Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education**
The analyses and evidence in the Self-Evaluation Report presented under Standards II.A and II.B demonstrate compliance with this policy. All courses, including those offered through Distance Education delivery, are approved through the College’s faculty-driven Curriculum Committee, and must follow the Official Course Outline of Record (CORs) as approved by the College. All CORs establish stated Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), which must be followed regardless of location or delivery method, and faculty are involved in ongoing assessment of SLOs. In March 2011 the ACCJC approved the College’s Substantive Change Proposal for the offering of 12 programs in which 50 percent or more of the courses could be completed via Distance Education. The College has a process to establish that the student who registers in a distance education course is the same student who participates in and completes the course and receives the academic credit. Specifically, the College meets this requirement through a process of secure log-in and passcode.

**Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV**
The analyses and evidence in the Self-Evaluation Report presented under Standard II.B demonstrate the College’s Financial Aid Office operates in compliance with Title IV and is diligent in keeping loan default rates at an acceptably low level. The narrative in Standard II.B also details efforts by the Financial Aid Office to identify and report attempted fraud, including a proactive process with the United States Department of Education and several other colleges that led to the arrest and successful prosecution and imprisonment of a ring of persons engaging in criminal financial aid fraud.

**Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status**
The analyses and evidence in the Self-Evaluation Report presented under Standard II.B demonstrate compliance with each of the policy elements. The College catalog and other official publications and promotional literature are readily available and are clear, factually accurate, and current, and accurately depict all of the information detailed in the policy. Student recruitment for admissions activities is in full compliance with the policy. The ACCJC accredited status is accurately represented in the College catalog and College website.
Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits
The analyses and evidence in the Self-Evaluation Report presented under Standard II.A demonstrate the College engages in accepted practices when awarding credit, including academic study of sufficient content, breadth, and length; levels of rigor appropriate to the degrees or certificates offered; statements of SLOs to the disciplines; and assessment results which provide sufficient evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes.

Standard II.A of the Self-Evaluation Report also demonstrates the College conforms to the commonly accepted minimum program length of 60 credit hours for the associate degree; and has in place written policies and procedures for determining a credit hour. The College does not convert clock hours to credit hours in any of its courses or programs. Also, the College does not offer Direct Assessment Programs.

Policy on Institutional Integrity and Ethics
The College has a solid history of compliance with Policy Element 2 and 7 by providing the Commission information that is readily available, current, complete, and accurate, including reports to other accrediting and auditing agencies; and cooperating with external evaluation processes, including site visits. The College catalog provides the information in Policy Elements 3 and 5. Standard III.A of the Self-Evaluation Report demonstrates the College complies with Policy Element 4. Standard IV of the Report demonstrates the College complies with Policy Elements 1 and 7.

Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations
Not applicable.
Certification of Continued Compliance with Selected United States Department of Education (USDE) Regulations
Effective fall 2012 the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) issued specific procedures for External Evaluation Teams to demonstrate compliance with United States Department of Education (USDE) regulations, particularly several new regulations that became effective July 1, 2010, 2011, and 2012 (Higher Education Opportunity Act 2008 including 2010 and 2011 regulations interpreted through August 2012; USDE Regulations and USDE Guidelines for Paragraph 34 C.F.R Sub-Section 602, January 2012).

The Self-Evaluation Report contains analysis and evidentiary documentation that substantiate the College's continued compliance with USDE regulations, in particular these new regulations. The following is a summary of conclusions regarding compliance with each of these specific regulations and citations of key parts of the Self-Evaluation Report containing analysis and evidence of that compliance.

**Institution-Set Student Achievement Measures**
(Sub-Sections 602.16(a)(1)(i))

The analyses and evidence in the Self-Evaluation Report, particularly as presented in the Introduction and in Standards I.A, I.B, II.A, and II.B, demonstrate the College sets a broad array of institutional student achievement benchmarks in alignment with the mission. These benchmarks were collaboratively established using per comparisons and incorporating the college vision to be known for “…superior rates of student success.” The College regularly assesses performance on these metrics including, but not limited to, course completions, state licensing examinations, program/certificate completion data, graduation data, course retention and success, transfer rates, and, where available, job placement rates. Dialogue takes place on the results of the assessments to guide improvement planning.

**Proper Credit Hour Standards** (Sub-Sections 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e); 602.24(f); *As pertains to:* 600.2 (Credit Hour); 668.8(k), (l))

Analyses and evidence presented in the Self-Evaluation Report under Standard II.A demonstrates that the College ensures that any awarded academic credits and degrees conform to commonly accepted practice including time invested and content mastered. Course Outlines of Record and corresponding syllabi, along with the class schedule, demonstrate that the appropriate amount of work is assigned to conform to the Carnegie Unit. This is true of traditional lecture-based classes, as well as distance education courses, classroom-based courses with a laboratory, and courses that provide for clinical practice. The College’s transfer of credit policies are publicly disclosed and include a statement of the criteria regarding the transfer of credit earned to another institution of higher education. The College does not convert clock hours to credit hours for purposes of federal financial aid, thus compliance with the USDE 2011 conversion formula is not applicable.
Student Complaints
(Sub-Sections 602.16(a)(l)(ix); and Related 668.43)

The analyses and evidence presented in the Self-Evaluation Report under Standard II.B demonstrate the College has procedures which define student grievances and complaints and the manner in which they are received. An examination of the College’s files containing student complaints and grievances for the five years did not reveal any patterns constituting evidence of failure to comply with Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, or policies.

The College catalog provides information about the College’s accrediting body, copies of documents describing an institution’s accreditation or governmental approval, as well as contact information for filing complaints with such bodies.

Performance on Student Achievement
(Sub-Section 602.17(f))

The analyses and evidence in the Self-Evaluation Report, particularly as presented in the Introduction and in Standards I.A, I.B, II.A, and II.B, demonstrate the College sets a broad array of institutional student achievement benchmarks in alignment with the mission. In addition, analyses and evidence presented in Standard II.A demonstrate that Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are set and assessed at the programmatic levels with the intent of continuous improvement. The evidence presented in the Self-Evaluation Report shows the effective achievement by students on institution-level and programmatic-level measures.

Distance Education – Security of Student Identity and Effective Student Contact
(Sub-Section 602.17(g))

The analyses and evidence in the Self-Evaluation Report presented under Standard II.A demonstrate that the College has a process to establish that the student who registers in a distance education course is the same student who participates in and completes the course and receives the academic credit. Specifically, the College meets this requirement through a process of secure log-in and passcode.

The College’s distance education courses involve regular and substantive interaction between students and the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and distance education activities are included as part of a student’s grade. The Distance Education Committee and the Faculty Senate approved an “Effective Contact Requirement” statement. The statement defines regular and substantive interaction initiated by the instructor and describes strategies to be used. The strategies include not only the extensive use of the Blackboard Course Management System and integrated distance education course content tools such as NETLAB, but also course syllabi and grading policy directions. The “Effective Contact Requirement” statement is provided to all full-time and adjunct faculty members in the Faculty Handbook.

The effectiveness of distance education instructional delivery is monitored by the academic deans and included in the faculty evaluation process. The Deans’ Handbook provides specific guidance and direction regarding the dean’s role in ensuring quality distance education offerings that involve effective student contact.
Collection and Analysis of Key Data and Indicators, Including Fiscal Information and Measures of Student Achievement (Sub-Sections 602.19(a-e))

Under Standard III.D, the Self-Evaluation Report presents longitudinal data on the College’s fiscal condition, including increases or decreases in revenues and enrollments, and demonstrates current and past fiscal stability, despite significant decreases and uncertainties in state funding.

As stated several times above, the Self-Evaluation Report shows that the College’s student achievement data demonstrates stability and achievement of mission.
Organization of the Self-Evaluation Process

Introduction

Structure of the Self-Evaluation Process

Major Milestones of the Self-Evaluation Process

Special notes and principles for distance education
When the current accreditation standards were being planned by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) from 1999 to 2001 and implemented in 2002, distance education (DE) at community colleges was in a very formative stage. Therefore, the Standards themselves do not have a specific focus on DE. As DE at the community colleges began to grow, ACCJC developed its first Guide to Evaluating Distance Education, which the College used as the basis for a Focused Assessment of Distance Education in the 2008 Self-Study.

Since then, DE has continued to grow at all colleges, statewide and nationally. More specific United States Department of Education (USDE) Regulations for DE have been promulgated (spurred by concerns about the use of federal financial aid funds), and in pressure from the USDE on accrediting commissions to pay more attention to DE. ACCJC has also developed a more specific policy statement on DE. The August 2012 ACCJC Guide to Evaluating DE includes all the standards and resembles a full Self-Evaluation Report. Thus, the College decided to forgo a separate focused assessment of DE and integrate attention to DE throughout the Self-Evaluation Report. Further, in the spring 2011 the College proposed and ACCJC approved a Substantive Change Proposal for offering specified degree and certificate programs in a DE format. This proposal included justifications covering all of the Accreditation Standards.

The College maintains an overall matter of principle that all DE offerings, both fully distance education and hybrid formats, are integrated into the general standards for the quality control for curriculum development and review, and instructional delivery and assessment. Thus, all College efforts to meet all of the Accreditation Standards assume that DE is woven into the regular work of the College. Academic deans and the Faculty Senate (including Curriculum Committee; General Education Committee; Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee; Equivalency Committee; and Distance Education Committee) are as responsible for the DE offerings as they are for any other academic courses and programs. In fact, the College often makes note of having three integrated locations: Fremont campus, Newark campus, and eCampus. This integration is especially evident in the Educational Master Plan, District Facilities Master Plan, and the Technology Master Plan.

Previous sections of this report entitled Continued Compliance Certification of Continued Compliance with Commission Policies and Continued Compliance with Selected USDE Regulations indicate specific areas in the remainder of the report that respond to compliance requirements relative to DE. To further demonstrate the College’s integrated view on DE the following additional general principles are stated for each major Accreditation Standard area:

### I.A. MISSION

The College considers the Mission Statement to cover DE courses and programs as it does all other
courses and programs. The Mission Statement of the College identifies the purposes of the College's courses and programs as focused on basic skills, transfer, and career preparation. DE, including fully distance education and hybrid formats, are part of each of these three components of the College mission. DE courses extend access to students who may not be able to take classes on campus.

I.B. IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
The College views DE courses and programs as integrated into all Planning and Program and Services Review processes.

II.A. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS
DE courses and programs are subject to the same curriculum development and review and student learning outcomes and assessment as all other courses and programs. Academic deans, the Faculty Senate, and its committees are as responsible for the DE offerings as they are for any other academic courses and programs. The College often makes note of having three integrated locations: Fremont campus, Newark campus, and the eCampus.

II.B. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES
Through the use of online resources, DE students have access to the College's student support services. It should also be noted here that many students take both regular and DE courses and thus have access to both in-person and online student support services resources.

II.C. LIBRARY/LEARNING SUPPORT SERVICES
Library and learning support services are available to DE students using online resources. As noted above, many students take both regular and DE courses and thus have access to both in-person and online student support services resources.

III.A. HUMAN RESOURCES
Faculty who teach DE courses are subject to the same minimum qualifications as all other faculty. Recruitment, hiring, and evaluation processes for faculty teaching DE courses are the same as for all other faculty.

III.B. PHYSICAL RESOURCES
Although DE courses are not dependent on physical resources in the conventional sense, there are definite connections between physical resources and technology planning. These connections are addressed in both the District Facilities Master Plan and the Technology Master Plan.

III.C. TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES
The Technology Master Plan includes special considerations for ensuring infrastructure support for the operations of DE. The Technology Master Plan also emphasizes the need for all students, including those taking DE courses, to be able to access technology resources both at on and off campus locations.

III.D. FINANCIAL RESOURCES
Faculty costs for teaching DE courses and programs; administrative costs for oversight of DE; and the associated technology resource needs; are all fully integrated into the College budget.

IV.A. DECISION-MAKING ROLES/PROCESSES
The governance processes of the College assume DE courses and programs to be an integral part the overall College offerings.

IV.B. BOARD/ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION
The Board of Trustees and the president/superintendent view DE course and offerings as part of the fabric of the institution.
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Responses to Recommendations from the Most Recent Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Review
Planning and Program Review

RECOMMENDATION 1: The team recommends that the college establish a regular assessment and review process for the Mission and Vision statement to meet Standard I.A.3 and do likewise for its planning processes (including program review) to meet Standard I.B.6.

This recommendation resulted from versions of the College Mission Statement being slightly different from the Board of Trustees (Board) approved version appearing in the College catalog, on the website, and in the self-study, leading the team to conclude that there was not a clear and systematic cycle for reviewing the Mission Statement. The team did find that the College had updated its Mission Statement and Goals, that the College Strategic Plan and organizational structure were clearly linked to the Mission Statement, and that the College has structured its committees to accomplish the Goals and Mission Statement. The team also found that the Mission Statement was closely linked to the College goals, curriculum and program review processes, and other initiatives.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS TAKEN
The College regularly reviews its Mission Statement as part of its five-year strategic planning cycle. In spring 2009, during the comprehensive assessment phase of the cycle, the Mission Statement underwent significant discussion and review by the College community. As a first step in this review process, a task force was created by the College Council to evaluate the language in the Mission Statement. This task force, composed of two faculty members and an administrator, reported regularly to College Council during the spring of 2009. Moreover, the Mission Statement was reviewed by the entire College community during the March 12, 2009 Planning Summit held in the College gymnasium. Finally, to ensure a comprehensive review, the College community was surveyed in April 2009. The results of that survey showed that 80.1 percent of respondents felt the Mission Statement did not need to be changed (see College Council Minutes May 4, 2009).

The College Council also established an annual review of the Mission Statement to occur during each College Council fall retreat. In this way, the Mission Statement is revisited through a governance process every year. During the fall 2012 retreat the College Council discussed the Mission Statement and whether or not the College can maintain its commitment to offering instruction in personal enrichment in light of revisions to regulations that limit course repeatability. The College believes in lifelong learning and personal enrichment, but the new regulations prevent the College from offering some courses that students have previously been able to repeat for credit. Given that lifelong learning is a value held by faculty and staff, the College has chosen to offer these courses on a not-for-credit basis through Community Education. In short, the College will maintain in its Mission Statement, “The Mission of
Ohlone College is to serve the community by offering instruction for personal enrichment” (College Council Retreat Agenda, August 22, 2012). Besides supporting transfer, vocational, and basic skills courses, the College maintains a commitment to personal enrichment and lifelong learning.

For the 2013 review of the Mission Statement the College Council appointed a task force who reviewed the Mission Statements from several other colleges. An open discussion of the group’s recommendations took place during a College Council meeting, and a revised Mission Statement was proposed.

The College reviews the Mission Statement as part of other assessment processes in addition to strategic and annual planning. The College has extensively reviewed, evaluated, and assessed the planning cycles, including the College Strategic Plan, the Education Master Plan (EMP), the District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP), the Technology Master Plan, and Program and Services Review. The College’s mission continues to be central to institutional planning and decision making as evidenced by the importance of the Mission Statement in strategic planning and Program and Services Review.

After each of the aforementioned planning processes was completed, the Process Assessment Committee (PAC) conducted an assessment of the planning process. Each process was evaluated for effectiveness in several areas: description of the process; involvement and roles; research and data; opportunities for input and vetting; integration with other plans; planning for sustainability; and product of the planning process. A written assessment of each planning process was presented and discussed by the PAC with a particular eye to improving the process and ensuring sustainability. The College consistently invokes the “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness” to provide that all planning meets the proficiency and sustainable levels of institutional effectiveness. The findings of each planning process assessment are then reviewed by the College Council at its annual planning retreat.

During the spring and summer of 2011, PAC assessed the planning processes for each of the College’s major plans: College Strategic Plan, EMP, DFMP, Technology Master Plan, Program and Services Review, and the budget planning process. One of the College’s managers conducted a comprehensive assessment of the Program and Services Review process as a part of her doctoral dissertation that year, as well, and this analysis was included in the PAC’s assessment of the Program and Services Review. Again in the spring of 2012 the PAC reviewed additional planning processes, this time with particular focus on the Program and Services Review process and especially on the Program Improvement Objective (PIO) prioritization process within the Program and Services Review.

To ensure consistent assessment, goal setting, and implementation within an ongoing cycle, two important documents were created. First is Administrative Procedure 3250, which outlines all the necessary components of the planning and Program and Services Review cycles. The second document—a comprehensive compilation of planning policies, procedures, and resources, including a glossary—is the Planning and Decision-Making Handbook. Both of these documents were approved during 2013-2014 in response to College wide dialogue among governance groups.

Finally, the College has endeavored to review for consistency the content on its web pages, printed documents, administrative procedures, and Board actions.

**Analysis of Results**

Given wide input and discussion, the Mission Statement, as part of the College Strategic Plan, was endorsed by
the College Council on May 18, 2009, and subsequently reviewed and approved by the Board on June 10, 2009. This process is scheduled to be repeated as part of the next strategic plan development. The assessment phase is slated for fall 2014.

As a result of each planning process assessment, improvements to the processes are implemented, but none have been quite as dramatic as the improvements to the Program and Services Review process. Resulting revisions improved timelines, the PIO prioritization and funding process, and the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module. College Council approved the revisions to the PIO prioritization and funding process in September 2012. During the spring of 2013, further improvements to the Program and Services Review process were approved by College Council with implementation starting in the fall 2013. Now in its third annual cycle, process assessment has become a regular part of the College’s assessment culture.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** The team recommends that the college improve its program review process by enhancing the nature and use of data to meet Standard I.B.5 and by codifying the links between program review, budget decision making, facilities planning, and information technology decisions that support student learning outcomes.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** The team recommends that the college improve its program review process by enhancing the nature and use of data to meet Standard III.D.1.d and by codifying the links between program review, budget decision making, facilities planning and information technology decisions that support student learning outcomes.

**NOTE:** The response to Recommendations 2 and 4 combines the two recommendations, as the language was the same for each with Recommendation 2 referring to Standard I.B.5 and Recommendation 4 referring to Standard III.D.1.d. Thus, the common theme is that program review be improved to codify links between program review, budget decision-making, facilities planning, and information technology decisions that support student learning outcomes.

This recommendation resulted from the College needing to make disaggregated program and College wide data available; increasing research capacity; more broadly disseminating and dialoguing about data on achieving goals; making the use of data in program review a more central part of the process, especially for Student Services and Administrative Services; applying the results of program review to ongoing College budget decisions in a formalized fashion; and adding data to all reports of progress, including the president’s state of the college speech. The College also needed to codify the link between planning and budget allocation and other decision-making processes and create a systematic evaluation of its planning and budget processes and Program and Services Review.

**DESCRIPTION OF ACTION TAKEN**

In the follow-up report of March 15, 2009 the College reported that a more integrated, data-driven, cyclical planning process to improve the strategic planning cycle had been successfully implemented. The process includes regular assessment and review of the Mission and Vision Statements; regular assessment and review of College planning processes (including Program and Services Review); strengthening the link among program and services review, planning, and budget decisions; and an improved Program and Services Review using enhanced data, including the Environmental Scan. Additionally the “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness” served as the framework for assessing the implementation of Program and Services Review, planning, and student learning outcomes, a self-identified planning agenda within the initial Self-Study document. On June 29, 2009, ACCJC confirmed that the College had met these two
recommendations. In addition, the report acknowledged the development of an evaluation and planning oversight team and the establishment of a process for on-going assessment and review of the College’s planning processes.

In accord with a suggestion in the 2009 Follow-Up Report, data has become even more integrated into the Program and Services Review process, especially in evaluating PIOs. The Program and Services Review process has been upgraded to include links from the program achievement page to the Program and Services Review data on the Institutional Research and Planning Office website, so reviewers have immediate access to the data while they are working in the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module. On the Institutional Research and Planning Office website, data for Program and Services Review has become more robust as data has been more disaggregated and become more course—rather than department—specific. Data is also incorporated in the evaluation of PIO outcomes and the alignment of the PIO with budget priorities. Reviewers also analyze not only data as it relates to the PIO, but also analyze budget impacts of the PIO, including the effects of reallocation and/or allocation of additional resources.

Since the mid-term report, the College has maintained its fervor for integrated, data-driven planning. Consistent with the College’s comprehensive plan of plans, each major plan has been updated and aligned with the Strategic Plan 2010-2015, including the EMP, the DFMP, the Technology Master Plan, Program and Services Review, and the budget planning process. Each of these planning processes is born of the mission and vision statements and hearkens to the goals and objectives set forth in the College Strategic Plan 2010-2015. Each planning process also looks to the findings of the Environmental Scan and to other relevant data sources, as well as to the Program and Services Reviews. All are integrated into budget planning.

The College Council appropriated funding in 2008-2009 for acquisition, customization, and implementation of the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module. The relational nature of the CurricUNET® database helps facilitate the generation of useable data and provides the linkages between Program and Services Review, facilities and information technology planning, and budget decision making. The CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module facilitates the tracking of activities and outcomes tied to departmental budget requests, provides historical tracking that allows for Program and Services Review feedback loops, and tracks recommendations and results from one review to another.

Subsequent to the accreditation mid-term report, all departments, including instructional disciplines, student services, instructional services, administrative services, and the departments reporting to the president, completed at least one comprehensive Program and Services Review within the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module. Many departments also completed annual updates, including responding to recent data and reviewing, revising, or creating new PIOs in response to the data. At the time of the mid-term report there had been two PIO funding cycles whereby PIOs were evaluated on several criteria, most notably their alignment with College goals and objectives, and several PIOs had resources allocated as a part of the budget planning process. The PIO process became a bridge between the grassroots planning of Program and Services Review and the budget development. Requests for new or additional resources originate as a result of the Program and Services Review process, identification of the improvement needed, and action plans for implementation. The action plans spell out needed resources, be they for new computers, additional staff, the creation of a new learning laboratory, or new faculty members. Whether it is a departmental PIO or a more broadly-based Institutional Improvement Objective (IIO) conceived at the division or
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At the core of the accreditation recommendations on planning and Program and Services Review is the notion of linkages among program planning and review (programs, disciplines, departments) and resource allocation and decision making. When looking at the budget and how it is allocated between resources, it is common to sort the data by major object codes. This yields an analysis that is based on major resources such as instructional salaries, non-instructional salaries, benefits, supplies, materials, etc. This is a helpful perspective of the budget when the concern is on a macro level. However, the Accrediting Commission’s recommendation is that linkages to budget allocation should be made at the program level and that the program and services review process should be a primary driver of those linkages. The elements of the College’s accounting structure also include an element called activity center codes. Sorting the budget by these codes yields data that is program specific, with all costs for a program included in one data set. This data is made available electronically to all program managers in a close to real-time format and facilitates the analysis of programmatic expenditures to provide a solid foundation for the establishment of PIOs for the next Program and Services Review cycle.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

As reported in the response to Recommendation 1 above, the College has improved its Program and Services Review process in a variety of ways. In addition to the recent improvements to the review cycle timelines, the PIO prioritization process, and the revisions to the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module, earlier improvements include the use of enhanced data sources, as well as a comprehensive Environmental Scan; the provision of links to statistical data to inform and bring credibility to the various PIOs proposed by program managers; and by providing budget information to managers that is sorted by program code to target its usefulness as a programmatic analytical tool. As part of the Program and Services Review process, managers are asked to define PIOs by their impacts to the College’s human, technological, physical plant, and financial resources. This impact analysis creates strong linkages between the program’s PIOs and the College’s planning efforts to allocate resources in critical areas that support student learning outcomes.

This process ensures a more sustainable Program and Services Review process to inform the budget process, as well as other College planning processes, on a regular basis. This process also provides a viable “bottom-up” input to all planning processes that occasionally become too “top-down” and then lack buy-in from all constituent groups. With every Program and Services Review subject to regular review and updates, immediate needs or changing circumstances can be addressed, and planning is more timely, relevant, and responsive.

During the spring of 2012 PAC conducted a comprehensive assessment of the entire planning and Program and Services Review processes. The assessment found the processes to be working well but there were concerns raised about the cumbersome nature of the PIO prioritization process. PAC developed a series of recommendations to the College Council to improve the process. In September 2012 College Council endorsed the improvements to the PIO prioritization process.

During 2012-2013 all Program and Services Reviews completed the full approval cycle within the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module and the new approach to handling PIOs was implemented. Concerns
were raised about difficulties using the Program and Services Review module and workload associated with it, particularly for smaller departments. To address these concerns PAC conducted a focused assessment of the Program and Services Review process during spring 2013, with specific focus on the efficacy of the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module.

The result of that assessment has been to streamline the module, which, because of its complicated nature, had generated some frustration with the Program and Services Review process. Improvements to the module are designed to make the module more intuitive and user-friendly; to eliminate redundancy; and to simplify questions in order to target answers essential to—the intent of Program and Services Review. Further, the timeline for comprehensive Program and Services Reviews was changed from annual to every third year on a rotating cycle. However, departments and programs annually respond to recent data and update PIOs for funding.

In addition to reviewers’ access to budget detail on the Institutional Research and Planning Office website, the College is continuing to move ahead with another budget planning tool. The enrollment management tool that enables projections of what-if enrollment scenarios is being upgraded to show the budget impacts of the changing faculty needs that accompany the schedule planning and course offering scenarios. Reviewers can then more accurately assess the budget implications of course or program revisions that arise through the PIO process.

**Human Resources**

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** The team recommends that the college continue its planning agenda to put in place appropriate and systematic employee performance evaluation procedures. (III.A.1 .b)

This recommendation resulted from the College using a process for evaluating classified employees based on their date of hire, meaning evaluations were expected to occur throughout the year. Consequently, a large number of staff were not regularly evaluated, especially in the Information Technology Department.

**DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS TAKEN**

As the College reported in its March 2011 Mid-Term Report to Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), a tracking system is now in place for performance evaluations. A Senior Human Resources Specialist is assigned to this process and has developed a simple way of administering the new annual evaluation period.

The College has shifted from performance evaluations being completed on an employee’s anniversary hire date to an annual period where all employees are evaluated. 2013 is the third year since implementation and the performance evaluation period has been institutionalized. Managers and employees now refer to April 1-June 30 each year as the focused performance evaluation period.

**ANALYSIS OF RESULTS**

The Human Resources Department is committed to assisting managers in completing performance evaluations. Managers are taught and know the importance of regular and meaningful feedback to their employees. The initial launch of the annual evaluation period, where all classified employee evaluations are completed by June 30 each year, was difficult for managers with several employees since they could no longer spread out completion based on the employee’s date of hire. During the second year of implementation it appeared that managers had embraced the change of annual evaluations due by June 30. 2013 has been the most successful evaluation period in that managers did not wait until the due date to turn in their completed
evaluations. More than 98 percent of evaluations have been completed for the year.

One major challenge still remains. The College has experienced some turnover in management. It is not uncommon for hiring of managers to occur in the spring each year. New managers often do not have enough time to observe and experience the work of their employees. This conundrum is especially challenging for new managers with large departments. To allow for an accurate and fair employee assessment, new managers are either assisted by the overseeing vice president or associate vice president to complete the annual evaluation, or they are asked to complete baseline evaluations for their classified staff members that would establish their expectations for the next evaluation period. The associate vice president, human resources and training works closely with new managers to ensure that they have the tools necessary to accomplish this task.

The College is in 100 percent compliance with this recommendation. The implementation process has not only brought the College into full compliance; it has done more. Managers are more engaged with their employees as is evident with the level of feedback being recorded on the evaluations. Managers are thoughtful in providing and accessing goals and engaging their employees in performance improvement. Of those responding to the question in the Spring 2013 Faculty Survey and the Spring 2013 Staff Survey, 61.0 percent of faculty and 66.0 percent of staff agreed “Evaluation processes help improve the quality of employees’ job performance.”

**Board of Trustees**

**NOTE:** Because of the intertwined nature of the recommendations regarding the Board of Trustees, the actions taken in response are multiple and overlapping. The responses reflect the interrelatedness of the recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION 5:** The Board of Trustees cease involvement in college and district operations and delegate all non-policy issues and policy implementation at the district level to the President. (Standards IV.B1.e, j)

This recommendation resulted from the actions of a few trustees who engaged in behavior that was not in compliance with accreditation standards between 2004 and 2008. Specifically trustees came on campus unannounced, one to solicit complaints from students about faculty and administration. There was also a significant amount of communication directly between trustees and College faculty and staff. For example, individual trustees contacted faculty asking to attend Faculty Senate meetings.

**DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS TAKEN**

In response to the recommendation, the Board immediately conducted a workshop on Board roles and behavior. Upon her arrival in July 2008, the new College president conducted an assessment to determine causes of the problem and what information, structures, and practices could be employed to remedy the situation. There were several College structures and practices identified that seemed to invite the Board to discuss and question College operations.

In the workshop, the Board developed protocols for coming on campus and for communication between trustees and the College community, the president’s staff, the press, and the president. The protocols established included trustees notifying the president in advance of coming on campus and made it clear that communication with College employees was to be directed through the president. On the College side, the president informed and regularly reminds the College staff to communicate to the Board through her, especially when requesting trustee involvement in College functions.

At the time of the accreditation visit, the College had in...
place an “extended board,” which included representatives from two unions, the Faculty Senate president, the College Council co-chair, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents seated at the table with the elected trustees. The original concept behind this arrangement was to enhance trustee understanding of, and participation in, governance. However, the scope of such a body was not clear. The Board’s domain is policy, the unions’ domain is work conditions, the Faculty Senate’s is academic issues as spelled out in the collegial consultation model, and the College Council’s is as the governance body advising the president. In other words, all of these groups have necessary, but separate and distinct functions. As such, putting them in a single group meant they would be discussing each other’s areas. Exchanges turned naturally to the operations of the College, thus bypassing the role of the president and undermining the governance structure as a whole. Having members of the “extended board” sitting at the Board table also invited the Board chair to ask each individual what he/she thought about issues. In August 2008, the “extended board” was eliminated leaving just the elected trustees, the student trustee, the College president, and the president’s assistant seated at the Board table.

The structure of Board agendas seemed to contribute to micromanagement, as well. Agendas did not contain specific items for the Faculty Senate or the Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC) to make reports to the Board. Instead, reports were solicited from all members of the extended board under “Reports and Announcements.” This issue was resolved by meeting structure changes. The presidents of the Faculty Senate and ASOC make standing reports to the Board and have designated items on the agenda to do so, and questions and comments are solicited solely from the trustees.

**ANALYSIS OF RESULTS**

On occasion since the last accreditation visit, trustees have made overtures to insert themselves into College operations. For instance, trustees have directed College staff to prepare presentation materials for them for non-college use, repair facilities, or make specific changes to College reports or practices. In each case, the president has been able to address the trustee’s request by altering the structure of a report to the Board, by explaining the reason for the College process, or by reminding the trustee that he/she is encroaching on College operations.

The president has made efforts to inform the College employees to communicate to the Board through her, especially when requesting trustee involvement in College functions. Individuals have responded well, but effort is ongoing due to the large number of College employees. Trustees have supported the protocol in this area very well, redirecting requests or at least informing the president when such a request is received. Some employees, however, continue to advocate for their specific causes through individual trustees, thus bypassing collegial decision-making processes that are in place for the rest of the College and respected by other groups.

Trustees communicating directly to College staff have become the exception rather than the rule. However, on those rare instances when such communication has occurred it has created confusion for the employee. The president has reminded the Board and employees about the protocol whenever this issue has arisen. During Board evaluation retreats, trustees, specifically the Board chair, have been asked to monitor the actions of their fellow trustees rather than expecting the president to direct trustee behavior. The Board has given permission to the president to remind them when a request crosses the line into College operations, and the president has exercised this option a few times, occasionally drawing a negative response from individual trustees. On other occasions, when trustees make overtures to insert themselves into College operations,
the other trustees have responded well. As a result of trustees directing communication through the president, the authority of the administrators and the president to manage the College has been reinforced. Executive and other administrators report feeling less susceptible to Board requests and directions. The Commission confirmed that the College had satisfied this recommendation in its letter dated June 2009.

The Board has successfully ceased its previous involvement in the operations of the College and District. Their response to the Commission’s recommendation was swift and decisive and they have demonstrated their strong desire to support the president and commitment to setting policies rather than concerning themselves with operational decisions.

RECOMMENDATION 6: The Board of Trustees, District leadership, and College leadership define, publish, adhere to, regularly evaluate, and continuously improve the respective leadership roles and scopes of authority of college and district constituent groups and governance committees in meaningful, collegial decision-making processes. (Standard IV.A.1, 2, 3, 5)

It was evident from a comprehensive assessment of the situation that this recommendation resulted from trustees’ engagement in issues that were outside of their role as a policy making body. Beginning in 2008, the new College president reviewed policies relating to the Board; viewed videos of Board meetings; read news articles and other documents; and interviewed a number of staff and trustees to understand the recommendation. She informally assessed the routine actions and involvement of College Council in College governance, the history of the Classified Senate, and the role and participation of the Faculty Senate in College governance. She also reviewed the written descriptions of the roles of the College Council and the Faculty Senate and the College Council by-laws and examined the history of the “extended board.”

Prior to the accreditation visit, trustees engaged in issues that were outside of their role as a policy making body. Specific behaviors included trustees talking repeatedly in meetings about pet projects they would like to see the College undertake or solutions to what they perceived as College problems. These discourses were labeled “soap boxes.” During the standing item titled “Reports and Announcements,” trustees would return to agenda items already discussed or voted upon to continue presenting their point of view. Trustees would question presenters, often dipping into operational matters, and engage in dialogues with the speakers. On at least one instance a trustee spoke to the press about a personnel item that had been discussed in closed session. Additionally, trustees would bring their personal experience to bear on agenda items dealing with real estate or engineering projects, and at one meeting a trustee offered his personal business card to outside visitors.

The structure of Board agendas seemed to draw the Board into operational discussions, as well. In addition, there were no documents to provide concrete examples on the differences between policy and operational decisions. Additionally, College documents did not describe roles of the various constituencies in decision-making processes.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS TAKEN
The workshop following the evaluation visit was designed to inform the Board about the appropriate roles of the president and the Board, improvement planning, and team building. In subsequent workshops they discussed suggestions to improve delineation of their role, including changes to the Board meeting structure, participants, and the agenda. The Board created a plan to shape their future performance including how to practice trusteeship appropriately and
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expectations of trustee behavior in meetings.

These workshops continued regularly throughout 2008 and 2009, totaling nine separate sessions. Thereafter workshops about the role of the Board and its scope of authority occurred each year. In addition, an outside consultant has facilitated discussion about the appropriate roles of the Board and the president during an annual evaluation and goal-setting meeting held each summer. Extensive materials have been distributed and reviewed during the sessions. Over the past six years, ten of these workshops have included outside presenters and facilitators. Progress on meeting recommendations has been reviewed periodically.

In addition to workshops held at the College, nearly every trustee has attended the new/effective trustee workshop held by the California Community College League of California (CCLC). Topics typically covered in this workshop include the roles of the CEO and the Board, effective trusteeship, fiscal management, Robert’s Rules of Order, and the Brown Act.

The president provides a new trustee orientation which includes extensive information on the role of the Board and examples on the difference between policy and operation, plus scenarios that ask the new trustee how he/she would respond to different situations involving College policy versus operation.

One area of needed improvement was written documentation describing the role of the Board and guidelines on effective trusteeship. Plans to articulate appropriate trustee and College behavior in each area were identified. Ideas for improving communication and policing trustee comments during Board meetings were listed and addressed in a Board Member Guide. The Guide was updated in 2012. Additionally, reminders such as “No soap boxes” were placed on the backs of all Board name plates.

To clarify the intent of the agenda item titled, “Reports and Announcements,” the item was expanded to read, “Reports and Announcements: This is an opportunity for the trustees to report on College activities attended or to announce upcoming events.” When trustees have revisited agenda topics already discussed or asked questions of speakers rather than the president, the Board chair has reminded the trustee of the parameters for discussion.

The presidents of the Faculty Senate and the ASOC make standing reports to the Board and have designated items on the agenda to do so. Representatives from the three unions frequently attend Board meetings and the classified union representatives typically address the Board during the opportunity for comments from the public.

To eliminate the extended Board while elevating the College Council to its full function and facilitating the role of the Faculty Senate and ASOC, the president met with leaders of each group represented on the “extended Board” to discuss their appropriate roles and articulate her rationale for the change. The president also discussed her rationale with the College Council as a whole. All groups expressed their comprehension of the concept and support for the proposed changes to the Board meeting and agenda, and changes were implemented at the August 2008 Board meeting.

Before every Board meeting the chair and vice chair of the Board meet with the president and the vice presidents of academic affairs, administrative services, and student services and the associate vice president, human resources and training to review the agenda. During the meeting the trustees ask questions about the agenda and materials that are likely to be topics of concern to the Board and advise on items that should be moved to or removed from the consent agenda.
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Trustees receive supporting documentation for each agenda item in the form of attachments posted with the agenda. The agenda does not contain place holders. Trustees forward questions to the College president prior to the meeting to ensure that needed information is presented at the meeting.

Good practice and the Accreditation Standards require that Board Policies be reviewed on a regular basis. In fall 2008 the Board agreed to review its policies on a four-year cycle, and the first cycle is now complete. As changes to law and statute occur, policies are continually revisited and updated. The comprehensive review of policies provided an opportunity for trustees to engage in detailed discussion about their role in all areas of the College and to see more clearly the distinction between policy and operational practices. To ensure that agenda items are related to policy, the relevant policy numbers are listed next to each agenda item.

The delineation between policy and operation is sometimes difficult to recognize in day-to-day decisions. In order to reinforce that distinction, the president writes regular updates that are separated into three categories: For Action, For Potential Action, and For Information. The first category contains items that are on an upcoming agenda for a Board vote. The second category is for issues that may eventually require Board action. The third category is for interesting background information about the College, but unlikely to require Board action. Contained in this third category, for example, are upcoming events, planned Board presentations, responses to trustee questions, progress on initiatives such as the Student Success Act, personnel items, descriptions of processes, and complaints that may reach the Board.

The College has also taken specific steps to codify, assess, and improve constituent participation in governance. In addition to the Board’s complete review of its policies, the College has spent the last year updating and revising Administrative Procedures. This has been a monumental task involving the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, deans, directors, Faculty Senate, and the College Council. One Administrative Procedure in particular, Administrative Procedure 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making, describes the roles of all constituencies of the College--faculty, staff, students, administration, the president, and the Board--in College decision making.

Another document, the Planning and Decision-Making Handbook, collects, documents, and presents the major College policies, procedures, and arrangements related to planning and decision making. The handbook is intended as a resource for members of the College community and employees newly hired by the College. The handbook also describes the roles of College committees in these processes.

The governance bodies have ensured that they follow their respective roles in College governance by reviewing and updating the documents that describe their roles and purposes, including policies, procedures, bylaws, and committee structure and descriptions.

The College Council, the College’s main governance body, is governed by bylaws which have been updated several times since the last evaluation visit in 2008. For each iteration of the bylaws, the Council has discussed its role, processes, and membership. The Council has revised its membership structure to improve representation; the body now includes a member of the adjunct faculty. The topic of how to improve constituent input is regularly discussed and includes identification of strategies to enhance the communication loop from College Council to constituent group back to College Council.

The president/superintendent and all executive managers
undergo regular evaluation, which includes how well they are adhering to their roles, and apply the results of those evaluations to improvements. The Board annual self-evaluation retreat includes extensive discussion on the appropriate role and scope of authority of the Board.

The College as a whole evaluates itself through the accreditation self-evaluation and through annual assessment of its strategic goals and objectives. The creation of Administrative Procedure 2510 and the Planning and Decision-Making Handbook has been the result of broad-based discussion of constituent roles in College decision making. The Board appointed an ad hoc committee for the express purpose of evaluating its sustained response to the accreditation recommendations related to its performance and its adherence to Standard IV.B.1.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS
All groups have clarified and improved their roles in College governance.

The Board meeting environment has changed very significantly since six years ago. Trustees no longer climb up on their “soap boxes.” They no longer circle back to agenda items once action is taken. Questions to presenters are conveyed through the president unless otherwise designated (usually for informational presentations). Confidential discussions have not been revealed to the press, and trustees have refrained from speaking from their personal expertise on Board matters. The Board chair has been effective in reminding the trustees of appropriate parameters when necessary, but those occasions are quite rare.

The change in Board meeting structure has resulted in much more efficient meetings and, more importantly, a focus on policy issues rather than the daily operation of the College. The Board has rated itself quite high regarding adhering to its role as a policy making body. Board progress has been good, especially considering having assimilated six new trustees and five student trustees since the last visit.

Members of the College community report greater understanding of their role in making decisions. They also have a better understanding of the connection between planning and budgeting and attest that decisions are based on evidence. Representation and communication looping have improved, and the College feels better informed and believes there is better participation in decisions (See IV.A for details and evidence list).

The Board, the president, and the College leadership have clarified and worked within their respective roles and scopes of authority since receiving this recommendation. The College wide perception of the Board is now positive.

RECOMMENDATION 7: The Board of Trustees take measures to bring all constituent groups together to enable the campus toward:

a) Developing a positive and in-depth dialog on decision making roles and responsibilities that will ultimately lead to strengthening student learning and success at the college. (Standards I.A.3, I.B1)

b) Creating an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2, A.2.a, A.2.b, A.3, A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.2, and IV.B.3)

This recommendation resulted from issues with Board structures, Board meetings, and the lack of codification and discussion of roles and processes that caused confusion for College governance and afforded the Board inappropriate influence over College operations occurring between 2004 and 2008. Trustees thought it was important to be able to influence a decision early on before it had been finalized rather than focusing on the Board-identified result or outcome.
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DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS TAKEN
The rationale for eliminating the extended board and initial discussion with unions, the College Council co-chair, the Faculty Senate chair, and the vice presidents regarding this topic are described in the response to Recommendation 6. All groups expressed their comprehension of the concept and support for the proposed changes to the Board meeting and agenda. No negative reactions about the changed role of constituent groups at Board meetings were expressed. The extended board was eliminated as of August 2008.

In order for all governance groups to define, publish, adhere to, regularly evaluate, and continuously improve the respective leadership roles and scopes of authority of College and District constituent groups and governance committees as required in Recommendation 6, all groups engaged in in-depth dialogues about their respective roles in College decision making.

Each of the bodies with roles in College decisions (the vice presidents and associate vice presidents; Faculty Senate; College Council; and ASOC) have engaged in regular dialogue about those roles. As described in the responses to Recommendations 5 and 6, the Board in particular has engaged and continues to participate in positive and in-depth dialogues about its appropriate role.

College Council regularly discusses its role as the collegial governance body for the College. Discussion topics have included the Council’s vital role in strategic planning, budget development, facilities planning, and accreditation; membership; improving the communication loop with constituents; and committee functions as part of decision processes. The Council has also discussed whether the co-chair position needs to be filled by a faculty member; its role in issues that concern the College as a whole; and how its recommendations to the president are treated in the process. The Council has reviewed and revised its bylaws several times since the 2008 visit and has reviewed two documents intended to codify the roles and responsibilities of the various College bodies in governance, Administrative Procedure 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making, and the Planning and Decision-Making Handbook. The Council has also reviewed and endorsed a related procedure, Administrative Procedure 3250: Institutional Planning and Program Review. Faculty Senate has discussed its role in decision making at some length in the context of endorsing Administrative Procedure 2510. Representatives of the ASOC; the two classified bargaining units; and DDAS participated in the College Council discussions, as well.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS
The actions taken by the president, College constituency groups, and the Board to restructure Board meetings required significant, focused, and ongoing dialogue about governance processes and roles. The changes have been sustained since 2008, and the results of the restructuring have been quite positive.

The College continues to enjoy great collegiality and goodwill among its constituent groups.

b) Creating an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2, A.2.a, A.2.b, A.3, A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.2, and IV.B.3)

This recommendation resulted from the pressure felt by College administration as a result of a small number of trustees criticizing and involving themselves in the operational decisions of the College. Interpreting the intent of the phrase “greater administrative stability” was somewhat difficult. It would seem, at first glance, to imply that there have been turnover issues in administrators. However, at the time of the visit there had been little turnover in administrators at the College, and the Team Report did not
suggest this was an issue. The fact that the phrase is linked to concept of “administrative empowerment” indicates the visiting team was concerned about administrative instability that can result from micromanagement at the Board level. Micromanagement can create an atmosphere of role confusion, and thus instability.

**DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS TAKEN**

Responses to Recommendations 5, 6, and 7a describe the many actions taken to improve the College environment. One change that affected the administrative team directly was the redefinition of their presence at Board meetings. Rather than being members of an “extended board” expected to participate in discussion of agenda items and other topics as they arose, the restructuring made it clear that vice presidents and associate vice presidents were attending the meetings as resources. They have since made presentations to the Board on topics and have responded to questions within their areas. This change has reduced administrative contact with the Board and the frequent exchange that occurred outside Board meetings.

In order to allow sufficient time for workshops on trusteeship, Board business meetings were scheduled for once rather than twice per month. This change reduced the amount of time the vice presidents and associate vice presidents were required to spend at Board meetings. Workshop attendance is only expected when the topic is within the administrator’s area of responsibility.

New trustee orientations include sessions with several of the vice presidents. This arrangement increases the trustee’s understanding of the vice president’s area and offers an opportunity to answer general questions about structure. It also affords the president the opportunity to reinforce that communication with these vice presidents is to be directed through the president.

The president has invited trustees to attend speeches and other College events and takes care to encourage and provide opportunities for the Board to display its interest in and recognition of College employees.

**ANALYSIS OF RESULTS**

Senior administrators at the College indicate a lessening of tension and better understanding of the relationship of the administration, the College president, and the Board. They report feeling less pressure from trustees and reduced conflict about Board issues.

Steps to reeducate the College about the appropriate relationship between the Board and the College have improved the Board’s image in the eyes of the College.

**RECOMMENDATION 8: The Board of Trustees develops a process to implement identified improvements derived from regular self-evaluations. (Standard IV.B.1.g)**

This recommendation resulted from a lack of annual Board goals with measurable outcomes and identifiable improvements resulting from achievement of the goals.

At the time of the last accreditation visit, the Board had a regular self-evaluation process that had been in place for the three years prior to the visit. The self-evaluation involved a survey of the trustees and members of the extended board. The process did not include identification of annual Board goals and no measurable outcomes were listed.

Close examination of the trustees’ survey results indicate areas of misunderstanding about the Board’s role on several fronts.
- At least some trustees indicated they should be involved in College committees.
- At least some trustees indicated they should be involved at the early stages of decision making rather than as a monitor of desired outcomes.
RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MOST RECENT EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

- Items not listed on the agenda were discussed at Board meetings.
  There were significantly lower average survey scores from the members of the extended board than from the elected trustees on a number of topics including the following:
  - The Board assesses its own performance using accreditation standards.
  - The Board has an understanding and appreciation for the governance process.
  - The Board makes decisions in a manner that withstands pressures of special and limited interests.
  - Trustees are respectful of fellow colleagues’ opinions.
  - The Board is active in learning about the communities’ educational goals.
  - The Board and the president are in agreement with each other’s roles.

These results should have provided direction for improvement goals; however, no documented means for improvement or assessment of improvement were established.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS TAKEN
Following the accreditation visit, the self-evaluation survey was revised and an external analysis of results was performed. The new version of the survey was developed by ACCT and based on best practices for trusteeship; the process included goal setting. Discussion of the results was led by an expert consultant. Survey items with the lowest and highest scores were identified and discussed in the new process. The new president’s contract required that Board and CEO goals be developed and assessed together, and a mid-year assessment was agreed upon.

Further refinement of the survey instrument occurred in 2011. Survey items expanded to include adherence to Accreditation Standard IV.B and Board goals became more measurable and concrete. In 2013 the Board conducted a mid-year self-assessment and revised its goals to rephrase them in measurable terms. The term “goals” has been replaced by “priorities” for both the Board and the president to distinguish them from College strategic goals. Board priorities are designed to complement the president’s priorities and the College strategic goals.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS
The new self-evaluation process that includes Board priorities is still a work in progress. To date, however, the process has enabled trustees to identify areas where they agree improvement is needed and to discuss actions that have caused problems. The Board has been conscientious in addressing these problems and their causes. For instance, as a result of the self-evaluation, the Board chair made special efforts to promote cohesion among trustees. Discussing the results of both the Board self-evaluation survey and that of the president has led to numerous improvements to meeting practices and communication. Lately, with the addition of measurable priorities, whether the Board has achieved the desired outcome should be easy to see. The recent identification of Board priorities has resulted in their best alignment with the president’s priorities and College strategic goals to date.

The Board took the Commission recommendations to heart and acted on them thoroughly and promptly. Their efforts and those of the College as a whole have been documented and public. Improvements have been significant and sustained.
Institutional Analysis
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The following sections of the Self-Evaluation Report present Descriptive Summaries, Self-Evaluations, and any needed Actionable Improvement Plans for each of the Accreditation Standards.

Throughout the Institutional Analysis, particular attention is paid to topics of special concern to the ACCJC. An earlier section of the Report cited relevant sections of the Institutional Analysis demonstrating College compliance with Commission Policies and with selected USDE Regulations. Standard I.B presents student achievement data, including institution-set student achievement benchmarks. Using the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Standard I.B demonstrates the College is at the Proficiency and Sustainability Levels for Program Review and Planning. Standards II.A and II.B demonstrate the College is at the Proficiency and Sustainability Levels for SLOs. Standard III.D presents all Required Evidentiary Documents for Financial Review, an Explanatory Matrix of Auditor’s Opinions, and a Schedule of Financial Trends and Analysis.
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STANDARD I.

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

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

- STANDARD I.A.
  Mission

- STANDARD I.B.
  Improving Institutional Effectiveness
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STANDARD I.A.
Mission
The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College’s Mission Statement has served it well for many years. The Mission Statement underwent a thorough review during the spring of 2009 and was reaffirmed by the Board of Trustees (Board) on June 10, 2009. The Mission Statement prioritizes the learning and success of the College’s diverse student population.

The College’s Mission Statement is as follows:

*The mission of Ohlone College is to serve the community by offering instruction for basic skills, career entry, university transfer, economic development, and personal enrichment for all who can benefit from instruction in an environment where student learning success is highly valued, supported, and continually assessed.*

The Mission Statement is the basis for the College’s Strategic Goals and Objectives, which are found in the College Strategic Plan. These goals and objectives in turn drive the College’s programs and services through ongoing Program and Services Review, and are also intimately tied to professional development of faculty and staff. The Mission Statement is at the heart of the College’s Educational Master Plan (EMP), which identifies important student populations in relation to the Mission Statement. The EMP helps drive the goals and objectives of the College Strategic Plan. This is particularly true of College Strategic Plan Goal 1, which focuses on student learning and achievement; and College Strategic Plan Goal 2, which focuses on responding to community and student employment needs. In turn, the EMP and College Strategic Plan drive the District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP) and the Technology Master Plan.

The College wide participatory governance body is the College Council, which includes representation from the faculty, classified staff, Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC), and administration. The College Council annually assesses the College Strategic Plan. Through this assessment process, progress on the College Strategic Goals and Objectives is evaluated using quantitative and qualitative data. Faculty members continually assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). During meetings of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC), faculty members regularly share and showcase their findings about student learning. Assessment plans and results are also discussed at department meetings and in email dialogues. Assessments are archived in the CurricUNET® Program.
and Services Review module and SLOAC presentations are posted on the SLOAC website (I.A.1, I.A.2). Faculty members also make SLO assessment presentations to the Board and have dialogue with trustees.

SELF-EVALUATION

The College fulfills its mission by offering a variety of courses to a diverse student population with varying interests, skills, and abilities. The courses support the educational goals of basic skills development, university transfer, and/or vocational preparation (I.A.3). The College also maintains a commitment to personal enrichment and lifelong learning.

During its retreat in the fall 2012, the College Council discussed the Mission Statement in light of state regulations that limited course repeatability. These revisions create a conflict for the College. The College believes in lifelong learning and personal enrichment, but new state regulations prevent the College from offering courses that students have previously been able to repeat for credit. In order to continue to meet the mission, the College is offering not-for-credit courses through Community Education. In short, the College Council decided that the College will maintain “personal enrichment” in its Mission Statement and its offering of instruction (I.A.4). To date the change to fee-based offerings has resulted in strong enrollment.

The distribution of course offerings aligns with student goals, majors, and the need for basic skills courses. Faced with a workload reduction, academic deans sought input from counselors and consulted enrollment patterns to identify those courses most strategic and most necessary for students to complete their educational plan (I.A.5). When the number of courses and sections had to be reduced, academic deans could then minimize the effects of the workload reduction on students. The result was to offer fewer elective courses, but at the same time the College chose to increase some of the most strategic and necessary course offerings, particularly in the areas of general education and basic skills. This was done in direct response to counselor advice and student need.

The spring 2013 Student Survey shows that 88.7 percent of students responding believe the College offers a variety of courses to meet their needs and interests (I.A.6). In addition, 91.8 percent of those students agree that the College is preparing them for their career or educational goals. Student survey data compellingly show that student learning is highly valued and supported by faculty, who are perceived as excellent instructors. Ninety-one percent of students who expressed an opinion agree or strongly agree their instructors are highly skilled teachers who come to classes well prepared.

It is evident that faculty members value student learning and engage in ongoing assessment of SLOs at the course, program, and college level. SLOAC is one of the largest and most well attended committees at the College. The quality, thoughtfulness, and innovation of faculty members’ assessment of student learning are regularly highlighted during meetings, through faculty members’ presentations of assessment projects, and with lively dialogue about the results (I.A.7, I.A.8). There have been more than 25 faculty assessment presentations at SLOAC meetings, including assessment of basic skills and transfer level courses, and ranging from assessment of student learning on math exams to multimedia projects to business courses (I.A.1, I.A.2). Dialogue about SLO assessment also takes place at academic department meetings. Regularly scheduled faculty presentations of SLO assessment work have been incorporated into Board meetings (I.A.9). As of November 2013 seven faculty members have made presentations and responded to questions from trustees.

Perhaps the strongest evidence that the College is meeting the needs of students comes from the Accountability
Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report and the Student Success Scorecard (Scorecard). The 2012 ARCC report revealed the College to be above both the statewide and peer group averages on all seven performance indicators, one of only four California Community Colleges to achieve that level of success, and one of only two community colleges to accomplish it two years in a row (I.A.10). The 2013 Scorecard also shows the College to be among the top ten colleges statewide in the most comprehensive transfer/completion metric (I.A.11).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

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

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College assesses its student learning and achievement through the College Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives (I.A.12). By analyzing data from the Environmental Scan, the College assesses the ongoing programs and services and anticipates the needs of future students. All departments, including instructional disciplines, student services, instructional services, administrative services, and the departments reporting to the president complete a Program and Services Review, which incorporates the Mission Statement. Updates to data analysis and the Program Improvement Objectives (PIOs) within each Program and Services Review occur annually and trigger dialogue within departments and divisions, among faculty and staff and academic deans. All PIOs must relate to the Mission Statement and to the College Strategic Goals and Objectives. Comprehensive Program and Services Reviews are completed on a three-year cycle.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Reflective of the College mission, in the Spring 2013 Student Survey 77.2 percent of students who responded are currently enrolled in transfer level courses, while 20.5 percent of responding students are in career technical education (CTE) courses and 15.9 percent are in basic skills courses (I.A.6). With recent changes to state repeatability regulations and with budget constraints placing a greater focus on transfer, CTE, and basic skills enrollment, the opportunities for a robust personal enrichment curriculum have been challenged. Nonetheless, the College has made a conscious decision to continue to offer personal enrichment classes, both through the credit course offerings and through Community Education, in order to serve the College and community constituents.

Another example of how the College offers needed services to its student and community population is the Tri-Cities One-Stop Career Center located at the College’s Newark campus. Through the One-Stop community members and students alike can access resources for jobs, education, training, or business development. When Toyota closed its New United Motors (NUMMI) plant in Fremont, and later when the local solar energy company Solyndra closed unexpectedly, many former NUMMI and Solyndra employees used the One-Stop for new employment opportunities or for job retraining. Some of those community members became students in College CTE programs as a part of their retraining and in keeping with the partnership between the College and the Tri-Cities One-Stop Career Center.

As shown in the Spring 2013 Faculty Survey, more than 85 percent of faculty members agree that College programs and services reflect the College’s Mission Statement (I.A.13), while 98.2 percent of responding staff members feel the College’s programs and services reflect the College’s mission (I.A.14). While most faculty (63.8 percent) who expressed an opinion feel the College offers
an adequate number and variety of courses and programs, a significant minority (36.2 percent) do not (I.A.13). This is an interesting contrast to students, the large majority of whom (88.7 percent) express an opinion that the College offers a variety of courses to meet their needs and interests. Perhaps this discrepancy exists because faculty members recognize that some courses cannot be offered because of low-enrollment and budget cuts. Prior to the state budget crisis, over 74 percent of responding faculty felt that an adequate number of courses were offered, but in the 2011 Faculty Survey only 58 percent of faculty who responded felt enough courses were taught (I.A.15). The 2013 survey reflects an increasing faculty satisfaction with course offerings in what are still difficult times.

The College has had to be more selective in the courses it offers, prioritizing basic skills, transfer courses, and courses that enable students to complete vocational degrees. In fact, in preparation for anticipated budget cuts if Proposition 30 did not pass in November 2012, the vice president, academic affairs--in coordination with instructional faculty and counselors--created a list of courses that would need to be cut from the spring 2013 semester. This list was based on a rubric that prioritized classes based on student need as identified by the academic deans (I.A.5). The College reviewed not only enrollment patterns but educational needs of students, in light of the Mission Statement, in response to state-imposed reductions to course offerings.

The College has worked hard to make the ethnic makeup of the student population equitably reflect the ethnic makeup of the community. The College’s students represent the community at large, especially Hispanic students who have increased in percentage in the past five years to better reflect the District’s Hispanic population (I.A.16). In addition, programs such as Puente and Chicano/Latino Studies, as well as College events such as Raza Day and Día de los Muertos, support Hispanic students.

The College also has a good record supporting a broad range of students academically. In addition to the high transfer/completion rate in the 2013 Scorecard (I.A.11), the College’s individual course success rate is above the statewide average in all five course categories: success in basic skills courses, success in degree applicable courses, success in CTE courses, success in transfer level courses, and success in all credit courses (I.A.17).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**I.A.2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
The current version of the College Mission Statement was approved by the Board in June 2004 and was reaffirmed on June 10, 2009 (I.A.18). The Mission Statement is published in several places on the College’s website and therefore easily available to faculty, staff, students, and the community (I.A.19). Additionally the Mission Statement is visible in the College catalog, the class schedule, and on various other College forms and documents. Whenever faculty or staff members conduct Program and Services Review, a part of the review includes relating program or services goals to the Mission Statement, and the Mission Statement is displayed on the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module for easy reference (I.A.20).

**SELF-EVALUATION**
The Mission Statement is widely distributed and highly visible. The Mission Statement underpins foundational College processes, such as planning and Program and
Services Review, and drives professional development activities. The Mission Statement is not simply a statement but rather a guiding principle for planning, teaching, and learning at the College, and as such, is readily available to constituents.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**I.A.3. Using the institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College regularly reviews its Mission Statement as part of its five-year College Strategic Plan cycle. In spring 2009, during the comprehensive assessment phase of the cycle, the Mission Statement underwent significant discussion and review by the College community. As a first step in this review process, a task force was created by College Council to evaluate the language in the Mission Statement. This task force, composed of two faculty members and an administrator, reported regularly to the College Council during spring 2009. Moreover, the Mission Statement was reviewed by the entire College community during the March 12, 2009 Planning Summit held in the College gymnasium. Finally, to ensure a comprehensive review, the College community was surveyed in April 2009. The results of that survey showed that 80.1 percent of respondents felt the Mission Statement did not need to be changed (I.A.21). Given this wide input and discussion, the Mission Statement, as part of the College Strategic Plan, was approved by the College Council in May 18, 2009. This process is scheduled to be repeated as part of the next College Strategic Plan development. The assessment phase is slated for 2014-2015.

The College Council also established an annual review of the Mission Statement during the College Council fall retreat. In this way, the Mission Statement is revisited through a governance process every year. Recent discussions focused on whether or not the College can maintain its commitment to offering instruction in personal enrichment in light of changes regarding repeatability of courses. Given that lifelong learning is a College value held by faculty and staff, the commitment to personal enrichment remains in the Mission Statement. How that aspect of the Mission Statement is cared for is addressed in Standard II.A.2.

For the 2013 review of the Mission Statement the College Council appointed a task force who reviewed the Mission Statements from several other colleges. An open discussion of the group’s recommendations took place during a College Council meeting, and a new statement was proposed.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College has a robust and enduring Mission Statement, one that is widely embraced by the College community. The College has confidence that the Mission Statement is endorsed by the College community and has established an ongoing, systematic review of its Mission Statement through its major governance body of the College Council.

The College reviews its Mission Statement on a regular basis through its College Strategic Plan cycle and annual review. Institutional planning is conducted at both the long-term strategic level and the annual operational level, and includes regular review of the mission, vision, and value statements. The major plans of the College include the College Strategic Plan, EMP, DFMP, Technology Master Plan, and the annual budget planning process. These planning processes are based on the College Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and Core Values and integrate with one another (I.A.22).
The Mission Statement is scheduled for further review in fall 2014 when assessment for the 2015-2020 College Strategic Plan will occur. Any changes to accreditation requirements for the Mission Statement will also be addressed.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

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

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

As stated in previous sections, the Mission Statement is the basis of all of the key College planning processes. During the College Strategic Plan process, which cycles every five years, a task force appointed by the College Council reviews the Mission Statement and Core Values and brings recommendations back to the College Council. Proposed changes are reviewed by the College community and ultimately approved by the Board. The College Council considers and discusses the Mission Statement in tandem with the review of proposed College Goals to ensure every goal and objective is consistent with the statement and that all aspects of the statement are addressed in the goals. College Goals are established to reflect College values and are grouped accordingly. Visioning for the College’s future occurs at this point in the strategic process (I.A.22).

The Mission Statement, as well as the College’s Vision Statement, Core Values, and Goals, are intimately connected to Program and Services Review. An entire section of the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module is devoted to clarifying how the program aligns with these key drivers by prompting users to describe how the program supports them (I.A.20). During Program and Services Review each department or area determines a PIO, which is tied to student learning and success. The PIOS are connected to the College’s budget and planning process and are considered in the allocation of resources at the department level.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College has extensively reviewed, evaluated, and assessed the Program and Services Review cycle, at the heart of which is the College’s Mission Statement. The College’s Mission Statement is central to institutional planning and decision making as evidenced by the importance of the Mission Statement in strategic planning and Program and Services Review. PIOs are the result of an annual process whereby the College evaluates College wide programs, identifies needed improvements, and decides to allocate resources each year, based on how well the requests align with the Mission Statement, Goals, and Objectives. PIOS ensure ongoing improvement of programs, services, and College operations.

The Mission Statement is the lens through which the College and all it does is viewed, analyzed, and understood. Whether it be the establishing of College goals at a College wide summit in the gymnasium, assessing programs and services as a part of the regular Program and Services Review cycle, requesting additional resources as a part of a departmental PIO, or deciding to inaugurate a new bond measure, the Mission Statement is always the touchstone against which proposals are evaluated.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
Standard I.A. Sources of Evidence

I.A.1 Faculty Assessment Presentations to SLOAC
I.A.2 Math SLO Presentation
I.A.3 Full-Time Equivalent Students by Credit Type
I.A.4 College Council Retreat Agenda from August 22, 2012
I.A.5 Courses Priorities Framework
I.A.6 Spring 2013 Student Satisfaction Survey
I.A.7 SLOAC Meeting Minutes Website
I.A.8 Specific SLOAC Meeting Minutes
I.A.9 SLO Presentation from faculty during Board of Trustee Meeting
I.A.10 2012 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report
I.A.11 2013 Student Success Scorecard
I.A.12 College Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives 2010-2015
I.A.13 Spring 2013 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
I.A.14 Spring 2013 Staff Satisfaction Survey
I.A.15 Spring 2011 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
I.A.16 District Ethnic Comparison
I.A.17 Footnote about student success
I.A.18 Board Meeting Minutes from June 10, 2009
I.A.19 Ohlone College Website (About Ohlone)
I.A.20 CurricUNET Program Review Module
I.A.21 College Council Meeting Minutes from May 4, 2009
I.A.22 Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning
STANDARD I.B.
Improving Institutional Effectiveness
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The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

Community colleges that are functioning well and have extensive engagement in college processes among administration, faculty, staff, and students sometimes face an unexpected consequence of not seeing how all the pieces fit together in the whole. Individual faculty members are doing Program and Services Review, while other faculty members are assessing course and program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); staff members are working together on a District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP), while others work on department-specific Program Improvement Objectives (PIOs); all know their work may also have budget implications. But where there is such widespread participation, some tend only to see their piece, and they miss the integration of assessment, planning, and resource allocation in provoking and sustaining student learning and institutional improvement beyond their local environment.

The tendency sometimes is to look at all these processes as separate and unrelated. The College, however, has addressed this inclination by melding planning, resource allocation, and assessment into a collegial, goal-oriented, data-driven, and ongoing cycle (I.B.1). Individual plans, from Program and Services Reviews to the Educational Master Plan (EMP), conjoin within the College Strategic Plan (I.B.2). Strategic Goals align with the College Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Core values (I.B.3), and with accreditation standards. Objectives and action plans are created so goals will become operative, and regular assessment cycles answer the question of how well goals have been met. Planning processes are annually assessed and revised with the intent of becoming effective and efficient. PIOs that result from Program and Services Reviews are evaluated, assigned priority in accord with strategic goals, and integrated within the budget planning process.

Throughout, the key element guiding the processes, planning, resource allocation, assessment, and improvement, is student learning. It is the focus of the College Mission Statement and the work of the faculty and staff that drives the College in its continuous pursuit of excellence, one of the College’s Core Values (I.B.3).
I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Multiple processes and venues for dialogue in the College give opportunity for robust conversation and critical examination of issues. A governance process (I.B.4) provides opportunity to include constituents in the dialogue.

The College has structured dialogue to start with those members of the College community who are closest to, or most involved with, the relevant topics relating to student learning or institutional processes. Dialogue then proceeds through various, more broadly-based groups to inform and receive input from the appropriate decision-making bodies (I.B.1).

At the grassroots level, every department regularly is in dialogue about, assesses, and revises its Program and Services Review (I.B.5). Each of the more than 90 Program and Services Reviews (I.B.6) include SLOs or student impacts (for non-instructional departments) and PIOs that are intended to foster improved student learning, improved services to students, or more effective departmental processes and practices. The intra-departmental dialogue reaches a more broadly based audience as Program and Services Reviews are shared publicly (I.B.7), integrated with other similar or supportive Program and Services Reviews, highlighted in public meetings as exemplary, assessed as components of broader plans or goals, and forwarded on for budget consideration.

It is not unusual for an email announcement to be sent to all College employees highlighting exceptional Program and Services Reviews and to invite all to a public presentation or to direct them to the website to read the Program and Services Review. There is also interest in, and sharing of, effective means of doing assessment, from courses and programs to PIOs and SLOs. Dialogue around planning and assessment is practical in addition to being theoretical.

Broader planning venues, such as the EMP (I.B.8), the DFMP (I.B.9), or the Technology Master Plan (I.B.10), discuss and integrate Program and Services Reviews with institutional needs and goals. Faculty Senate (I.B.11), Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) (I.B.12), and others may be involved in the dialogue as well, but since 2003, the College Council is the governance group where everything comes together. Regardless of how widespread and inclusive any prior vetting may have been, the College Council is intended to ensure that everyone within the College community has opportunity to participate in the dialogue. The College Council meetings are open to any who choose to attend, its agendas are well-publicized in advance of the meetings, and the meetings themselves are characteristically open and inclusive. Following the Learning College Model (I.B.13) where all within the College community are regarded as capable of learning and facilitating learning, titles and status are left at the door. Each comment and contribution is heard. In a Learning College, engagement and discussion are encouraged, supported, and vital; dialogue is robust.

As the integrative hub of College dialogue, the College Council includes representation of all constituent groups: classified staff, faculty, administration, and students. The College Council also serves as the Strategic Planning Committee and the Accreditation Steering Committee. Other groups that participate in College wide dialogue include Faculty Senate (I.B.11); Curriculum (I.B.14) and General Education Committees (I.B.15); and numerous standing committees ranging from the Process Assessment Committee (PAC) (I.B.16) to the Faculty Position Prioritization Committee (I.B.17). More widespread dialogue among stakeholders outside the College is fostered, as
well, particularly when working with advisory committees, crafting a College Strategic Plan that is responsive to those who live and work within the District, or developing strategies for gaining and expending community resources. The Bond Oversight Committee (I.B.18) and the Foundation (I.B.19) serve as examples of groups where community wide dialogue is solicited and heard, as well as informal meetings with stakeholder groups (I.B.20) when producing the College Strategic Plan goals and objectives.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
The College is characterized by its particularly collegial spirit (I.B.21). The areas of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services are in regular and mutually supportive contact (I.B.22). Dialogue is open, transparent, and meaningful; territorialism and rancor are noticeably minimal. In such an environment of respect and trust, assessment, critique, and improvement flourish. Integration thrives best where communication is widespread and constant. From College wide public forums to committees and work groups to governance meetings, the College is consistently focused on improving student learning and institutional processes.

While College Council meetings are typically well attended by both Council members and the College community and dialogue is healthy, improving constituent input is regularly discussed. Strategies to improve the communication loop from College Council to constituent groups back to College Council are shared frequently.

Because the College strives for data-driven decision making, it has been a hallmark of the College to support discussion with evidence (I.B.23). For instance, faced with the prospect of discontinuing a printed class schedule, the College chose to look at the data. What percentage of students on the spring 2013 Student Satisfaction Survey expressed a need for a printed schedule? What are the other community colleges in the San Francisco Bay Area doing about printing a class schedule? How, and to whom, are schedules distributed and used? How often do faculty and staff consult the schedule? All of these questions were answered with data rather than with anecdotal stories as the College then collegially decided to continue printing a class schedule.

The College truly looks to data to make informed decisions. As resources have been limited, however, the institutional research function has been stretched. Additional resources are needed to meet the College wide appetite and need for data.

An example of the College’s robust and ongoing dialogue about student success occurs at SLOAC meetings (I.B.24). SLOAC is comprised of faculty, academic deans, administrators, and students and meets monthly to review assessments of course SLOs and program SLOs and to discuss changes that might result in response to the assessments. This meeting is the venue where best practices in assessment are also showcased for others to emulate. Examples of best practices in SLOs and their assessment are also presented at Board of Trustees (Board) meetings.

Standing committees and work groups also provide opportunity to discuss student success and institutional processes. The Faculty Position Prioritization Committee, for example, is annually in dialogue about the changing faculty needs of the College and establishing appropriate priorities for faculty hiring. The PAC likewise meets annually to review the effectiveness of planning processes and to make improvements based on critical discussion and review of evidence. The president/superintendent’s (president) ad hoc Environmental Scan Analysis Group was formed to interact with, and respond to, the findings of the Environmental Scan and to do the necessary gap analysis.
The College is in constant, evidenced-based dialogue about student learning. Goal 1 of the College Strategic Plan (I.B.2), for instance, specifically focuses on student learning and has several measurable objectives. Its annual assessment (I.B.25) by the College Council provokes spirited dialogue: How well is the College doing compared to peers? To prior years’ performance? To where benchmarks (I.B.26) have been set? How is the College assessing progress? Is the assessment appropriate? Similar discussions occur at the academic deans’ meetings and retreats. Additionally, evidence relating to student learning is presented to, and analyzed for, the College community through public forums such as the president’s twice-annual State of the College (I.B.27) speech or regular meetings of the Board (I.B.28). The use of, and dialogue about the meaning of, data is infused within the College culture. The College is open and self-reflective, honest with itself, and unafraid to discuss accomplishments and challenges alike.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

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

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Planning processes for linking short-term, long-term, and departmental goals are clearly defined, with the ultimate goal of meeting strategic goals and objectives of improving both student success and the College itself. The 2010-2015 College Strategic Plan (I.B.2) is the core integrating document for all College plans and goals. As the most comprehensive of College plans, the College Strategic Plan is crafted with consensus from among as broadly-based constituent groups as possible. Beginning with a College wide public forum in March 2009 that included administration, faculty, classified staff, and students, the College Strategic Plan was developed, discussed, and refined through governance.

Eight College Goals are articulated, each with measurable objectives. These goals are all consistent with the College Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and Core Values, and all focus on improving student learning and the College. Each objective is created to be rigorous yet attainable. The goals are expressed in more detail and often operationalized in other College plans, such as the EMP or the DFMP, and Program and Services Reviews with their PIOs.

The goals and objectives are regularly brought before the College community for dialogue and assessment. Each of the president’s State of the College speeches addresses progress on the goals and objectives. These speeches, presented to College wide employees during Learning College Week at the beginning of each semester, are both informative and encouraging as progress on, or accomplishment of, goals and objectives is shared. Currently, halfway through the 2010-2015 time period covered by the College Strategic Plan, most of the objectives have been met or are on their way to being met.

Various data and evidence are incorporated into assessing progress and attainment of goals and objectives. One example of this evidence would be the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report (I.B.29) and its seven performance indicators. Evidence of progress on several College Strategic Plan Goal 1 objectives related to student achievement in transfer, completion, retention,
and success is corroborated in the ARCC report. The College consistently performs at rates that are above both the statewide and peer group averages, recently for all seven performance indicators. Numerous other sources of evidence—District data in the Environmental Scan (I.B.30); comparisons to the Bay 10, the 21 colleges in the ten community college districts that surround the San Francisco Bay or to similarly-sized single college districts; longitudinal studies of student success data; and external benchmarks and standards—are used to assess goal attainment. Such evidence is captured annually and analyzed, both the evidence and the ensuing dialogue captured in the Annual Assessment of Goals and Objectives Assessment Documentation Tool (I.B.25).

The timeline for creating the 2015-2020 College Strategic Plan has already begun. The initial step is a broad-based assessment of community need and College performance. Data is being collected for the writing of a new Environmental Scan; current goals and objectives are regularly being assessed; and Program and Services Review results are being reviewed. In January 2014 the new Environmental Scan will be analyzed and a strategic review of the Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and Core Values conducted. Plans are in place to again meet with community stakeholder groups; call another College wide Planning Summit; respond to community and College input and to the data; identify goals and measurable objectives; and craft a new 2015-2020 College Strategic Plan for College wide vetting, review by the College Council, and approval by the Board at their June 2015 meeting.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College Strategic Plan is the essential planning document for the College, and as such must necessarily be current and relevant. The College Council annually evaluates, discusses, and updates the College Strategic Plan through identified meetings and retreats. The College Strategic Plan is a dynamic, organic document, subject to refinement and adjustment as necessary to meet changing needs within the College; but it is also a key component in guiding College decisions and in assessing the results of those decisions. The College Strategic Plan is not a placeholder on a shelf, consulted only when an accreditation visit is imminent; its goals and objectives are integral to all College planning, and especially central to Program and Services Review.

Every Program and Services Review must address one or more goals or objectives within the College Strategic Plan, must assess how well that department has contributed to attaining the goal or objective, and must justify in light of the College Strategic Plan any PIOs and resource allocation requests (I.B.31). Program and Services Reviews that fail to align with the College Strategic Plan are returned to the departments for revisions or updates before they are approved. This attention to the centrality of the College Strategic Plan in College wide planning and resource allocation touches every department in an on-going way. All 90 Program and Services Reviews are completed on a three-year cycle with PIOs annually reviewed and updated, each regularly examined through the lens of the College Strategic Plan (I.B.2). Because the College Strategic Plan and its institutional goals were collaboratively created, are publicly reported and celebrated, and are paramount within College wide Program and Services Review and institutional planning, the College Strategic Plan’s content, rationale, progress, and importance are communicated to constituents throughout the College.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

DESCRIPTION SUMMARY
Institutional planning and Program and Services Review are conducted in accordance with Administrative Procedure 3250 (I.B.33). Institutional planning has both long-term and annual components. All planning processes include regular review of the plan(s) using the Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and Core Values as the touchstone to which the plans are assessed. College plans include and incorporate Program and Services Reviews; are informed through multiple sources of evidence, both qualitative and quantitative, including the Environmental Scan; are regularly assessed, both the plans and the planning processes; and are linked to budget planning and resource allocation.

The major plans of the College are the College Strategic Plan (I.B.2), the EMP (I.B.34), the DFMP (I.B.35), the Technology Master Plan (I.B.36), and budget planning (I.B.37). Each plan is integrated into the work of the College Council and its subcommittees. All of the major plans are informed by Program and Services Review.

Full Program and Services Reviews are completed on a three-year cycle by all departments, including instructional disciplines, student services, instructional services, administrative services, and the departments reporting to the president (I.B.38). Every Program and Services Review must address the Mission Statement as well as the College Strategic Plan and the goals and objectives relevant to the department. Program and Services Reviews result in PIOs, which serve as the means to making objectives operational and linking planning to resource allocation. While Program and Services Review is conducted on a three-year cycle, each year every Program and Services Review must respond to recent data and update PIOs. These annual updates of all PIOs are completed on a timeline designed to appropriately inform budget planning and to provide resources to implement improvements in a timely manner. Annual review of Program and Services Review data, including annual updates to the PIOs, form the bridge from Program and Services Review to budget planning (I.B.39). This process makes operational a sustainable Program and Services Review system to inform the budget process, as well as other College planning processes, on an annual basis, providing vital “grassroots” input to all planning processes.

As part of the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review process, PIOs are required to have action plans and to identify resources needed to implement the improvement. Financial resources are identified and allocated through the annual budgeting process as described. The process also requires a plan of how the outcomes of PIOs are to be assessed and consideration of the results of those assessments after the PIOs have been implemented.

At this juncture, partly because the time required to move from program evaluation to identification of needed improvements and action plans, to resource allocation, to implementation, to assessment of the effects of the improvement is sometimes several years, many PIOs have not made it all the way through the sequence. Those that have completed the cycle have been assessed.

The College Strategic Plan is created every five years (I.B.40, I.B.41) and is comprised of three main steps, the first step of which is assessment. The College Strategic Plan grows out of assessments that are both internal and external to the College. The Environmental Scan provides an assessment of the College itself and the community it
serves. The College’s Glossary of Planning Terminology (I.B.42) defines Environmental Scan as “the acquisition and use of information about events, trends, and relationships in the local community and beyond that informs the College of forces and needs relevant to planning future direction. Environmental scanning constitutes a primary mode for institutional learning and self-assessment.”

The Environmental Scan (I.B.30) is completed in preparation for a new strategic plan by the Institutional Research and Planning Office (I.B.23) and published on the College website. The Environmental Scan is updated regularly as new information becomes available. Data from the Environmental Scan is presented to the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, College Council, and the Board. Suggestions for augmentation of the data are taken and implemented as appropriate. This extensive statistical information addresses events, trends, needs, and opportunities within the local community and includes data about the workforce and the economy, District demographics, student preparedness before enrolling at the College, and community expectations, to name a few. The Environmental Scan also includes internal demographics and data on student success and trends and serves as a source of evidence in the preparation of Program and Services Reviews and PIOs.

To complement the statistical information contained in the Environmental Scan, a series of meetings with community groups and leaders is undertaken. At each meeting participants are provided basic information about the College and its mission. Using a brief survey, the community participants are asked for their opinion of how the College is perceived in the community and how the College is meeting community expectations. The information collected in the community meetings is used in creating the vision for the future.

To complement the broad-based community assessment of the College, the internal College community completes surveys on College performance.

A gap analysis follows to identify areas where the College could expand or improve its efforts to better align with community and student needs. The president’s ad hoc Environmental Scan Analysis Group, made up of administrators and faculty including the College Council faculty co-chair, is charged with extracting key information from the Environmental Scan data and identifying areas where the College needs to expand or improve its efforts. This information is used in goal setting. The results of the gap analysis, along with Program and Services Reviews and the evaluation of prior College Strategic Plan goals and objectives, inform the writing of each new College Strategic Plan.

As part of the planning cycle, in November and December the president and College Council assess annual progress on College Strategic Plan goals and objectives (I.B.39). The College Council then reviews and refines this assessment of the College Strategic Plan at its January retreat each year, followed by a review among the president and vice presidents. The president completes a final assessment and report that is presented to the College Council for review and consent (I.B.4). This assessment informs new goals at the five-year mark.

At this point, the College’s Actionable Improvement Plans (formerly Planning Agendas) from the most recent Accreditation Self-Evaluation are reviewed and considered for inclusion in the strategic goals.

Integral within these multiple assessments of the College Strategic Plan are the results of Program and Services Reviews. To incorporate grassroots ideas and areas of needed improvement from all parts of the College into
consideration for new College goals, the results of Program and Services Review are considered during the assessment phase in the planning cycle.

Goal setting is Step Two in the strategic planning cycle. During the creation of the College Strategic Plan, the Mission Statement is reviewed by a task force of the College Council. Recommendations for change are considered and discussed by the College Council in accord with formulating strategic goals. This process is to ensure that every goal in the College Strategic Plan aligns with the Mission Statement. Visioning for the future occurs at this point in the strategic process.

To capture the vision of internal stakeholders, a College wide summit is held in the College gymnasium, where ideas and visions are sought from faculty, classified staff, management, and students concerning the future goals of the College. The success of prior goals and objectives is discussed in small groups, and suggestions for new goals and objectives are solicited. Feedback from each of the groups is collated, further discussed, and analyzed among governance groups, and incorporated as part of the data that will guide the writing of the new College Strategic Plan.

Using the assessment in Step One, the president and the College Council propose a set of goals to be accomplished in the next five-year cycle, some of which may be goals continued from the previous College Strategic Plan. Comprehensive goals are crafted that allow all departments to be active participants in improvement that supports the College Strategic Plan. For each goal, measureable objectives, with action plans and timelines for completion, are identified. The College Council may identify specific programs and services to address the objectives. Direction for College wide improvement from the College community is provided in this manner. Various drafts of the strategic goals are vetted and revised through the College Council, the College website, and through email exchanges. Once this process is complete, the Board reviews and approves the new plan at its June meeting (I.B.43). Goals and objectives are born of Program and Services Reviews, College plans, the gap analysis, and multiple assessments such as the Environmental Scan. They reflect College wide priorities for the following five-year cycle.

Implementation of the College Strategic Plan, Step Three in the strategic planning cycle, is made operational through the updates to Program and Services Reviews and the annual updates to PIOs they generate. Every Program and Services Review includes PIOs and an explanation of why the improvement is needed, how the proposed improvement supports college goals and plans, and action plans and resources necessary to implement the improvements. During the review of PIOs the president and vice presidents may also identify certain Institutional Improvement Objectives (IIOs) (I.B.39). These are College wide improvement objectives created after reviewing all the PIOs and assessing the more global needs of the College.

The process of evaluating and actualizing PIOs is outlined within the steps of the annual planning cycle (I.B.44). Each year, aligned with the budget planning cycle, Program and Services Reviews and their attendant PIOs are reviewed, and priorities are established for the next year’s work to achieve College objectives. Categories are assigned to PIOs by the respective departments based on the scope and impact of the planned improvement. PIOs with College wide impact are assigned category 1; cross-departmental PIOs receive a 2; and department-specific PIOs are given a category 3. The president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents create a list of IIOs, which are then reviewed with the Budget Committee and the College Council.

PIOs are a formal item for review at the annual budget manager meetings with the vice president, administrative
services as the budget for a subsequent year is being developed. It is during these meetings that the integration of planning and resource allocation occurs. Budget managers provide a rationale for all PIOs for which funding is requested, including PIO priority within the department and the relation of each PIO to College goals, objectives, mission, and plans. The vice president, administrative services then explores funding options with the budget manager, from reallocating currently budgeted funds to requesting approval of additional funds from the Budget Committee to finding alternative funding sources such as from the Foundation or Bond funds. These meetings take place from February to April. The vice president, administrative services documents the results of the budget manager meetings and communicates the results to the Budget Committee as the budget development process unfolds (I.B.45, I.B.46).

Prior to the tentative budget approval each June and the final budget approval by the Board each September, the president and the vice president, administrative services review the budget with the College Council. At that time, the president and vice president, administrative services indicate the IIOs and/or PIOs that are receiving specific resource allocations within the proposed budgets.

For strategic objectives not addressed effectively through PIOs or IIOs, the president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents draft action plans. These action plans are reviewed by the College Council and implemented by the appropriate area in the College.

Despite appropriately determined planning cycles, planning is also created to be flexible and responsive, able to adjust to changes in the educational environment. For example, the College has planned for, and addressed, the impacts of recent revisions to state regulations, the Student Success Act, and mandated associate degrees for transfer. Similar advance planning in anticipation of the November 2012 election results, specifically the Proposition 30 results, reflect the proactive assessment and planning. Multiple budget and staffing plans were developed in response to the recent budget crisis and the success or failure of Proposition 30; analyses were done on the impact on enrollments in fine arts and physical education courses and faculty load in light of changes to repeatability; and new College-identified benchmarks have been set in response to the Student Success Scorecard (I.B.57).

SELF-EVALUATION
The College understands on-going and integrated planning and realizes it has and will lead to continuous improvement in student learning and institutional processes. Planning, with all of its associated elements, is thoroughly a part of the College culture. Completing, assessing, and celebrating Program and Services Reviews; assessing student learning outcomes at course and program levels; gathering, analyzing, discussing, and responding to data; aligning department goals and improvement plans with the College Strategic Plan; viewing all that the College does through the lens of the Mission Statement; seeking ever higher gains in student learning and institutional effectiveness, all are hallmarks of College life and practice. Participation is College wide, mutually encouraged, supported, and celebrated. Exemplary Program and Services Reviews are showcased at Learning College Week activities, while outstanding examples of SLO assessment are presented as models at regular meetings of SLOAC.

Rather than languishing on a website, data is sought and is incorporated in all levels of planning and assessment. If anything, the demand for data is greater than the supply as planners increasingly learn to ask more questions and to dig deeper in their assessments. The College is in an on-going cycle of planning, assessment, goal setting, implementation, and re-assessment; and the College has the successful
student learning data (I.B.48) that results from good planning.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

To further improve the assessment of PIO outcomes, the College is incorporating the results of PIO assessment into the regular report that is generated through CurricUNET® at the end of each Program and Services Review cycle. The Institutional Research and Planning Office will review each of the PIO assessments for completion and validity, and the results of this initial analysis will be forwarded to appropriate administrators responsible for each Program and Services Review. In this way the College will have a process to regularly check the active involvement in assessing PIO outcomes and the success of individual PIOs.

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

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

College planning, at all levels, is broadly based and inclusive. Opportunities for College personnel to participate range from memberships on planning committees and task forces to public forums where plans are envisioned and assessed to governance groups like the College Council, the nexus of all College planning. In addition to College personnel, students have opportunities to engage in the planning process, including formal representation on the College Council (I.B.49). Some Program and Services Reviews, particularly those in Student Services, are vetted before students. Stakeholder groups from the community--educators, business leaders, friends, and supporters of the College, service groups, and alumni--are offered the chance to provide insight essential for planning to meet District needs.

Standing advisory committees (I.B.50), bond oversight committees (I.B.51), ongoing presentations to community groups, and the Ohlone College Foundation Board (I.B.52) provide opportunity for community involvement. The College Council and planning committee memberships purposefully include representatives from faculty--both full-time and adjunct--administration, classified bargaining units, and students with the intention of getting widespread constituent perspective.

Acknowledging that 87 percent of the College budget goes to salaries and benefits, and 10 percent goes to fixed expenses such as utilities and upkeep, there remains only three percent of the budget to be allocated for discretionary expenditures. It is from that three percent that PIOs and IIOs are funded. PIOs are a formal item for review at the annual budget manager meetings with the vice president, administrative services as the budget for the subsequent year is being developed. These meetings take place in February through April, and then the vice president, administrative services documents the discussions and communicates the results to the Budget Committee as the budget development process unfolds.

The president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents review the PIO requests and categorization, focusing in particular on category 1, those with College wide impact. The president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents also create the list of IIOs, which are reviewed with the Budget Committee and College Council for input and feedback. In addition to available funds from the College’s general fund, there are additional funding sources such as the College Foundation and bond funds. The expenditure of these funds to support PIOs is also guided by the same resource allocation process.
When additional staffing is needed, even in the case of hiring faculty, a PIO is required to document how the program data demonstrates the need and to explain how addressing the need will support the College mission, goals, and objectives. This rationale then becomes a part of the deliberation as either the Faculty Position Prioritization Committee (in the case of faculty) or the president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents (in the case of management or classified staff) consider the staffing request.

When resources to fulfill College plans have not been available, the College has found alternate means of meeting its planning needs. The Measure G bond is a particularly apparent example, but not the only example of how the College has been fiscally prudent and proactive. The International Student program, as well as the English Language Institute, provides non-apportionment revenue; some departments, particularly Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) and health sciences, have been awarded grants; and the College also built substantial reserves, which allowed progress in fulfilling plans to continue despite the loss of apportionment revenue in recent years.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

As a result of resources being distributed to support PIOs, and despite recent statewide budget challenges, some notable improvements have been made. One example is the funding of a PIO for the Institutional Research and Planning Office. Access to multiple data sets is now available to the College through a license with Economic Modeling Services, Incorporated (EMSI) (I.B.53), obtained with funds allocated in response to a PIO. Data mining that once took weeks and required separate access to numerous census, economic, labor, and educational sites can now be gained on a single site and can be merged into reports in a matter of hours, not days. Such reports can support everything from the updates to the Environmental Scan to employment documentation for CTE programs to job openings and completer data required for the submission of CTE programs to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO).

The College planning process is inclusive and broadly informed. The College is sensitive to its multiple constituencies and takes care to be responsive to, and supportive of, each constituent group as it creates, assesses, and implements its plans. Importantly, each constituent group is afforded respect and is given voice; no one sector tends to dominate. In the Learning College Model, all are learners and all may have something to teach. At the grassroots level, PIOs are annually produced and revised by every department at the College, and each has equal standing when evaluated for resource allocation. All major planning committees afford each constituent group a seat at the table, so all voices can be heard. The work of planning committees is widely shared and constituent feedback is welcomed, either directly or through representative members. Bi-annual surveys that separately go out to faculty (I.B.54), classified staff and managers (I.B.55), and students (I.B.56) generate thousands of responses to dozens of issues, and those results are included in the Environmental Scan, strategic goals and objectives, and Program and Services Review planning and assessment.

In response to faculty and staff surveys in spring 2013, 88 percent of responding faculty (including both full-time and adjunct faculty) agreed that the College Council—the venue for vetting both budgets and College plans—is “…an open forum for broad participation by all constituencies…in the decision-making process.” Similarly, 85 percent of staff who expressed an opinion also agreed with that statement. Of those responding to the survey question, 83 percent of faculty and 72 percent of staff additionally...
affirmed that they have opportunities to be involved in institutional dialogue and decision making.

Membership on the Budget Committee (I.B.57), the forum where budgets are planned and resources are allocated, is similarly broadly-based and inclusive of constituent groups. Both planning and budgeting are accessible, transparent, and equitable at the College. All departments have equal opportunity to secure funding, and there are no sweetheart deals apart from the process.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

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

DESRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College collects and uses assessment data to validate the quality of its programs and services and to create a culture of evidence. The Institutional Research and Planning Office maintains a visible presence on the College website (I.B.23) where institutional and student successes are publicly highlighted. Among the assessments reflected on the site, the results of the ARCC report (I.B.29) and the Student Success Scorecard (I.B.47) are especially important because their performance indicators are indexed against peer colleges. These assessments are also on the CCCCO website and are mandated to be presented to, and discussed by, the Board, so these measures of quality assurance are particularly visible and relevant to all constituents. Key results are included in presentations to the public through community groups and city council meetings.

Every other year the College conducts satisfaction surveys among students, faculty, and classified staff and managers (I.B.58). These surveys request levels of satisfaction with everything from classroom instruction to food service, or from the level of customer service provided by Admissions and Records to one’s sense of feeling safe at the College. The results of these surveys are publicly shared and sometimes serve as a catalyst for change and to bring increased quality from departments or services across the College.

The College regularly evaluates courses and both instructional and non-instructional programs through its student learning outcomes and student impact assessments in accord with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) rubric. SLOAC (I.B.12) uses multiple sources of data from the Institutional Research and Planning Office, classroom assessments, and advisory committees to assess the quality of courses and programs and to communicate those results to constituents.

The Institutional Research and Planning Office provides data on all manner of student success, from program completion to transfer; from retention, success, and persistence to progression through a basic skills curriculum to transfer level courses; and from the effects of intervention on grade point averages to success indicators disaggregated by student demographics and unique needs. These data and much more, are available to appropriate constituents on the Institutional Research and Planning Office website.

Research is not limited to assessing the College alone. The Environmental Scan (I.B.30) is a comprehensive analysis of data from a District wide, county wide, and statewide perspective. The Environmental Scan is communicated to governance bodies, to the Board, and is highlighted on the Institutional Research and Planning Office website. The findings of the Environmental Scan have been incorporated
into college planning processes from the College Strategic Plan to the EMP to Program and Services Reviews to Measure G bond proposals; and those findings are visible parts of these public documents.

Instructional Program and Services Reviews, one of the College’s grassroots planning processes, begin with assessment results prepared every semester for every instructional discipline. Those results include data about courses and sections, enrollment and full-time equivalent students (FTES), program awards, retention and success, full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) and departmental efficiencies. Data for each department includes results for several years, and these results also become a basis for assigning priorities for faculty hiring.

The Institutional Research and Planning Office is also responsive to gathering data in accord with unique departmental requests to support individual Program and Services Reviews. Examples range from comparing the grade point averages of new students who initially enroll in personal development courses to those new students who do not take such courses, to comparing the success of basic skills English students who take reading and writing courses concurrently to students who take a reading or a writing course separately. The Institutional Research and Planning Office regularly discusses the validity of data requests and seeks to provide data that can best address the assessment needs of each program.

Research data is included in departmental support of PIOs. Data is the basis of the program’s evaluation and conclusions regarding program improvement leading to PIOs. Data is also a means of assessing progress to meeting College Strategic Plan objectives; as a way to compare College performance to external standards, such as similarly-sized single college districts or those neighboring community colleges in the San Francisco Bay Area, on topics like staffing or compensation.

Indicators of institutional effectiveness are widely shared through the College web site, televised Board meetings, the president’s State of the College address, and College publications. Additionally, statewide assessments of institutional quality, such as the ARCC report or the new Student Success Scorecard, are publicly displayed on the CCCCO website, as well as being publicized by various media. To determine if such communication is effective, the College formally queries constituents in focus groups as a part of the strategic planning process. Informal queries are a part of meetings with community groups, public forums, advisory committees, and various boards on which members of the public sit.

SELF-EVALUATION

For the past six years the College has been consumed with gathering data and with using the results of data analysis to drive planning and decision making. It is a part of the College culture to ask “How do you know?” or “What does the data indicate?” Not unexpectedly, the College has been more than pleased with the answers to those questions. The spring 2013 surveys of faculty and staff revealed that 65 percent of full-time and adjunct faculty and 85 percent of staff who expressed an opinion understand institutional planning decisions are based on research data.

The presumption has always been that the College was doing well, producing successful students, designing relevant programs, serving students with excellence; but how much more rewarding it is to see those presumptions validated with evidence. For the past two years the College has been above the statewide average and above the peer group average on all ARCC performance indicators, one of only two of the 112 community colleges to achieve...
that level of performance. The recently released Student Success Scorecard, using a different set of metrics than the ARCC report, still shows the College to excel in most of the performance indicators, including the important completion indicator. This measure of students who complete a degree or certificate and/or transfer shows the College remains in the top 10 percent of community colleges statewide.

The College is not reticent to share its quality assessments with the public. In public forums such as the president’s State of the College address, which is also posted online; in Board meetings that are locally televised; in the president’s presentations to community groups; in postings on the web, on Facebook, and other social media; in annual reports and in blurbs in numerous College publications; at every opportunity the College seeks to be open and forthcoming, even on those occasions when the data is not flattering. Sometimes the ARCC report will reveal an area where the College is below statewide and peer group averages. The College discovered recently that its rate of degree completion to FTES was below most Bay 10 colleges. Those assessments are shared as publicly as the College successes, and such data may often result in a new PIO or a new objective within the College Strategic Plan. Assessment is, after all, integrally tied to planning.

All of the aforementioned assessments, and more, are part of the public record on the College website. These findings also become items for discussion and analysis at meetings of the Board, College Council, Faculty Senate, academic deans, academic divisions, academic departments—essentially, throughout the College. College data is shared with constituents, legislators, and the media, wherever the opportunity emerges, because the College is proud of the story it has to tell.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

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

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College regularly reviews and modifies both its plans and its planning processes. Long-term plans such as the EMP, DFMP, and Technology Master Plan may remain in place for multiple years, but are annually reviewed and adjusted as needed to meet changing trends and contingencies. The DFMP, for example, required revision once the realities of expending a $349 million bond measure became practical rather than theoretical. The College staffing scenarios (I.B.59) had multiple versions dependent on the success or failure of Proposition 30 in November 2012. The College Strategic Plan defines objectives for a five-year period, but it is reviewed and updated annually (I.B.25). The review includes representation from constituent groups and focuses on progress made in the prior year to achieve objectives. Similarly, the EMP is a long-term plan that is subject to annual review, particularly because there is such strong linkage between annual priorities within the EMP and resource allocation (I.B.60).

In addition to reviews of plans resulting from economic or legislative changes, the College as a whole reviews its planning and allocation processes on a regular basis. To support the goal that College planning and resource allocation processes are effective, the College has a formal PAC (I.B.16). Every spring semester this committee begins the process of assessing those planning processes that were used to create and implement College plans. Not every planning process is reviewed every year because some plans are effective for multiple years and are only rewritten once every three to five years; but the processes that lead
to the development of all the major plans, including both long-term and annual plans, have been assessed and modified.

The PAC has eight different aspects of planning (I.B.61): description of the process; involvement and roles; research and data; opportunities for input and vetting; integration with other plans and processes; product of the planning process (the plan itself); planning for sustainability; and recommended improvements. It should be noted that process assessment looks at every aspect of the planning process, not just at the plan itself, and concludes with improvements that are implemented and reassessed with the next planning cycle. The committee also works to assure that planning is integrally linked to resource allocation. An important link between planning and the budget is Program and Services Review and the PIOs.

SELF-EVALUATIONS
Admittedly, the first suggestion of process assessment was met with some skepticism. After all the assessments that drove the planning cycle, the thought of assessing assessments seemed oppressive; would the next step be to assess the assessments of the assessments? But once in place the dialogue that resulted within the PAC and within the College Council reinforced the truth that successful plans emerge from successful planning. The process is as important as the product.

As a result of the work of the PAC, some planning processes were revised in order to be more effective. PIO prioritization—the process of evaluating resource requests growing out of Program and Services Review—was determined by the PAC to be particularly convoluted and unnecessarily time consuming. This review of the planning process by the PAC led to changes in the PIO prioritization (I.B.62) that made the process less intensive and more aligned with budget planning; and more manageable for both PIO authors and evaluators. PIO prioritization is but one example of improvement resulting from process assessment.

As another example, the entire Program and Services Review process was assessed during the 2012-2013 academic year in response to widespread concern over the apparent imbalance of workload Program and Services Review generated for some faculty and managers when using the annual Program and Services Review model. A work group was formed, dialogue was spirited within multiple venues, options were presented and weighed, and standards were consulted. Eventually the College Council analyzed the various proposals and concluded the Program and Services Review process needed to be revised and improved. New three-year timelines were established that better balanced workload; a streamlined process and simplified repository in CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module were planned; and members of the College community who had felt burned out on the Program and Services Review process now feel less over-burdened. By systematically reviewing and modifying the Program and Services Review process, the College has not only made the Program and Services Review process more efficient, but has also responded to the needs of its community and removed some of the obstacles that hindered their full engagement with the process.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None
I.B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College uses a variety of processes to gather evidence to support the effectiveness of institutional programs, student and academic support services, and administrative services. Surveys; Program and Services Reviews; minutes from committees, work groups, and task forces; budget audits; feedback, both formal and informal, from community focus groups, student groups, advisory committees, and departmental meetings; environmental scanning; site visits; all are utilized in the evidence building and evaluation processes.

The Curriculum Committee (I.B.14) oversees regular course review and academic program development. The General Education Committee (GE) (I.B.15) assesses the effectiveness of approved general education courses in meeting general education SLOs; SLOAC (I.B.12) assesses the effectiveness of course and program SLOs. All three committees were reinvigorated after an extended workshop on SLOs hosted by ACCJC during fall 2011, and assessment processes were further revised to be more effective. The recent passage of the Student Success Act has both provided metrics and increased focus on effective student support services, and Student Services departments have translated that focus into Program and Services Review assessment and PIOs (I.B.31).

In practical terms, the College has two approaches to gathering evidence about program and service effectiveness. First, the Institutional Research and Planning Office focuses on gathering data to answer common institution wide questions, such as those every Program and Services Review or plan might address: student success data, demographics, District-wide trends, and the like. The Institutional Research and Planning Office especially focuses on those assessments that answer the questions of: How well have we met goals and objectives? In our pursuit of excellence, how do we compare to others or to the benchmarks we have set for ourselves? How effective are we doing what we say we should be doing?

The second approach to evidence gathering is to enable others to do their own research. Whenever possible the public data sources (the CCCCO DataMart, the American Community Survey of census data, CalPass, or even the College’s own survey data) are explained to curious faculty and managers. With minimal guidance they learn to explore, to data mine, and to answer questions of their choosing. The recent acquisition of the Informer reporting tool in Colleague® will allow interested parties to delve into the College’s massive database. The Institutional Research and Planning Office is responsible for writing many of the queries that, with appropriate prompts, allow departments to obtain very specific information on their own, particularly in support of Program and Services Review.

SELF-EVALUATION
Assessing planning processes is one component of ongoing, cyclical evaluation, but another is assessing the validity and relevance of the assessments themselves. Over the years the College has gathered myriad sources of evidence. But good research does not equate with the quantity of evidence as it does with the quality of the evidence. Evidence and assessment must address the relevant questions the College poses as it strives to achieve specific objectives and meet specific goals. The College, therefore, regularly assesses its assessments. One component of the PAC is to review the validity and relevance of data used as the basis for planning and to suggest changes that might be made in data gathering to better support planning. Such suggestions
have led to restructuring the PIO prioritization process, initiating benchmarking for College goals and objectives, and creating the Planning and Decision-Making Handbook, just to name a few.

At one point the Institutional Research and Planning Office sought to provide access to as much data as possible, sometimes providing answers to questions that were not being asked. The current goal of the office is to gather less data, but more relevant data, and to provide more insightful analysis. So the Institutional Research and Planning website has fewer charts and graphs and spreadsheets, but what it does have addresses questions the College is asking of itself, and is therefore less cumbersome and more user-friendly, more easily navigable.

For more than a decade an important characteristic of the College’s self-identity has been that of a Learning College, where all members of the College community can be both learners and teachers. In such a setting, evidentiary-based critical thinking and planning is prized. In this culture research, evidence gathering, data analysis, dialogue, critique, improvement, and success are hallmarks. Ongoing evaluation and re-evaluation are the way the College does business, and it is as natural a part of the education process as a classroom lecture.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
### Standard I.B. Sources of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.B.1</th>
<th>Planning and Decision-Making Handbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.B.2</td>
<td>College Strategic Plan 2010-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.3</td>
<td>Mission, Vision, Core Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.4</td>
<td>College Council Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.5</td>
<td>Planning and Program Review at Ohlone: A Continual Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.6</td>
<td>Program Review Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.7</td>
<td>Exemplary Program and Services Review site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.8</td>
<td>Educational Master Plan Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.9</td>
<td>District Facilities Master Plan Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.10</td>
<td>Technology Plan Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.11</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.12</td>
<td>SLOAC Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.13</td>
<td>Definition/description of a Learning College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.14</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.15</td>
<td>General Education Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.16</td>
<td>Process Assessment Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.17</td>
<td>Faculty Position Prioritization Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.18</td>
<td>Bond Oversight Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.19</td>
<td>Foundation Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.20</td>
<td>Sample questions and notes from discussions with stakeholder groups during the Strategic Planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.21</td>
<td>Footnote about Satisfaction Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.22</td>
<td>The academic deans’ meeting agenda and attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.23</td>
<td>Research &amp; Planning Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.24</td>
<td>SLOAC Website – agendas and minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.25</td>
<td>Annual Assessment of Goals and Objectives, Assessment Documentation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.26</td>
<td>Benchmarking Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.27</td>
<td>President’s State of the College Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.28</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.29</td>
<td>2012 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges Report (ARCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.30</td>
<td>Environmental Scan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.31</td>
<td>CurricUNET Program Review Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.32</td>
<td>Academic Procedure 3250,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.33</td>
<td>Educational Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.34</td>
<td>District Facilities Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.35</td>
<td>Technology Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.36</td>
<td>Budget Committee Website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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STANDARD II:
Student Learning Programs and Services

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

- STANDARD II.A.
  Instructional Programs

- STANDARD II.B.
  Student Support Services

- STANDARD II.C.
  Library and Learning Support Services
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STANDARD II.A.
Instructional Programs
The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student-learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

II.A.1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College offers a comprehensive selection of associate degree and certificate programs within the context of its mission, “to serve the community by offering instruction for basic skills, career entry, university transfer, economic development, and personal enrichment for all who can benefit from our instruction in an environment where student learning success is highly valued, supported, and continually assessed” (II.A.1). The Educational Master Plan (EMP) establishes overarching educational philosophy and principles, linkages with the institutional strategic goals and objectives, and academic directions for faculty and staff to pursue within the context of the College’s mission, values, and goals (II.A.2). To ensure quality programs and services at the Fremont and Newark campuses and the eCampus, an ongoing Program and Services Review process is followed to evaluate instructional programs and services, student services, and administrative services areas (II.A.3). Program Improvement Objectives (PIO’s) are generated from the program and services review process and incorporated into the budget planning processes.

Associate degree programs are offered to prepare students for the rigors of continued study towards a major at baccalaureate institutions, as well as career technical majors. Multidisciplinary majors with areas of emphasis in business, liberal arts, fine arts, natural science, and social science are also part of the degree curriculum (II.A.4). Fifty-six associate degree programs are offered, including five associate degrees for transfer (AA-T and AS-T). In addition to associate degrees, 32 Certificates of Achievement are offered, which are awarded for the completion of an organized series of courses in a particular emphasis area of 18 or more units (II.A.5). There are also 84 Certificates of Accomplishment of less than 18 units, which are often job or career related in disciplines ranging from Audio Technician to Web Design.
The Institutional Research and Planning Office is responsible for the coordination, collection, organization, compilation, and dissemination of data related to student needs, characteristics, and performance. The office collects data from external sources to conduct a periodic Environmental Scan and internally through student and staff surveys (II.A.6, II.A.7, II.A.8). This information is used in the Program and Services Review process to assist departments in identifying areas for improvement. The Program and Services Review process documents how programs and services support the College mission and goals and how the students are served. Data analysis in Program and Services Reviews includes student achievement criteria such as program awards, transfer, retention, and success rates.

The Curriculum Committee, a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, provides strong leadership and oversight to ensure curriculum is current and contributes to the College mission and goals. The committee reviews and makes recommendations on proposals to add, delete, or modify courses and programs (II.A.10). The CurricUNET® Course and Program Approval module, a web-based software program, is used to process and document all curriculum activity (II.A.11).

The General Education (GE) Committee, a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee, reviews and approves courses for the Ohlone College General Education Plan, commonly known as Plan A. Each GE Plan A Area has its own definition based on state requirements as well as local considerations. Faculty members have been actively involved in developing the definitions and SLOs for GE Plan A Learning Areas (II.A.12).

The Distance Education (DE) Committee, a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee, approves courses being offered either fully via distance education or as hybrids (combining in-person and distance education formats) and forwards

Chart 1: Process Cycle Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>CYCLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program and Services Review</td>
<td>Three Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Degrees and Certificates) and Course Development</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Review</td>
<td>Six Years or As Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Student Learning Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>Four Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>Ongoing/Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Student Achievement Measures</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (General Education Plan A) SLO Assessment</td>
<td>Ongoing/Flexible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each instructional Program and Services Review includes sections focused on assessment of course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and program SLO.

Program and services review; course development and review; and assessment of College SLOs, program SLOs, and course SLOs are integrated to form a practical and sustainable assessment system (II.A.9). This assessment system focuses on review and assessment that provide pragmatic direction for continuous program and course improvement. To ensure courses and programs are current and relevant, the College has implemented the following integrated process cycle:
recommendations to the Curriculum Committee. The DE Committee ensures distance education course design includes regular and effective contact per the Regular Effective Contact Policy (required by state regulations) through the DE course approval process (II.A.13). In addition, the DE Committee assists with the design and implementation of faculty development related to teaching online courses and conducts periodic needs assessment so that faculty development and resources reflect current best practices for distance education (II.A.14).

The Student learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) is a sub-committee of Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate. The membership of SLOAC consists of a faculty member and dean from each of the seven academic divisions and the Counseling Department. Meetings are open to the entire College community. SLOAC provides leadership for identifying and assessing SLOs in alignment with accreditation standards. SLOAC’s goals include promoting a continuous process of ongoing SLO assessment; assisting programs to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of their own assessment processes; providing the forum to address questions arising from the implementation and use of assessments; and educating faculty, staff, and administrators on SLOs and assessment (II.A.15, II.A.16).

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College follows an integrated and systematic planning and evaluation process that links strategic planning, educational master planning, program and services review, and budget planning to the College mission and goals. Data from the Environmental Scan and student surveys along with program specific data used throughout the Program and Services Review process demonstrate the varied education needs of students are being met regardless of location or methods of delivery. SLO assessment is systematic and ongoing and used to identify student-learning needs and student progress towards achieving stated course, program, and College SLOs. Through its various committee processes the College assures that all instructional programs are meeting the mission and are of high quality.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.1.a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student-learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Institutional Research and Planning Office conducts a periodic Environmental Scan to understand the varied student and community needs within the service area. The office collects data about District demographics; labor markets specific to Fremont, Newark, and Union City; student demographics, student success rates, and course and section data (II.A.6). The office also conducts student surveys and compiles data matrices for Program and Services Review.

To assess the educational preparation of students, the Placement Testing Center offers computerized non-timed placement assessments for English, English as a Second Language (ESL), and Math. In addition the Placement Testing Center offers a timed chemistry paper and pencil assessment. These assessments are used to determine student preparation and advice on placement into course levels to provide the greatest opportunity for success. The assessment program follows the state guidelines for placing
students into basic skills courses. During the 2010-2011 academic year the Placement Testing Center staff conducted a validation study for the English and Math placement tests (II.A.17). The Placement Testing Center staff is planning to conduct a validation study for ESL and chemistry in the spring or fall of 2014.

The validation study surveyed students and faculty during the fourth through sixth weeks of selected English and math courses. Students were asked to assess the accuracy of their placement by determining if they belonged in the course in which they were placed; if they should have been advised to enroll in a lower level course; or if they should have been advised to enroll in a higher level course. Faculty from the same courses were asked to evaluate students’ academic preparedness using the same criteria.

Data gathered from placement assessments are shared with English, math, ESL, and chemistry faculty. Faculty incorporate these data into their Program and Services Reviews and make changes as needed to ensure proper student placement.

To assess progress in achieving course SLOs, SLOAC and the Faculty Senate have established a baseline inventory of regularly offered courses called the master course list for assessment, which forms the context for assessment of course SLOs. The master course list for assessment provides a realistic list of courses and course clusters across disciplines to be assessed (II.A.18). A four-year cycle of course SLO assessment has been established to allow for the assessment and improvement loop to take place.

Assessments of program SLOs are documented as part of instructional Program and Services Review process. All degree and certificate programs have program SLOs established and documented in the CurricUNET™ Course and Program Approval module, and these SLOs are published in the catalog. Each instructional Program and Services Review documents an SLO matrix, which shows the relationship between course SLOs and program SLOs and whether the program SLOs are demonstrated at the introductory, practice, or mastery levels in each course (II.A.19).

Student learning at the College level is evaluated using two approaches: analysis of student achievement data and assessment of Ohlone College GE Plan A SLOs. College Strategic Plan Goal 1 sets a series of student achievement objectives, which are assessed annually (II.A.20).

Student achievement results, which are updated every summer, are also reported annually to programs for use in Program and Services Review. This includes data reflecting student success by department, by selected individual courses, and disaggregated data by gender, age, and ethnicity. Program awards by degree or certificate are also included. Achievement metrics from the Student Success Scorecard (Scorecard) are tracked annually and reported to the College Council and Board of Trustees (Board). The Scorecard is a workable structure for annual evaluation of community college performance in meeting statewide educational outcome priorities. At the annual College Council retreat in the fall, student achievement data from the Scorecard are discussed and analyzed with a goal of provoking further analysis and improvements to teaching/learning as necessary. The Scorecard represents transparency and accountability on student progress and success metrics in public higher education in the California Community Colleges. The information in the Scorecard indicates how well colleges are doing in basic skills instruction, job training programs, retention of students, and graduation and completion rates.

Institution-level SLOs are those covered under the GE Plan A Pattern. Plan A has seven learning areas, each with a defined scope and SLOs. An analysis of student enrollment
patterns has led to the identification of target courses used by most students to meet Plan A requirements. The SLOs for these courses are reviewed to align with the GE SLOs and assessments can be designed to measure how well GE SLOs are being achieved by students in those courses. Relevant GE Plan A courses are assessed as part of the course SLO assessment process, which is a four-year cycle; however, departments may determine their own best practices for GE assessment, as long as a regular timeline is established.

Additionally, College benchmarks for student success have been established reflecting goals for student achievement that are realistic, challenging, and attainable. These benchmarks reflect analysis of the College Strategic Plan’s goals and objectives as well as achievement data from the Scorecard.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Data from Program and Services Reviews, student surveys, and student achievement data verify that the educational needs of students are being met. Data from the 2013 Scorecard confirms the instructional programs are high quality and exceed peer group and statewide averages for the College Performance Indicators (II.A.21). Currently the College is in the top 10 percent of all California community colleges in the overall student success metric. Vocational course completion rates continue to be strong and are above the peer group and statewide averages. Course completion rates for basic skills courses are above both the peer group and statewide averages. Revisions to the English as a Second Language (ESL) curriculum have produced noticeable gains; however, they remain below the peer group and statewide averages. The College wide persistence rate has remained steady over the past three years and continues to be above both the peer group and statewide averages.

In addition to the data described above, for the past several years the College has used a course priority framework for enrollment management decisions (II.A.22). This framework contributed to ensuring the course needs of students were met within the context of the College mission. When the Spring 2013 Student Survey asked if the variety of courses were meeting students’ educational needs, 88.7 percent of those responding answered strong yes or yes. Ninety-one percent of students expressing an opinion answered strong yes or yes that courses at the College prepare them for their career or educational goals (II.A.7).

The Placement Testing Center provides services to assess student educational preparedness.

The results of the validation study for English indicated 74.9 percent of the students who were placed into their English courses by the placement test said they were in the appropriate course. The instructors thought that 83.8 percent of the students placed by the test were in the appropriate course (II.A.17). The results of the validation study for math indicated that 74 percent of the students who were placed into their math course by the placement test said they were in the proper course. The instructors thought that 92 percent of the students placed by the placement test were in the proper course.

Placements into English composition courses and English reading courses remained relatively stable from fall 2010 to fall 2012. There were slight differences between semesters, but no clear trend. For English composition, students who were placed into English 151A, Fundamentals of Composition, comprised the largest group at 40 percent (combining See Counselor and ENGL-151A). Sixty-seven percent of students were placed into basic skills writing and 34 percent were placed into college-level writing.
For math the largest placement group was Intermediate Algebra (MATH-152, MATH-153, MATH-155) at 42 percent. Forty-two percent of students were placed into basic skills math (Algebra I or lower). Seventeen percent of the students placed into California State University transferable math courses (MATH-156, MATH-159, MATH-181) or higher.

The ESL test places students into an ESL Reading/Writing course and an ESL Listening/Speaking course. From fall 2010 to fall 2011, placements into ESL-183RW peaked at 65 percent and then began to decline. During that same time period placements into ESL-181RW ranged between 39 percent and 73 percent. Spring 2011 also had a high percentage of students placing into ESL-183LS and Clear.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**II.A.1.b. The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
Faculty members incorporate a variety of teaching methodologies to deliver course content to meet the diverse educational needs of the College’s student population. The College offers courses face-to-face; in a hybrid format which combines face-to-face and distance education; and in a fully distance education format. As part of the curriculum approval process, faculty members select the appropriate methods for delivering their course material. The course outline of record (COR) requires faculty members to list the primary methods of instruction used to deliver the approved course content. These pedagogical methods may include lecture, laboratory, discussion, demonstration, audiovisual, seminar, self-paced, independent study, preceptoring, collaborative learning, distance education, web-enhanced, or other specified method.

Delivery methods are evaluated in part during the six-year course review cycle, by course assessments, peer evaluations, and student surveys. Faculty who present their course assessment projects at a SLOAC meeting receive peer input on their course learning outcomes and methodologies when applicable. The faculty evaluation process provides additional opportunities for the faculty to receive feedback related to delivery methods from the academic dean and/or peer faculty who conduct classroom observations. Learning College Week, attendance at professional conferences, and individual projects also provide faculty opportunities to explore and expand their knowledge related to current innovations in content delivery and modes of instruction.

In 2008 the College opened the Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology. This state-of-the-art facility provides faculty with flexible learning environments that facilitate incorporating various instructional methodologies. Wireless access is available throughout the Newark campus, allowing faculty to incorporate technology into their delivery methods. In addition faculty augment face-to-face instruction with web-enhanced materials available via Blackboard, the course management system used by the College. With the passing of the general obligation bond Measure G in 2010, the College is excited by the opportunity to design and create learning spaces on the Fremont campus which will enable faculty to implement innovative and current learning pedagogies. During the fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters the College conducted surveys, focus group meetings, and end user group meetings to discuss and gather College wide input leading to the vision for the new Academic Core structures on the Fremont campus.
SELF-EVALUATION

According to the 2013 student survey 85.5 percent of the students who responded to the question “the quality of instruction is excellent” indicated a strong yes or yes. Comparably 82.6 percent of the students felt their instructors are responsive to their individual needs and 86.2 percent reported that their instructors encourage active and participative involvement in class.

As indicated by the 2013 Faculty Survey (II.A.23), faculty members are incorporating a variety of teaching methods into their courses. When asked to identify instructional methods used in courses they teach (Question 51) the top six responses of the 125 faculty respondents were: lecture (90.4 percent), group discussion (86.4 percent), group work (78.4 percent), multimedia presentations (72.8 percent), demonstrations (64.8 percent), and collaborative learning (61.6 percent). Also worth noting is that 61.6 percent of surveyed faculty use supplemental online materials.

Presentations at SLOAC highlight faculty using a variety of teaching methods. For example, ESL and Spanish faculty use interactive online tools such as Voice Threads, Facebook, and YouTube to share student work. Health Sciences and Biotechnology faculty have created rubrics for assessing skills related to industry needs. Multimedia faculty are incorporating a two minute short story video assignment into their digital media course, and Environmental Studies faculty are using interactive web tools to have students measure their individual ecological footprint (II.A.24).

As evidenced by faculty development workshop attendance summary (II.A.25), faculty continue to participate in workshops that provide opportunities to learn about innovative pedagogies to incorporate within their courses. The following are some examples of faculty development activities offered during the 2012-2013 academic year: Incorporating Laboratory Research in Biotechnology; Creating a Social Presence in the Online Classroom; Algebra Workshop; Facebook and Social Media; English Reading and Writing Composition Faculty Workshop; Learning Disability Simulation Activity; Helpful Resources for Student Success; and English Learning Center Workshop.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

None

II.A.1.c. The institution identifies student-learning outcomes for courses programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

SLOs are identified for all courses, certificates, and degrees, and the faculty regularly assess student achievement of those outcomes and uses assessment results to make improvements. SLOs are included in official COR and are housed in the CurricUNET® Course and Program Approval module (II.A.11). Program SLOs are also housed in CurricUNET®, in both the Course Approval module and in the Program and Services Review module (II.A.11, II.A.26). Course SLOs are mapped to program SLOs in departments by an SLO Matrix in the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module as part of the Program and Services Review process (II.A.19). Degree and certificate SLOs are also listed in the catalog (II.A.27).

SLOs are developed, reviewed, and approved by faculty and academic deans for courses, degrees, and certificates on a regular basis, as part of the course review process, which is on a six-year cycle, and as part of the Program and Services Review process. These processes are described in the SLOA Framework Document (II.A.9). The Curriculum Committee,
which is comprised of representative faculty from each division and is chaired by a faculty member, oversees the course and program (certificate and associate degree) approval process. Curriculum Committee minutes, which are posted on the committee’s website, list approved revisions to courses, degrees, and certificates. Approved changes to course SLOs can be found in CORs within the CurricUNET® Course and Program Approval module; approved changes to SLOs for courses, degrees, and certificates are also included in the Curriculum Committee minutes (II.A.10).

Within the context of the previously described master course list assessment, course SLO assessment is done each semester by faculty. All courses and course clusters on the master course list assessment are to be assessed over a four-year cycle. Course SLO assessments are tracked and recorded each semester and assessment data and improvement results are attached to Program and Services Reviews, which are housed in the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module. Program (degree and certificate) SLO assessment is done by faculty as part of the Program and Services Review process, and results and planned improvements are updated and recorded each fall semester in the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module. The Framework Document describes the SLO assessment processes (II.A.9). SLOAC includes faculty and academic deans from all instructional areas and is co-chaired by a faculty member and the vice president, academic affairs. SLO assessment tracking charts are managed by the co-chairs of SLOAC and are posted on the SLOAC website, along with the master course list assessment and featured faculty assessment presentations. SLOAC minutes are posted on the SLOAC website (II.A.16) with a record of faculty assessment presentations, including dialogue about the assessment. As part of Program and Services Review, PIOs are identified each fall semester and linked to budget planning. PIOs are based on achievement data and SLO assessment results and housed in the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module. The PIO process is described in the Framework Document and in the Planning and Program Review section of the president/superintendent’s (president) office website. Budget decisions related to PIOs and assessment are included in Budget Manager meeting minutes, and are discussed at Budget Committee and College Council Meetings (II.A.28). The Budget Committee reports to the College Council.

There is widespread dialogue about assessment results and identification of gaps. The focus of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Action Plan (2011-2013) has been achievement of proficiency and sustainability levels, as defined by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness. Dialogue about assessment results occurs on an ongoing basis at department meetings, as well as through ongoing email exchanges among faculty and staff. Dialogue is also recorded in department meeting minutes (II.A.29). Dialogue about assessment results also occurs on an institutional level at SLOAC meetings, which are scheduled five times per semester. Assessment projects are presented to the committee at each SLOAC meeting, which promotes dialogue about assessment. Presentations are included in SLOAC meeting minutes and are posted on the SLOAC website. Assessment presentations are also featured in a separate section on the SLOAC website (II.A.16, II.A.24).

In addition, the entire academic community engages in dialogue about SLOs and assessment during Learning College Week held at the beginning of each semester at a one-day workshop entitled Get it Done Day, which is devoted to faculty and staff work and dialogue on SLO assessment and Program and Services Review. Assessment project reports are included in or attached to CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module or linked to appropriate websites from the module (II.A.26, II.A.30).
SELF-EVALUATION

Improvements in the assessment process since the last accreditation visit include an expansion of SLOAC to include academic deans and faculty from all seven academic divisions, as well as the dean and a faculty member from the Counseling Department. The decision to expand the scope of the committee evolved from a need to make assessment a more integrated, integral part of the College culture and from the need to attain proficient and sustainable assessment practices by the 2012 deadline. The vice president, academic affairs coordinates academic dean involvement, and academic deans help coordinate faculty efforts. This involvement at all levels has helped increase the number of course and program assessments being done on an ongoing basis. Course assessments are at 55 percent with plans to reach 100 percent by 2014, and program assessments are at 91 percent. Course and program assessments are now clearly tracked and documented each semester (for courses) and annually (for programs), with faculty reporting to academic deans, and academic deans reporting to the SLOAC co-chairs, who then update reports on the SLOAC website (II.A.16). The SLOAC co-chairs also update the master course list assessment each semester (II.A.18), based on information reported by faculty to academic deans. This new tracking and documentation process has been in place since 2011 and has helped with overall organization of the assessment process. Reporting and documenting processes are being assessed by SLOAC in 2013 to continue to streamline the process.

Since the last accreditation visit, a Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Action Plan (2011-2013) was established to increase assessments, streamline processes, increase College wide dialogue, and provide support for assessment efforts (II.A.31). The plan led to the development of the rationale for master course list and the master course list assessment (II.A.18, II.A.32); a four-year course assessment cycle (II.A.9); an ongoing Program and Services Review cycle to link budget planning to Program and Services Review; a course assessment section of the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module; and the annual PIO process (II.A.33), which links assessment results to Program and Services Review and planning. SLOAC has increased the number of faculty presentations of assessment projects at its meetings to an average of ten presentations per semester (approximately 26 presentations have been given from 2011-2013), which has increased dialogue, provided models of assessment, and has provided a forum for faculty and staff to have their work shared (II.A.24). As described previously, Get it Done Day is devoted to SLO assessment and Program and Services Review, which has led to more dialogue, more support, more efficient use of time, and more communication on assessment efforts. Participation at Get it Done Day was over 90 percent in fall 2012 and over 70 percent in spring 2013 (II.A.34).

Planning and Program and Services Review processes are assessed through the Process Assessment Committee (PAC) (II.A.35). PAC, which is comprised of administrators and faculty leaders, was originally formed to comply with accreditation standards. In 2008 the Process Assessment Committee (PAC) developed the PIO process and made Program and Services Review ongoing in order to connect more directly with the annual budget and planning cycles (II.A.36). In 2011-2012, PAC assessed the PIO process and revised it to make it less cumbersome (II.A.37). In March and April 2013, in response to concerns about workflow and workload, PAC assessed the Program and Services Review processes and review cycles. PAC recommended revisions to the Program and Services Review cycle and streamlining the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module the College uses to standardize and gather data related to all Program and Services Reviews. Assessment processes and cycles for course SLOs and program SLOs have been revised by the SLOAC and PAC, as well (II.A.9, II.A.31).
Specific assessment results have led to the revision and alignment of course SLOs and program SLOs in the Math, Psychology, Multimedia, and English departments in 2012-2013, and in the creation of pilot lab programs for developmental writing and reading in the Deaf Studies and English departments in 2011 and 2013, respectively. Course improvements from assessments include the following examples:

**Chart 2: Course Assessment Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ART-103A</strong> Survey of World Art History — Prehistoric Through 1300 C.E.</td>
<td>Developed a series of YouTube videos and redesigned worksheets and study guides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOL-101B</strong> Principles of Biology — Organisms and Systems</td>
<td>No changes. Will reassess a second time before determining if revisions area needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOT-101</strong> Environmental Biotechnology Research Projects</td>
<td>Exploring the possibility of revising prerequisites. Will reassess after one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHEM-109</strong> Biochemistry for Health Science and Biotechnology</td>
<td>Full-time faculty assigned to teach and provide curriculum leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS-118</strong> Introduction to Assembly Language Programming</td>
<td>No changes. Assessment indicates SLO is being met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECS-307A</strong> Practicum — Field Experience</td>
<td>Introducing new assessment tool recommended by statewide organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGL-101C</strong> Critical Thinking and Composition</td>
<td>No changes in curriculum or in teaching methods as assessment indicated overall success in all outcomes. Revising the number of SLOs as part of six year course review cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESL-183LS</strong> Listening and Speaking, Level III</td>
<td>Revised curriculum. New technologies and teaching strategies have been introduced (such as use of digital recordings, Voicethreads).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIN-251</strong> Fitness for Life</td>
<td>Curriculum modifications by re-designing specific assignments related to SLO being assessed (II.A.38).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSP-101</strong> Learning Skills: Writing Fundamentals</td>
<td>Implement assessment tool the first day of class to determine appropriate knowledge and skill level. Emphasize to students the necessity of using accommodations for test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATH-151</strong> Algebra I</td>
<td>Use results of initial assessment for early interventions and encourage students who do poorly to seek out additional help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUS-103</strong> Fundamentals of Music</td>
<td>Explore moving course from fully distance education to web-enhanced format. Maintain short term six week format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHIL-107</strong> Practical Reasoning</td>
<td>Curriculum revisions, modification of exams to improve SLO assessments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-nine target courses for GE Plan A SLO assessment have been identified based on student enrollment patterns, and assessment is being done for 100 percent of the 18 GE Plan A area SLOs (II.A.39). To date, 30 of the 39 target GE courses have been assessed (II.A.39). The GE Committee has also worked to clarify GE Plan A approval and reaffirmation processes as part of the six-year course review process. This process now requires a written rationale of how the course meets the GE SLOs for the GE area, as well as an explanation of how these SLOs will be assessed. The GE Committee regularly reviews these rationales at their monthly committee meetings and engages in dialogue about assessment and course curriculum as part of this process (II.A.40). The GE Committee revised all of the GE area SLOs in 2011; there are now 18 GE Plan A SLOs for seven areas. In 2011-2012 the committee reaffirmed 38 courses for their GE status and approved six new courses for GE Plan A. Three courses were removed from the GE Plan A plan as part of the committee’s assessment process (II.A.40).

SLOAC has surveyed faculty annually for the past several years to determine the types of assessment techniques being used. The table below indicates the results for 2011 and 2012. During spring 2012, 217 faculty members responded, an increase from 196 in spring 2011 (II.A.41).

### Table 28: Faculty Assessment Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Technique</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test to promote critical thinking</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill demonstration in relation to case scenarios</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common exams across sections requiring key application concepts learned</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentations or speeches</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team presentations</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of course content to analyze and resolve real life problems</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research papers</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Project</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect assessments such as surveys, discussion groups or interviews</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written analysis of a course issue in relation to specific criteria</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student designed and executed experiments or research projects</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotapes, placement test, theater or dance performances, and outside industry or certification test</td>
<td>less than 20%</td>
<td>less than 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the ACCJC rubric for Proficiency and Sustainability in SLOs as framework, SLOAC members have been surveyed on how well required levels of SLO assessment implementation are being met in their areas. Surveys on implementation of assessment techniques show improvement in all areas from 2011 to 2012. The 2012 survey indicated that all areas were fully implemented, nearly implemented, or that implementation was underway. Inclusion of dialogue was the area with the highest percentages, followed by assessments in place and systematized. Student awareness of SLOs showed the lowest percentages, indicating an area that can be a focus for improvement going forward (II.A.41).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.**

**II.A.2.a. The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College’s Mission Statement, EMP, program review data, and enrollment management data are incorporated in the decision process to determine program and course offerings. Members of the Curriculum Committee, GE Committee, DE Committee, and the academic deans assure the quality of credit courses regardless of the delivery mode or location. The academic deans, faculty when applicable, and the program staff assure the quality of not-for-credit courses offered through Contract and Community Education. The College offers courses and programs for transfer, basic skills, Contract and Community Education, and international and study abroad.

Established procedures are used to design, identify learning outcomes, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. Faculty members have created SLOs for all credit courses and programs (II.A.4, II.A.11). Guidance for development of SLOs in career technical education (CTE) programs is sought from advisory committees or by researching industry standards (II.A.4, II.A.42).

Credit course SLOs and program SLOs are reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee as part of the course and program approval process (II.A.10). The screening process requires that a Curriculum Committee member meet individually with the faculty member who originated the revisions and involves a conversation about how the course SLO and program SLOs are aligned. Curriculum Committee members provide support for faculty during the screening process by assuring that course SLOs are supported by the content, reinforced by the assignments, and finally, in connecting methods of evaluation back to the course SLOs. This process helps faculty identify course SLO assessment opportunities by linking assignments to methods of evaluation, and finally to the course SLOs. Additionally, Curriculum Committee members provide guidance at the department level by assisting faculty with
the development of course SLOs and emphasizing the importance of aligning course SLOs to program SLOs.

Faculty members play a central role in establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs through the assessment of SLOs. SLOAC (II.A.16) is an integral component in working with faculty to fine tune SLO assessments and providing a platform for College wide dialogue of assessments and improvement of student learning.

Community Education and Contract Education have established procedures in place for designing courses and identifying learning outcomes for courses offered through their respective programs (II.A.43). Emphasis in course offerings through Community Education and Contract Education specifically support the components of the College’s Mission Statement for instruction in career entry, economic development, and personal enrichment. Both programs also have a direct link to the College’s Strategic Goals 2, 3, and 4. Community Education and Contract Education programs participate in the College’s Program and Service Review process and include student learning impacts (II.A.44, II.A.45).

College faculty are consulted on relevant courses for design and SLO development for Contract and Community Education courses, and when available, provide instruction. When necessary, industry experts are consulted for Contract Education courses to substantiate the content and rigor in meeting industry standards. Instructors for Contract and Community Education courses are selected based on meeting minimum qualifications for faculty hiring established by the state, and/or have industry expertise in their respective fields.

The College’s English Language Institute (ELI) is part of the Community Education program and offers intensive English courses for international students who have not yet met the College’s English language admissions requirements. The ELI consists of four levels, from beginning to low advanced Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL score of 470-490), with the curriculum comprising all language skill areas: grammar, composition, reading/vocabulary, and listening/speaking/pronunciation. All of the 16 ELI courses have student learning outcomes designed for students to be successful at the next course level and to matriculate into College level courses. Assessment of outcomes are currently being reviewed and will be implemented with the ELI Program Review (II.A.46).

The College’s Study Abroad Program encourages the development of intercultural and international understandings. The program offers travel-study courses overseas and domestically. The program is currently administered through the Office of International Programs and Services with strategic oversight and guidance provided by the International Education Committee. The committee membership includes an academic dean, full-time and adjunct faculty representatives under the auspices of the Faculty Senate, a student appointed by the Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC), and the director, international programs and services. The committee is part of the College Council governance process. A Study Abroad Program Handbook is currently being developed (II.A.47).

In addition to the programs described above the College is a member of the South Bay Regional Public Safety Training Consortium. The consortium is funded by various community colleges regionally to provide vocational specific training which may require special facilities, special training conditions, or is presented outside of the schedules of regular college classes. Vocational training courses are offered in various areas including, but not limited to, the following: Correctional Officer; Law Enforcement Officer; Reserve Police Officer; Dispatcher; Fire Technology; Probation Officer; Juvenile Hall Counselor (II.A.48).
SELF-EVALUATION
Faculty members evaluate the quality of courses and programs on an ongoing basis to ensure continued rigor and quality. Courses and programs are updated at least every six years as a part of the curriculum review process. Review of courses by California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) campuses as a part of course articulation and transfer confirms that rigor and quality of courses is appropriate.

Faculty members develop and assess SLOs for all courses and programs. SLOs are developed by discipline faculty, reviewed by the academic dean, and approved by the Curriculum Committee as part of the course review process. Faculty members continually evaluate SLOs and make adjustments to learning outcomes, course content, and assignments to improve student learning. Through the Program and Services Review process, faculty link course SLOs to program SLOs through the use of the SLO Matrix, which allows for course level assessments to be used to evaluate the program and its effectiveness.

During Learning College Week in January 2013 several faculty members led a faculty only dialogue discussion about the workload issues related to course SLO assessment and Program and Services Review. Faculty members then reported the findings to the administration. As a result PAC decided to conduct a focused assessment of the Program and Services Review process and develop recommendations for improvement. In March 2013 PAC began meeting to look at improving the process. Administrators and faculty agreed the process and expectations of the Program and Services Review process and its annual updates needed improvement and revisions. As a result of the PAC assessment changes were approved by the College Council in April 2013 and were implemented during fall 2013. These changes include a three-year Program and Services Review cycle being established and the 90 Program and Services Review areas being divided into three groups with approximately 30 programs or service areas conducting the comprehensive review each year, with the cycle repeating thereafter. PIO updates based on data and course and program level assessments will occur annually. Annual PIO’s will continue to link to annual budget planning.

Community Education and Contract Education Programs are governed by Board Policy 4400 and Administrative Procedure 4400. Community Education is the larger of the two programs and each year serves over 1500 students in the Ohlone for Kids Summer Enrichment Program, over 1,000 students in the Youth Sports Camps and Clinics, and more than 400 students in the general Community Education program and Workforce Development programs. Community Education offers courses year round in person and through hybrid and various distance education formats. Community Education, Contract Education, and academic departments have partnered on several workforce training and grant related course offerings. Most recently the Business and Supervision Department (BSM) customized curriculum for a series of workshops to be delivered on site at Alameda County Water District offices located in Fremont, with workshops taught by BSM department faculty. Learning outcomes are identified for each course and for the series of workshops and will be assessed upon completion (II.A.49).

In response to displaced and unemployed workers, the College—in collaboration with the Department of Labor, local Workforce Investment Boards, the College’s One-Stop Career Center, neighboring community colleges, and the College’s Environmental Studies program—has contributed curriculum including SLOs and instructional expertise for the Home Energy and Retrofit Occupations (HERO) grant (II.A.50). Courses are offered at the College’s Newark campus, which has achieved LEED Platinum Certification,
the highest level from achievable for green buildings from the United States Green Building Association.

The ELI program consists of 16 courses with the curriculum comprising all language skill areas: grammar, composition, reading/vocabulary, and listening/speaking/pronunciation. Course SLOs emphasize areas deemed most important for students to be successful at the next level. All courses are currently taught by instructors who have a master’s degree and/or graduate certificate in the field of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) or Linguistics. The ELI program consistently enrolls about 75 students per semester with the majority of the students coming from China, Vietnam, Korea, and Japan.

The Study Abroad program has been impacted by budget constraints and as a result has temporarily suspended the semester long study abroad offerings. From spring 2011 to summer 2013 the College offered short term trips to Egypt; Italy and Greece; and London and Paris. A total of 75 students participated in the Study Abroad credit courses focused on English and Communication.

The College is currently in the process of strengthening the academic support of the Study Abroad program, the ELI, faculty exchange program, and internationalizing the curriculum by creating and filling a new position of dean, international programs and services. The position will strengthen the academic portions of the program with administrative oversight and will offer the opportunity to enhance the ELI curriculum so it flows better into the College’s credit courses.

The College is one of eleven regional community colleges that participate in the South Bay Regional Public Safety Training Consortium. Consortium courses offered by the College appear in the printed class schedule and WebAdvisor so any interested students have access to information about the consortium courses. Information in the printed class schedule and WebAdvisor includes a description of the course, course requirements, unit value, meeting times and location, and other relevant information. During the past five years the College’s FTES commitment to the consortium has ranged from 217 to 268 FTES.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student-learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Appropriate competency levels and measurable SLOs for courses, certificates, and degree programs are determined within departments by faculty working in conjunction with the academic dean. Also, in the case of CTE programs, input is sought from advisory committees comprised of experts from the field. Faculty members are hired and evaluated based on their expertise and experience in their given field, and curriculum development, including SLO development and assessment, is part of the faculty role (II.A.51).

Faculty must review and update courses a minimum of every six years. This curriculum review process includes a review of course SLOs. As of fall 2013, program review occurs on a three-year cycle, which includes a review of program SLOs as well as a review of assessment activities for SLOs at all levels of the program. Course SLO assessment is on a
four-year cycle (as of 2013) and program SLO assessment is ongoing annually, with comprehensive reports of assessments reported a minimum of every three years (II.A.52). Course SLOs are provided in all course syllabi, and program SLOs are published in the catalog and on department websites (II.A.4). Course, certificate, and degree curriculum and assessment details are also housed in the CurricUNET® Course and Program Approval module and the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module (II.A.11, II.A.26). Student achievement and success rates are measured each year by the Institutional Research and Planning Office and made available on the College website, to the Board, and to department faculty and academic deans for use in the SLO assessment and Program and Services Review processes.

Industry advisory committees are in place for all 20 CTE programs, supporting the “career entry” emphasis of the Mission Statement. Advisory committees provide program specific faculty with direct input related to curriculum and program design, industry specific competencies and skill levels desired for employment, and current and future industry trends. Advisory committee membership, in addition to academic deans and faculty, includes subject matter experts from industry liaisons, adjunct faculty currently working in industry, faculty from baccalaureate universities and other community colleges, and when available city economic development liaisons. The advisory committees meet at least once a year and the membership lists are approved by the Board of Trustees and published in the catalog (II.A.52, II.A.53).

Faculty also engage in a minimum of twelve hours of professional development activities every year in order to help keep expertise honed and current; most faculty far exceed this minimum amount. The average number of professional development hours per faculty member was 24 hours in 2011-2012 (II.A.25). Faculty members regularly attend professional conferences, take advanced courses, and also lead workshops at the College and at professional conferences (II.A.54). Faculty report on professional development activities at department meetings, during Learning College Week activities at the beginning of each semester, and as part of their self-evaluations in the faculty evaluation process. Staying current in their fields and expanding expertise is an expected part of faculty responsibilities (II.A.51). This continuous process helps faculty maintain appropriate competency levels and SLOs in curriculum at all levels.

The College has structured the program review process to incorporate the results of course SLO assessments and program SLO assessments using the SLO matrix which shows the relationships between course and program SLOs. For degrees and certificates, competency levels are reviewed within the program review analysis by incorporating data from the recently revised program review data dashboard (II.A.19).

SELF-EVALUATION

Analysis of program achievement through data including success and retention rates is an integral part of the Program and Services Review process, along with course SLO and program SLO assessment (II.A.26, II.A.55). The annual PIO process has been developed and incorporated into Program and Services Review to link more directly with budget planning. PIOs stem from assessment results and achievement data analysis (II.A.26, II.A.34, II.A.56). The CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module is used for Program and Services Review, and annual student achievement and success data are made available by the Institutional Research and Planning Office for use in Program and Services Review (II.A.55). A course SLO assessment page has also been added to the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module to help link to the overall Program and Services Review process. The CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module is being reviewed and redesigned to help streamline the Program.
and Services Review and assessment process. This will allow for more effective reports and more robust analysis of achievement data and assessment results.

CTE programs maintain close relationships with employers in the workforce through the advisory committees. A prime example of how advisory committee input is being used can be found within the biotechnology program. The Biotechnology Performance Assessment Rubric, designed from input received from the Biotechnology Advisory Committee, is used throughout the biotechnology program as a way to assess students’ skill levels and cognitive thinking (II.A.43, II.A.57).

The Registered Nursing Program also regularly meets with advisory committees that include local hospital and clinical staff that are working in partnership with the program. In addition to learning theory, students’ clinical work is an integral part of their program, and Registered Nursing faculty and the academic dean meet with hospital nurses and staff to communicate trends and concerns and ensure the inclusion of expected skills and activities within the program and for the preparedness of graduates for jobs in the field. Registered Nursing National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX) pass rates were at 96 percent in 2009-2010, 90 percent in 2010-2011, and 94 percent in 2011-2012, which helps show the success of advisory committee involvement in the curriculum process (II.A.24, II.A.58).

The Computers, Networks, and Emerging Technology (CNET) Department recently developed a new set of courses for implementation in fall 2013, including a course on Cloud Infrastructure and Services. The creation of this course was based on input from industry professionals and a perceived need for updated preparation for jobs in the field (II.A.44, II.A.59).

The Multimedia Department, which also regularly meets with an advisory committee, revised their course curriculum in 2012 to include professionalism and teamwork as part of their course and program SLOs. These changes were based on industry recommendations, in order to help students be more prepared for what is expected in the workforce (II.A.24, II.A.60).

Curriculum improvements, based on assessment results and achievement analysis, have been shared at SLOAC meetings since 2011, and are documented in Program and Services Reviews and on the SLOAC website. Approximately 26 assessment presentations have been shared by faculty at SLOAC meetings as of the spring of 2013 (II.A.24). In addition to presentations at the SLOAC meeting, faculty have been presenting their SLO assessment results at the Board meetings (II.A.61).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.2.c. High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study. These programs culminate in identified SLOs leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with the College mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated SLOs.
Faculty expertise is the driving force behind ensuring that all courses are appropriately using widely accepted norms in higher education. The articulation officer checks the transferability of courses to the UC and CSU systems, and course syllabi are kept on file in the academic deans’ offices to address questions about the transferability to other higher education systems. Faculty members engage in dialogue through their department Program and Services Review. The program and services review and course review processes both systematically examine the breadth, depth, rigor, and synthesis of learning.

Courses are created based on factors including new requirements from transfer institutions, responding to industry standards, relationship to College goals, and assessment results. The College is currently working on completing 22 associate degrees for transfer in response to new state laws and regulations. The degrees guarantee transfer to the CSU at the upper division level.

SELF-EVALUATION
In the Spring 2013 Student Survey, 85.5 percent of those responding answered Strong Yes or Yes in response to the statement “The quality of instruction is excellent at Ohlone.” In response to the statement “My instructors are highly skilled teachers and come to classes well prepared,” 91.4 percent of those expressing an opinion answered Strong Yes or “Yes.” These responses show a clear indication that, from the student perspective, this standard is being met (II.A.7).

As noted in II.A.1.a, the College was above both the statewide and peer group averages on all seven of the 2012 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) performance indicators (II.A.62). This measure is an additional confirmation of the College’s high-quality instruction and completion rates.

The vibrant dialogue the College engaged in to address the issues surrounding workload and Program and Services Review as well as course review shows a dedication and commitment to ensuring that programs conduct a meaningful evaluation to ensure depth and rigor.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.A.2.d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The learning styles of students are assessed by faculty both formally and informally. Faculty work closely with the Disabled Students and Programs Office (DSPS) to assist students who have accommodation needs and/or a learning disability. Courses are offered using a wide range of instructional formats, which include traditional in-person instruction, self-paced courses, learning communities such as the Puente program, short-term courses, hybrid courses which combine in-person and DE, and fully distance education courses. To meet student needs, the College offers courses throughout the day, during the evening, and on weekends.

An ongoing dialogue about delivery modes and teaching methods is demonstrated in a variety of ways. As described in detail in previous sections, SLOAC regularly discusses teaching and learning strategies and SLO assessment. SLOAC meets five times per semester and each meeting usually includes presentations from two different faculty members on the types of delivery modes they use and how they are assessing SLOs. Presentations have come from a
wide variety of departments and at least one department from each division has made a presentation (II.A.24).

The Faculty Development Committee plans Learning College Week before the start of each semester to include topics related to innovative teaching methodologies that support student learning. Topics are selected by conducting a faculty survey to assess the effectiveness of Learning College Week and to provide guidance for future events, and through dialogue with faculty and academic deans related to professional development activities. Examples of workshops held during this week include:

- **Lightning Rounds of Teaching Innovation:**
  “A high energy workshop that will introduce you to a collection of web-based tools and demonstrate how your peers are using them to support student learning.”

- **Facebook and Social Media:**
  “Want to build a sense of class community in your distance education or hybrid/blended courses? Like the idea of reaching your on-the-go students easily? Just plain curious about how social media is integrating into education? Let me show you how a private Facebook Group provides my distance education Spanish 101 course with an interactive virtual classroom.”

- **Screen Capture Using Jing:**
  “If now you want to add even more ways for your students to learn with the help of the latest technology, then this workshop is for you. The College will work with Jing (free!) to create screen captures and Picmonkey (free!) to work with pictures.”

**SELF-EVALUATION**

In the Spring 2013 Student Survey, 82.8 percent of those giving an opinion answered Strong Yes or Yes in response to the statement, “My instructors give practical examples of how theories apply to real life” and 82.6 percent of those giving an opinion answered Strong Yes or Yes in response to the statement, “My instructors are responsive to my individual needs.” These responses show a clear indication that, from the student perspective, this standard is being met (II.A.7).

The results of the faculty survey related to the 2013 Learning College Week were that 73 percent of the respondents rated the events either excellent or above average; 20 percent rated the events average; and no respondents rated the events extremely poor or below average. The majority of the comments for events faculty would like to see offered in the future centered on having more technology related events; more pedagogy-themed events that would foster colleague collaboration and provide new teaching techniques; and workshops addressing “crisis-type” or “contingency planning” issues such as campus safety, emergency preparedness, and helping veterans who may be having transition or mental health issues (II.A.63).

In 2011 the College submitted a Substantive Change Proposal to offer 12 associate degrees and 16 certificates of achievement through a distance education format. The proposal was approved by the ACCJC in 2012. On average the College offers 110 sections each fall and spring semester and 50 sections during the summer using a DE delivery mode. Depending on the semester 30-35 full-time faculty teach one or more courses via a DE format, with the remaining DE courses being taught by adjunct faculty. The DE Committee recently changed its processes from approving individual instructors to teach DE courses to approving courses to be taught using a DE methodology. The academic deans ensure that faculty teaching using a DE format have the necessary expertise to do so based on past DE teaching experiences, professional development related to teaching distance education, and preferable achievement of an distance education teaching certificate. Faculty
assigned to a DE course are also referred to the eCampus support staff for training and design.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Established procedures are used to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. At the design level, faculty members have created SLOs for all courses and programs. Where appropriate, SLOs are developed with the guidance of advisory committees or in alignment with industry standards (II.A.57).

Course SLOs and program SLOs are reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee as part of the course and program approval process. Additionally Curriculum Committee members provide guidance and direction when developing new or refining existing SLOs through the screening process (II.A.10). Faculty members play a central role in establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs through the assessment of SLOs. SLOAC is an integral component in working with faculty to fine tune SLO assessments and providing a platform for wide dialogue of assessments and improvement of student learning.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Faculty members evaluate the quality of courses and programs on an ongoing basis. Courses and programs are updated at least every six years as a part of the curriculum review process. Through the articulation process with CSU and UC campuses and through the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) approval process, the rigor and quality of course offerings are reaffirmed.

Faculty members are responsible for developing and accessing SLOs for all courses and programs. SLOs are developed by discipline faculty, reviewed by the academic dean, and approved by the Curriculum Committee as part of the course SLO process.

Faculty continually evaluate SLOs and make adjustments to learning outcomes, course content, and assignments to improve student learning (II.A.3). Through Program and Services Review, faculty link course SLOs to program SLOs through the use of the SLO Matrix, which allows for course level assessments to be used to evaluate the program and its effectiveness (II.A.19).

In May 2012 the Curriculum Committee revised the course approval process (II.A.64) to improve the completion of course revisions and additional approvals. In the previous approval process courses were skipping steps. The approval process ensures that faculty, academic deans, the articulation officer, and the GE and DE committees have the opportunity to review the rigor of the course and that the course is in compliance with accepted norms in higher education.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
II.A.2.f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student-learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Standard I details the system of ongoing integrated planning, with Program and Services Review at the heart of the process. As stated earlier in Standard II.A, faculty members are engaged in ongoing course SLO assessment on a four-year cycle. Student achievement data and program SLOs are assessed on a three-year cycle. Course review takes place a minimum of every six years and includes an evaluation of the relevancy of course SLOs and program SLOs. The CurricUNET® Course and Program module serves as a hub for course SLO and program SLO assessment, as do various department websites (II.A.26). Data for analysis in the Program and Services Review process are made available on the Institutional Research and Planning Office website (II.A.56). Ten SLOAC meetings are held each year featuring faculty presentations and dialogue on SLO assessment (II.A.16, II.A.30, II.A.65). The EMP serves as the driver for the College Strategic Plan, the DFMP, and the Technology Master Plan. These key plans are all integrated with the mission and values of the College. This integrated system of plans served as the foundation for the successful Measure G bond campaign. The planning for the transformation of the learning environment at the Fremont campus funded by Measure G is driven by the EMP and integrated with the overall planning and evaluation system (II.A.2, II.A.66, II.A.67).

SELF-EVALUATION
Since the last accreditation self-evaluation report, a new five-year College Strategic Plan (2010-2015) (II.A.66) has been developed, with an updated set of strategic goals and objectives. The EMP (2010-2015) (II.A.2), Technology Master Plan (2010) (II.A.68), and DFMP (2012) (II.A.67) have also been updated based on data from assessment and from the updated Environmental Scan (II.A.6). PAC has been created and updated a glossary of planning terminology and has developed the annual PIO prioritization process to more closely link annual budget planning with Program and Services Review (II.A.37). The CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module has been developed and refined. Pilot programs began to use the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module in 2010, and by 2012 all departments, including instructional disciplines, student services, instructional services, administrative services, and the departments reporting to the president, had uploaded, launched, and approved their Program and Services Reviews in the module (II.A.26). The results of Program and Services Review and PIO’s are designed to improve student learning.

Since 2008, the scope of SLOAC has been expanded to include academic deans and the vice president, academic affairs as co-chair. Stemming from the new Two-Year SLOA Action Plan (2011-2013), faculty presentations of assessments at SLOAC meetings have been instituted (approximately 26, as of spring 2013). SLOAC has also created the master course list assessment, developed a clear tracking and documentation process for monitoring course assessments, and revised the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module to include course and program assessment sections. A GE Plan A SLO assessment process has been developed, linked to course SLO and program SLO assessment, and committee websites have been updated to make data from assessments and achievement analysis available to appropriate constituencies. Assessment documents are available on the SLOAC website, and
assessments are housed in the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module (II.A.24, II.A.31, II.A.26).

A significant application of assessment and the EMP has impacted District facilities in both Fremont and Newark. In 2010 Measure G, a $349 million general obligation bond initiative was passed by voters, authorizing funds for facilities improvements, including major repairs, renovations, and construction projects, primarily at the Fremont campus. Since then, the Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee has met on a quarterly basis to ensure bond funds are used as indicated to the voters. An architectural firm was hired to design the building projects, and committees have formed, including user groups, to gather input and create a vision for campus-wide improvements. Surveys were also sent out to student users for additional input, and plans are underway for design of specific structures. A comprehensive project list has been created and a budget for each project has been determined. Temporary sites have been organized for the interim period during construction, and a timeline has been established. Projects include upgrades for earthquake and fire safety, infrastructure, disabled access, and new buildings for classrooms, labs, and offices at the core of the Fremont campus. The proposed plan is expected to take six to ten years to complete (II.A.69).

Since the opening of the Newark campus in spring 2008, continuous annual assessment has taken place and improvements based on results have been put in place regarding the functioning and needs of the facility, in terms of both student and academic services areas, facility maintenance, faculty work space, extra-curricular student activities, food services, Learning Resource Center (LRC) services, and Information Technology support services. A solar installation project was completed to install solar panels above the parking lots, and an overflow parking lot was used to help meet parking needs during the interim period of construction. Project completion is expected by 2014, and the Newark campus facility and technology plans have been linked to the updated DFMP and Technology Master Plan (II.A.67, II.A.68).

During the spring of 2012 the Technology Committee created a timeline and project list for replacement of outdated faculty computers, and replacements began in fall 2012. Plans for improvement continue to be based on assessment of College needs, in terms of classrooms, offices, lab spaces, and both LRCs (II.A.70).

In 2011, the ACCJC approved a Substantive Change Proposal for a number of distance education degree and certificate programs. The Substantive Change Proposal was developed to reflect the increase in the number of distance education courses, certificates, and degrees offered in response to student need. The results of an assessment of the number of certificate and degree offerings which students could achieve by taking more than fifty percent of their courses via distance education demonstrated the need for a Substantive Change Proposal. Results showed that twelve associate degrees and sixteen certificates of achievement could be completed in this format. The proposal was approved through the governance process and approved by the Board of Trustees. ACCJC approved the proposal in June 2011. The Substantive Change and increase in the number of distance education course, certificate, and degree offerings was the result of assessment and achievement analysis based on data from Program and Services Reviews, surveys, and the Environmental Scan (II.A.71).

Following the implementation of the new PIO and Program and Services Review process to link Program and Services Review and assessment more directly and overtly to budget planning, the PAC has been regularly assessing the Program and Services Review and PIO processes. In 2012, based on its assessment, PAC revised the PIO prioritization process to streamline and clarify it, making this task a regular part of
the Budget Committee and College Council processes. The intermediary PIO Committee was dissolved, as this extra layer of review was deemed too cumbersome (II.A.37).

Assessment of strategic goals and objectives takes place annually since the implementation of the College Strategic Plan 2010-2015, through College Council. In 2014-2015, work will begin on renewing the next five-year College Strategic Plan, including updating the strategic goals and objectives. These will continue to be closely aligned with the College vision and mission.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**II.A.2.g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
To assess this standard, a survey of the academic deans was conducted to determine if any departmental course and/or program examinations are in use. No departmental course exams were identified. However, it was determined that the Chemistry Department has instituted a form of exit examination for CHEM-101A and CHEM-101B, General Chemistry. Two program level exams were also identified; one in use by the CnET and the other in the Respiratory Therapy Department (RT).

Previously, there was not a method of objectively determining whether students who completed CHEM-101A and CHEM-101B possessed mastery of SLOs comparable to national levels. The American Chemical Society (ACS) has created standardized exams given in college chemistry courses across the country, allowing colleges to assess the level of mastery of their students. Starting in December 2006 the Chemistry Department began administering ACS standardized exams to better assess student mastery. The Chemistry Department instituted the ACS exam to measure the level of preparation of students taking CHEM-101A; the level of mastery of students who have completed CHEM-101A; and the level of mastery of students who have completed CHEM-101B.

All students in the Cisco Certified Network Associate program (CNET-155A, CNET-155B, CNET-156A, and CNET-156B) take standardized exams. The exams are standardized for worldwide distribution and presented in several different languages. The CNET Department and the CISCO Networking Academy use the results for validation of the SLOs that have been developed. The Academy strives to maintain cultural pluralism in the creation of exams.

The National Board of Respiratory Care (NBRC) Entry-Level Certified Respiratory Therapist (CRT) assessment is designed to objectively measure essential knowledge, skills, and abilities required of entry-level respiratory therapists. The examination consists of multiple-choice questions distributed among three major content areas: clinical data, equipment, and therapeutic procedures. The Respiratory Therapy Department obtains the exams from Applied Measurement Professionals, a professional exam-writing company serving many different disciplines.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
The Chemistry, CNET, and RT departments use national tests and/or models for implementing non-bias departmental and program examinations. Effectiveness in measuring student learning is determined through the Program and Services Review process which includes measuring course SLOs and program SLOs. In addition the RT program has a national accreditation process and licensure test results which further validate student learning.
The results of the chemistry exams are used to provide feedback for course SLO assessment and for curriculum modifications. Results of the exams for the health science programs provide student pass/fail rates. The programs use these results as a measure of student success and to reflect on students’ overall course achievement outcomes throughout the program. Curriculum is adjusted and/or revised if necessary in order to assist students in preparing for the exam. The results of the CNET exams are used to matriculate students to the next course level and to track student success. Completion of the exam is used in part as a capstone assessment indicating that program SLOs have been achieved.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.2.h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The curriculum development and review process is primarily the responsibility of discipline faculty and SLOs are one of the key components of the COR. The Curriculum Committee screening process reinforces the critical nature of the SLOs in the CORs and how they interact and support each other. Each COR is designed around the SLOs and how the different components augment one another. The course content is directly related to the SLOs and is supported by the course assignments. These assignments are then used to assess the student’s achievement of the course SLOs. Faculty members use the achievement of the course SLOs to determine a letter grade. Units of credit are awarded consistently with generally accepted norms in higher education.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The faculty and administration ensure that credit is awarded based on the student’s achievement of the stated SLOs, which appear on the CORs. Through SLO assessment, faculty members modify instructional strategies, as necessary, to improve student learning. Faculty use student achievement of stated SLOs as the primary factor in determining student’s success.

The College meets the standard.

**II.A.2.i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program’s state learning outcomes.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The previous sections of Standard II.A described in detail that degrees and certificates have program SLOs, all learning areas in GE Plan A pattern have SLOs, and there is an ongoing system of assessment in place. The courses within each program are aligned to ensure that program SLOs are met through the completion of the courses that comprise the core requirements of the degree or certificate. Students are awarded the degrees and certificates by satisfactorily completing the necessary courses that align with the program SLOs (II.A.5).

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The Program and Services Review process includes a component for faculty to evaluate and discuss the learning expected of students, and degrees and certificates are adjusted as necessary. Discussions occur at individual
department meetings; during Get It Done Day; within the Curriculum, GE, and SLOAC committees; and in CTE advisory committees. The GE requirement for degrees also ensures that students have met institutional SLOs.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.3. The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.**

**II.A.3.a. An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The GE Plan A philosophy focuses on the personal, cultural, and intellectual growth of students. The GE philosophy, learning area definitions, and SLOs are published in the catalog (II.A.4). There is a well-developed curriculum approval process that relies on faculty expertise. The GE Committee has an established system for approval of courses to be used as part of GE Plan A, as well as the review of courses already approved, which focuses clearly on aligning course SLOs with the related GE Plan A SLOs. GE SLOs are assessed organically as part of the assessments of courses that constitute the target courses taken by most students who complete GE Plan A.

The GE Plan A pattern requires that students complete a minimum of 18 units from each of the seven GE Plan A areas. Courses on GE Plan A represent the main areas of human knowledge: natural sciences; social and behavioral sciences; humanities and fine arts; language and rationality. Students are also required to complete courses in the areas of physical education/wellness, intercultural/international studies, and information competency.

In addition to GE Plan A, there are two additional general education patterns, California State University General Education Breadth (Plan B) and Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (Plan C) (II.A.4). With a few exceptions, courses on Plans B and C coincide with courses on Plan A.

Requests to add a course to GE Plan A are submitted by instructional faculty through the CurricUNET® Course and Program module (II.A.11). Faculty and academic deans review courses for relevance to GE Plan A. Courses on Plan A must reflect the GE Plan A philosophy and the learning area definitions and SLOs. Faculty submit a written rationale, along with the COR. The rationale statement describes how the course content supports each GE SLO, identifies which course SLO aligns with each GE area SLO, and identifies which method of evaluation will be used to assess each GE SLO. Rationales are entered into the GE additional approvals area of the CurricUNET® Course and Program module.

An in-depth review of the COR, course SLOs, and GE rationale statement occurs at monthly GE Committee meetings (II.A.40). The GE Committee forwards its recommendations to the Curriculum Committee for final approval. Courses already on GE Plan A are reviewed every six years as part of the overall course review cycle. Departments also review GE courses as part of the Program and Services Review process. Relevant GE Plan A courses are assessed as part
of the course assessment process, which is on a four-year cycle; however, departments may determine their own best practices for GE assessment, as long as a regular timeline is established.

GE information is communicated to students via the catalog, class schedule, counselors, and other faculty (II.A.72, II.A.73). Faculty members discuss GE issues in GE Committee, Curriculum Committee, and SLOAC meetings, as well as Faculty Senate and department meetings. The catalog describes the general education philosophy and student learning outcomes for each of the seven GE areas. Each area has descriptors which define the area philosophy and SLOs, all of which were created with input from discipline faculty and the GE committee members.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
In 2011 the GE Committee, in coordination with subject area faculty, revised the definitions and SLOs for all seven GE Plan A areas (II.A.74). The definitions and scope of each area are based on state requirements and are individualized to fit with the unique local needs. Particular effort was made to use language that is accessible to students. Notable changes to GE Plan A include the revision of Area VI, formerly Cultural Diversity, to a more inclusive Intercultural/International Studies requirement that reflects the College motto “A World of Cultures United in Learning;” the addition of an SLO for Area II, Social and Behavioral Sciences, that explicitly addresses ethical and civic perspectives; and fewer but more measurable SLOs for each GE area.

Efficient and meaningful approaches to GE assessment have been diligently pursued. In October 2011 a team of 14 faculty and academic deans attended the WASC Retreat on Assessment in Practice. The team was tasked with developing an approach to GE Plan A assessment. An especially useful result of the retreat was the idea to identify high enrollment GE courses as a way to focus assessment efforts (II.A.75). SLOAC meets five times per semester and has been instrumental in developing and cultivating a culture of assessment by showcasing faculty presentations of assessment projects across the curriculum (II.A.16, II.A.24). Methods for keeping track of assessment projects have been developed and are available on the SLOAC website (II.A.16, II.A.33). The GE Committee developed guidelines for faculty to follow as a way to ensure consistency across GE courses (II.A.76). The alignment of course and GE SLOs creates an assessment efficiency in that course and GE SLOs can be assessed at the same time.

Students can graduate with an associate degree using either GE Plan A, Plan B, or Plan C. This chart shows the breakdown by percentage of graduating students for each GE pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 29: General Education Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GE PATTERN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Plan A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Plan B (CSU GE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Plan C (IGETC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total degrees awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Institutional Research and Planning Office, March 2013

The 21 percent drop in students using Plan A over the past five years may be attributed to a number of factors. The students who graduated in 2011-2012 would have started two to three years prior, just when the state budget cuts were starting to be felt, more students were enrolling full time, associate degrees for transfer were looming as a way to clear the log jams at CSUs, and the College was beginning to take the lead among peers as a transfer institution.

Since the courses in GE Plan B and GE Plan C are not locally determined, the question of how these GE patterns are assessed has been raised. For the past three years the GE
Committee has worked to make sure that, where appropriate, courses on Plans B and C are included in GE Plan A. As of 2013, there are only 12 courses on Plans B and C that are not on Plan A. The assessment of GE Plan A courses, for the most part, ensures the assessment of GE courses from Plans B and C.

Although a framework is in place for the assessment of GE, strategies for assessing GE Plan A SLOs as a program and methods for tracking and reporting GE assessment activities should continue to be developed. GE assessment will require on-going coordination with academic deans and faculty. A full-time faculty member has been provided with reassigned time to serve as GE Committee Chair in order to focus more attention on the assessment aspect of GE. The GE Chair, GE Committee, and SLOAC coordinate and evaluate GE assessment.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The SLOAC, GE Committee, and Curriculum Committee will reassess the GE/Institutional Student Learning Outcome assessment framework and methodologies. Any recommend revisions and/or changes to the assessment processes will need to align with the College’s 2015-2020 Strategic Plan. The assessment and planning processes for the College’s 2015-2020 strategic goals and objectives will begin in fall 2014.

**II.A.3.b. A capability to be a productive individual and lifelong learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College includes oral and written communication courses in Area IV, language and rationality, parts A and B. The information competency requirement is included in Area VII. Scientific and quantitative reasoning are included in Area I, natural sciences, and Area IV, language and rationality, part C. Critical analysis and logical thinking are included in Area IV.B, analytical thinking and oral communication. Critical thinking is integrated throughout the curriculum as evidenced by CORs.

Courses on GE Plan A are introductory and integrative and reflect state and transfer requirements. Faculty and academic deans determine the basic content and methodology of traditional areas of human knowledge in GE Plan A. Course outlines are reviewed at the department level and reviewed further at the Curriculum and GE Committee levels. The articulation officer works closely with the CSU and UC systems to ensure the transferability of GE courses.

Computer literacy and information competency are integrated across the curriculum as evidenced by assignments and assessments in course outlines. For example, ENGL-101A, Reading and Written Composition, requires that students submit their research papers in a digital format and complete a research skills module in a fully distance education environment (II.A.77). Information competency has been embedded into COMM-100, Introduction to Communication Theory; HIST-119A and HIST-119B, Bad Girls: Women in America; and SPCH-101, Introduction to Public Speaking. Successful completion of these courses fulfills the GE Plan A Information Competency requirement.

Many courses include web-based components and students use productivity software such as Word, PowerPoint, and Excel throughout their coursework. A significant number of faculty members use the Blackboard course management
system to post syllabi and other relevant course documents for students to access electronically. The information competency requirement necessitates that students conduct research in a digital environment. Additionally, library faculty members work with faculty from various disciplines to embed information competency concepts into their curriculum (II.A.79).

GE Plan A is a pattern of education that exposes students to the major areas of human knowledge and the methods of inquiry used by various academic disciplines. Through the GE Plan A breadth experience, students develop the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means. For example, students discover and analyze primary source documents in a history course, use the scientific method in a chemistry lab, devise questionnaires to investigate and analyze specific behaviors for an abnormal psychology course, and develop skills of persuasion in an oral communication course.

Students demonstrate the ability to meet GE SLOs through successful course and program completion. The SLOs from the seven GE learning areas are the criteria being used to measure student attainment of GE goals (II.A.80). GE assessment efforts are being focused on high enrollment GE courses such as ENGL-101A, BIOL-130, and PSY-101 (II.A.40).

SELF-EVALUATION
The “Faculty Assessment of Course Student Learning Outcomes Survey” points to the varied ways faculty assess SLOs (II.A.41). Some of the techniques used to assess student learning and skills include student demonstration of skills learned related to case scenarios; oral and team presentations; research papers; and application of course content to analyze and resolve a real life problem. Noteworthy is the fact that 73.7 percent of the respondents administer “tests which promote thinking and not just memorization.” The survey showed that faculty members employ a robust variety of techniques to assess student learning.

A concrete example of assessment loop closing can be found in the Math Department. As part of its program assessment the math department determined that its program and course SLOs were disconnected. All SLOs have since been rewritten and flow more logically, allowing for more meaningful assessment across the entire math curriculum.

A diversity of courses is offered in each of the GE areas for students to master skills in oral and written communication; information competency; computer literacy; scientific and quantitative reasoning; and critical analysis and logical thinking. In addition to the course offerings there are options for students to test out of the information competency requirement, and a process for a student to request a waiver or substitution for the information competency option.

An average of 110 sections are offered through DE each semester in the areas of art; business administration; biotechnology; computer Science; computers, networks, and emerging technology; English; history; library science; music; political science; psychology; sociology; and speech. DE classes on average comprise 12 percent of total enrollments.

An on-going discussion in the GE Committee concerns adding a GE oral communication requirement to Plan A. Arguments in favor of adding such a requirement point to the fact that oral communication skills are essential to academic and workplace success. Arguments against adding a new requirement center on the additional unit burden. The GE Committee voted on this issue during their May 2013 meeting. The motion to add the GE oral requirement failed to achieve a majority vote.
The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**II.A.3.c. A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen:**
Qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
The GE philosophy emphasizes the value of developing ethical behaviors and effective citizenship in a multicultural world. These values are expressed in the goals and core values and are woven throughout the curriculum and student activities (II.A.74). Cultural diversity is specifically addressed by Area VI, Intercultural/International Studies. The development of historical and aesthetic sensibilities is specifically addressed by Area II, Social and Behavioral Sciences and Area III, Humanities and Fine Arts. Ethics and effective citizenship are specifically addressed by Area II, Social Sciences.

New courses and courses up for review are evaluated by the Curriculum and GE Committees with an eye toward the inclusion of SLOs that address concerns related to ethics and effective citizenship. Issues of ethical behavior extend across disciplines from business administration to biology. A course such as PHIL-106, Ethics, is an obvious candidate for inclusion of SLOs that stress the development of ethical behavior and social responsibility. Examples of courses outside the traditional realm of philosophy that include SLOs related to ethical behavior and social and civic responsibility include BA-125, Introduction to Business (Area II, Social and Behavioral Sciences); ENVS-103, Environment and Human Health (Area II Social and Behavioral Sciences); and ENVS-108, Human Ecology (Area I, Natural Sciences).

Many opportunities are provided for students outside the classroom to engage in civic, political, and socially responsible activities. The Ohlone College World Forum was inaugurated in 2005. The Forum brings speakers to the College to engage in dialogue about important global issues such as the African continent and world hunger, human trafficking, and the global climate crisis (II.A.81).

An active student government program, ASOC, is in place and provides students with the opportunity to participate in leadership roles and contribute to the betterment of the College (II.A.82). Additionally, a variety of student clubs such as the Civic Engagement Club, Women and Gender Empowerment, and the Green Club (environmental issues) provide students with opportunities to get involved in activities that promote positive social change (II.A.83).

**SELF-EVALUATION**
In 2011 the area definition and SLOs for Area II, Social and Behavioral Sciences, were revised. The GE Committee was mindful of the fact that GE Plan A did not have any SLOs directly related to the issue of ethics and civility. They developed the following SLO to address this gap: “Apply disciplinary knowledge from the social or behavioral sciences to contemporary ethical or social dilemmas.” The following table identifies courses that have been identified as target courses for assessing GE Plan A Area II and indicates the breadth of student involvement in these select courses.
STANDARD II.A. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

TABLE 30: Assessment of Student Activity by GE Plan A Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Area II: Social and Behavioral Sciences</th>
<th>FALL 2012</th>
<th>SPRING 2013</th>
<th>SUMMER 2013</th>
<th>ANNUAL TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>Sections Offered</td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>Sections Offered</td>
<td>FTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH-102, Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-102A, Principles of Economics-Macroeconomics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-117A, History of the United States</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST-117B, History of the United States</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY-101, General Psychology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC-101, Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCH-103, Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

II.A.4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

As defined in Administrative Procedure 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates, the requirements for the Associate in Arts or Associate in Science degrees follow the stipulations of state regulations that a student must demonstrate competence in reading, written expression, mathematics, and satisfactorily complete at least 60 semester units of college work. These units must include at least 18 semester units in general education and at least 18 semester units in a major. The work must include at least 12 semester units of study in residence; exceptions to the residence requirement can be made by the Board when an injustice or undue hardship would result.

The College offers three patterns of General Education courses. These plans include Ohlone College General Education (Plan A), California State University General Education (Plan B), and Intersegmental (IGETC) General Education (Plan C). All three GE plans share common focus areas in arts and humanities, English composition, natural science, mathematics, and social sciences.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The table below is a summary of the students who completed the requirements for an Associate in Science or Associate in Arts degree during the 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 academic year. Students granted an associate degree completed the required minimum of 18 general education units and at least 20 units in a major field of study.
### TABLE 31: Associate Degrees Awarded by Major Field of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANNUAL 2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohlone CCD Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Office Data Mart</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate in Science for Transfer (A.S.-T) Degree Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics-17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate in Arts for Transfer (A.A.-T) Degree Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (Letters)-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate of Science (A.S) Degree Total</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences-04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Industrial Technologies-09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology-07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics-17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate of (A.A) Degree Total</strong></td>
<td>365</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Management-05</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education-08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences-13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine and Applied Arts-10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (Letters)-15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology-07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies-49</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications-06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Protective Services-21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences-22</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

None

### II.A.5. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.

### DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

The College offers twenty associate degrees with a CTE emphasis. Administrative Procedure 4102 Occupational/Vocational Technical Programs ensures the integrity of these programs and that state regulations are being met (II.A.84). All CTE programs participate in the Program and Services Review process. In addition, the Physical Therapist Assistant, Registered Nursing, and the Respiratory Therapist programs complete accreditation self-evaluations through their respective state governing bodies. This documentation is included as attachments within their Program and Services Reviews (II.A.85). When applicable, data is included within the description and scope section of the Program and Services Reviews from California Employment Development, United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA) Core Indicators.

To comply with the Gainful Employment Act the Financial Aid Office provides employment and cost information about the College’s CTE programs that offer associate degrees and/or Certificates of Achievement (II.A.5). All vocational and occupational degree programs have program SLOs and course SLOs identified in the catalog (II.A.4), in Program and Services Reviews, and within the official COR. Through the Program and Services Review and in response to advisory committee input (II.A.43) and external accreditation recommendations, the SLOs are assessed in alignment with...
the SLO assessment and Program and Services Review processes.

The Physical Therapist Assistant, Registered Nursing, and the Respiratory Therapist associate degree programs prepare students for California State Licensure Examinations. As part of the preparation for the NCLEX, exam assessments are computerized and incorporate questions like those on the NCLEX exam. Nursing course objectives and contents include NCLEX test criteria to further prepare students. Upon completion of the Registered Nursing program, Assessment Technology Institute (ATI) success predictor exams are taken to provide each student a rating and analysis of which specific content area may need improvement. Students who complete the Physical Therapist Assistant Program are advised to enroll in PTA-140, PTA licensure Exam Preparation. This course focuses on study tactics, forming study groups, preparation methodologies for online computer tests, and self-evaluation skills needed to pass the exam.

The Computers, Networks, and Emerging Technology Department offers a comprehensive vocational program which leads to associate degrees and certifications in the field of Information and Communication Technologies. Certifications includes Cisco Certified Network Associate (CCNA), Cisco Certified Network Professional (CCNP), CompTIA A+, Network+, and Linux+, Microsoft Certified IT Professional (MCITP), Oracle Certified Professional (OCP), and VMWare Certified Professional (VCP), Citrix, and Linux Professional Institute (LPi).

The Early Childhood Studies (ECS) program prepares students to meet requirements as outlined by California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and California Community Care Licensing. Program courses are aligned with the California Early Childhood Curriculum Alignment Project (CAP), an evidence-based program of study to support early care and education teacher preparation. Program courses require comprehensive hands-on teaching demonstrations and exercises which provide students with current theory, methodologies, and critical and analytical skills. Upon completion of the ECS program, students are accepted into the California State University as juniors in the early childhood development discipline.

The real estate curriculum is designed to prepare students for employment as a real estate sales broker. Opportunities exist in sales, appraising, with a real estate finance organization, or with a title company. The program qualifies students for the real estate sales broker examination.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Administrative Procedure 4102 Occupational/Vocational Technical Programs ensures the integrity and quality of vocational and occupational degrees and certificates. Labor data and VTEA Core Indicators are reviewed annually. The Institutional Research and Planning Office tracks CTE Core Indicators for success rates and performance goals for the following: (II.A.85):

- Core Indicator 1: Technical Skill Attainment
- Core Indicator 2: Completions
- Core Indicator 3: Persistence
- Core Indicator 4: Employment
- Core Indicator 5a: Non-Traditional Participation
- Core Indicator 5b: Non-Traditional Completion

The Financial Aid Office complies with the Gainful Employment Act by providing employment and cost information. All CTE programs have advisory committees that meet annually to provide input related to SLOs and employment competencies. Health Sciences programs comply with their respective state and national accrediting bodies to ensure their programs prepare students to meet state licensure requirements.
STANDARD II.A. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

TABLE 32: Percentage Pass Rates for Health Sciences Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist Assistant</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nursing</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Therapist</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.A.6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student-learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the institutions officially approved course outline.

II.A.6.a. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The catalog, class schedule, and College website are the primary sources of information regarding the instructional programs offered and transfer policies governing the institution.

All courses offered are listed in the catalog (II.A.86). The catalog is updated annually to accurately reflect current course offerings. A print version of the catalog is available for purchase in the bookstore and an electronic version is available online to students and the community. Archival copies of the catalog back to 2004-2005 are also available online (II.A.87). The catalog includes comprehensive degree, certificate, and transfer information, and outlines general education plans for general, transfer, and occupational majors. All courses, degrees, and certificates are clearly described and all programs include SLOs. The class schedule (II.A.73) presents class offerings for a particular semester, GE requirements, and course transferability.

Counselors provide guidance regarding transfer requirements, articulation agreements with universities, and transfer admission agreements. Curriculum guides listing individual transfer and occupational degree and certificate requirements are available in the catalog, the College website (II.A.4), and in associated departments where faculty are a further source of information about courses and programs.

The Transfer Center provides a wealth of information in printed form and on its website (II.A.88). Transfer Center resources and services include a library of catalogs and reference handbooks; university representative visits;
transfer workshops and information sessions; guaranteed admission and concurrent enrollment programs; and search resources by college, university, and major. The Transfer Center reaches even more students by maintaining an active web presence including an events calendar (II.A.89), Facebook page, and transfer advice and tips blog. In addition, Transfer Day, mini-fairs, and university trips are coordinated through the Transfer Center and provide additional opportunities for students to visit representatives from baccalaureate colleges and universities.

All current articulation agreements for the CSU and UC systems are available on the ASSIST website (II.A.90). Courses are submitted for UC and CSU transferability by the articulation officer on a regular basis. Since the last site visit appropriate courses have also been submitted for C-ID approval, a statewide course identification numbering system that is used by the California State University and California Community College systems.

Five associate degrees for transfer (AA-T, AS-T) approved by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) are offered, including Communication Studies, Kinesiology, Mathematics, Psychology, and Sociology. An additional nine associate degrees for transfer have been approved by the Curriculum Committee and Board and have been submitted to the CCCCCO for their approval. Faculty are working on creating an additional eight associate degrees for transfer. Faculty are working towards a goal of getting all associate degrees for transfer approved by July 2014.

All faculty must follow the COR in teaching a particular course. The SLOs on the COR must appear on every course syllabus, as directed in the Faculty Handbook. Academic deans verify that all course syllabi include the SLOs from the COR. Each division office maintains documentation that ensures this verification. A syllabus must be provided to students no later than the first class meeting. An electronic copy of all syllabi must be submitted to the appropriate academic dean before the beginning of a semester. Syllabus rules and guidelines are detailed in the Faculty Handbook, which is distributed to faculty each fall and is also available online (II.A.91).

SELF-EVALUATION

In the Spring 2013 Student Survey (II.A.7), in response to the question, "I am comfortable using WebAdvisor to plan and register for classes," 93.4 percent of students who expressed an opinion answered Strongly yes or Yes. This response might indicate that students do not rely on the printed class schedule as much as they once did. The student survey results will be taken into consideration as the continuation of producing a printed class schedule is assessed.

The Spring 2013 Student Survey indicates that 70.8 percent of those expressing an opinion answered Strongly Yes or Yes when asked if they were satisfied with the information they receive about career and transfer options (II.A.7).

Due to budget and scheduling uncertainties, a printed class schedule was not mailed to continuing students for the spring 2013 semester. The decision to continue offering a printed version of the class schedule is currently under discussion at College Council. The College Council wants to gather data, conduct a survey of students, faculty, and staff so as to make an informed decision about whether or not to continue with a printed schedule of classes. In the meantime, 600 copies of the schedule were distributed to counselors and division offices. One suggestion was to make a printed schedule of classes available in public areas, such as the library or mailroom.

An Institutional Improvement Objective was established to improve access to web services via the availability of a mobile app for WebAdvisor, the online source for
registration and student records. This Objective is in support of College Goal 4: Use human, fiscal, technological, and physical resources responsibly, effectively, and efficiently to maximize student learning and achievement.

The Transfer Center has made impressive progress in its efforts to reach students. Below is a chart that summarizes students who used the Transfer Center’s resources and services multiple times throughout the year. The numbers refer to students who have visited the Transfer Center, attended a transfer workshop or presentations, called or emailed with an inquiry, met with a university representative, or went on a university trip.

**TABLE 33: Transfer Center Student Visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>STUDENT VISITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>2071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>3846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>4367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>5772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>5136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.6.b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

In May 2007 Administrative Procedure 4021 Program Discontinuance (II.A.92) was adopted. The Administrative Procedure clearly spells out the steps and processes involved in discontinuing a program, including the creation of a task force to analyze the potential impact on students. Students affected by program elimination or modification work closely with counselors and discipline faculty to ensure they have access to courses in order to complete their educational requirements.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

A clearly articulated Administrative Procedure governs the response to this standard. In the six years since the creation of this procedure no programs have been eliminated or had significant changes in program requirements.

The College meets the standard.

**II.A.6.c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College presents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently through the use of publications, including the catalog, the class schedule, curriculum guides outlining degrees and certificate requirements, and the web site (II.A.4, II.A.5, II.A.73).

The College updates and publishes the catalog annually. The class schedule is published twice annually. Both of these documents are distributed to the appropriate offices prior to publication in order to check content for accuracy.
and to make necessary additions and revisions. The Curriculum and Scheduling Office compiles all updates and checks for consistency before the publications are printed.

The website is increasingly relied upon as a primary source of current, accurate information about the College (II.A.93). The current and past editions of the College catalog are available online (II.A.87). In addition, the website contains a link to WebAdvisor, which provides the most up-to-date information regarding each semester’s classes (II.A.78).

The Board has a systematic process for the review of Board policies, and corresponding Administrative Procedures are developed by the president in collaboration with relevant constituent groups and posted on the District’s website. This systematic review process assures compliance and responsiveness to the changing needs of the College. The College utilizes the California League for Community College (CCLC) service for guidance with updating and incorporating changes to laws and regulations into the Board policies and procedures.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Evidence from the Spring 2013 Student Survey indicates that 86.1 percent of students expressing an opinion believe their experiences have been consistent with what they expected from College publications and/or College representatives (II.A.7).

Currently a review of the information on the College website is planned. An overall assessment of the website will be conducted in 2013-2014 to determine if improvements in the structure and navigation are needed.

Beginning in fall 2008 the Board began reviewing its policies on a four-year cycle, and the cycle is now complete. In addition to the Board’s complete review of its policies, the College has spent the last two years updating Administrative Procedures. All required procedures related to Chapter 4, Academic Affairs have been updated, approved, and posted on the Administrative Procedures website (II.A.94). The president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, deans, and directors, the Faculty Senate, and the College Council have all been involved in this monumental task.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.A.7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.**

**II.A.7.a. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Board Policy 4030 on Academic Freedom was approved in November 2005 and reviewed and reapproved in March 2010 (II.A.95). This policy obligates the Board to create and sustain an environment that is conducive to teaching and learning. The policy also clearly outlines the responsibilities of faculty, who should be “accurate, objective, exercise appropriate restraint, encourage a spirit of mutual respect for the opinion of others, and ensure the relevancy of subject matter to their instructional areas.” The policy examines the issue of teaching controversial subject matter in depth, making specific recommendations to faculty
regarding objectivity, respect for others, relevant data, suitable learning materials, and class time allocation to issues. This policy is available online and is included in the Faculty Handbook (II.A.51).

SELF-EVALUATION
The College supports an environment where discussions about topics like academic freedom can take place in a respectful and healthy manner. This environment was demonstrated when the Faculty Senate had an extensive debate about Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 4030 that extended over the course of five Faculty Senate meetings, including one that was attended by the president where she participated in the discussion (II.A.96). There had been concern about a paragraph in Administrative Procedure 4030 that referenced sexually explicit material. The discussion and debate covered academic freedom as a whole and led to a slight rewording of the paragraph that the administration had presented and is now in place. Everyone involved in the debate was satisfied by its conclusion.

In the Spring 2013 Student Survey, 83.9 percent of those giving an opinion answered Strong Yes or Yes in response to the statement, “My instructors encourage students to examine different points of view.” Additionally, 91.0 percent of those giving an opinion answered Strong Yes or Yes in response to the statement, “I have found the Ohlone campuses to be positive and supportive environments to pursue and education.” These responses show a clear indication that, from the student perspective, this standard is being met (II.A.7).

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.A.7.b. The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and consequences for dishonesty.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The Standards of Student Conduct and Discipline and Due Process Procedures list the actions that constitute student misconduct, provide available disciplinary actions, and describe the hearing process and student rights. These standards and procedures are printed in the catalog (II.A.97), the Student Handbook (II.A.98), and the Faculty Handbook (II.A.51).

The Academic Dishonesty procedure was updated in 2010 (II.A.99). This policy includes a definition of academic dishonesty, student evaluation and reporting, sanctions, protection of rights, and dissemination of information. This policy is available on the College website. The Faculty Handbook states: “The Academic Dishonesty statement must be referenced, along with any specific policies a faculty member has on plagiarism and cheating” (II.A.51).

SELF-EVALUATION
The process to update the Academic Dishonesty policy involved an inclusive and well throughout College wide discussion. Concerns were raised in 2009 about the policy in use at that time. The issue was brought to Faculty Senate where, in December 2009, the following motion passed:

The Faculty Senate will work with the administration to create an easy process for faculty to report cheating and to create a database of students who cheat.

This work culminated when the new procedure, which is still in use, was presented and approved by Faculty Senate in May 2010 (II.A.100) and presented to the entire faculty during the College’s Learning College Week in August 2010 (II.A.101).
The vice president, student services provides the Faculty Senate with an annual report on violations of the policy, including number, type, and disposition. This report relates only to those violations reported by faculty to the vice president, student services.

For the 2011-2012 academic year reports of academic dishonesty remained fairly stable. There were 79 reported cases (68 students) of academic dishonesty that were handled informally (compared to 80 cases last year). Of these 79 reported cases, 25 cases involved cheating and 54 involved plagiarism; four cases involved both cheating and plagiarism and six cases involved repeated violations. While no sanctions of permanent expulsion were rendered, one student was suspended and three students were placed on disciplinary probation for at least one semester as a result of repeated violations (II.A.102).

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.A.7.c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

The catalog is printed annually and is available online. It includes the following (II.A.19):

- Equal Educational and Employment Opportunity Policies and Procedures - Student Life
- Unlawful Discrimination and Unlawful Harassment
- Definition of General Harassment
- Definition of Sexual Discrimination
- Complaint Process
- Standards of Student Conduct and Discipline and Due Process Procedures
- Disciplinary Action
- Student Right-to-Know

In addition, copies of policies and procedures that relate specifically to student life are available in the Student Services offices at both campuses and the Office of Student Services, Policy, Procedures and Forms website.
The policies and procedures include the following:

- Academic Dishonesty Procedure
- Civil Rights Complaint
- Equal Educational and Employment Opportunity Policy
- General Complaint Procedures
- Unlawful Discrimination Complaint Form
- Administrative Procedure 3430, Prohibition of Harassment Standards of Student Conduct and Discipline and Due Process Procedures
- Administrative Procedure 3435, Procedures for Filing and Processing Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination

The Faculty Handbook is distributed to faculty annually and is also available online. This document includes the following appendices:

- Appendix G, Recommended Actions for Inappropriate Student Behavior
- Appendix H, Standards of Student Conduct and Discipline and Due Process Procedures
- Appendix I, Ohlone College Policy on Academic Dishonesty
- Appendix L, Ohlone College Academic Freedom Policy Statement
- Appendix M, Ohlone College Equal Educational and Employment Opportunity Policy and Policy on Sexual Harassment
- Appendix N, Maintaining a Drug-Free Workplace

In February 2013 the College Council took up the issue of cyber bullying. The conclusion of that meeting was a group formed by Human Resources to explore creating a code of conduct, discussing harassment, and cyber bullying.

SELFF-EVALUATION

Prior notice is given to all individuals and constituency groups regarding required conformity to specific codes of conduct. Notices include statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks. In cases where there is a need to address an issue that has not been addressed before, such as the case with cyber bullying, appropriate action is taken to create and publish these expectations.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

None

II.A.8. Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals operate in conformity with standards and applicable Commission policies.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

The College does not offer curricula in foreign locations other than U.S. nationals.

SELF-EVALUATION

Not applicable

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

None
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STANDARD II.B.

Student Support Services
Standard II.B. Student Support Services

The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

II.B.1. The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student-learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
All students who are over 18 years of age, have graduated from high school or have a high school GED or proficiency, are deemed able to benefit from enrollment and are admitted to the College. Additionally, any Kindergarten-12th grade student who has been recommended by both their principal and parent/guardian for specific college-level courses, with the exception of Physical Education courses, is also eligible for admission.

Student learning and success are addressed by the myriad of quality support services offered to students including Admissions and Records; Counseling, Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Financial Aid, International Programs and Services, Interpreting and Accommodations Services, Placement Testing Center, Student Health Center, Transfer Center, the Tri-Cities One-Stop Career Center, and WorkAbility III. Each service area takes part in regular Program and Services Reviews, which consider student outcomes, surveys, and innovations. These results are shared with both the Student Services Area in the form of shared Program and Services Reviews, shared prioritization of program improvement objectives, and with the College community through governance.

Students have access to all student support services on the Fremont and Newark campuses, and online; however, how services are accessed varies by service and location. Basic services used by the general student body, such as Admissions and Records, Counseling, and Financial Aid, keep similar hours on both physical campuses. This has been accomplished on the Newark campus by providing a student services assistant trained in all three areas. In addition, all service departments have websites.
and dedicated email addresses. Some services offered are dedicated to specific populations, which influences how services are accessed. DSPS, EOPS, and the Student Health Center have dedicated offices on the Fremont campus. Services for students at Newark for these offices are available by appointment, but generally these services are provided either at the Fremont campus or via email. For example, DSPS does not maintain a physical office at the Newark campus, but their staff work with students via email to ensure that all accommodations are provided for classes taken at the Newark campus. During summer term when all classes have been offered at the Newark campus, DSPS and accommodation services staff members have relocated to that site.

Support services for Distance Education (DE) students (as well as all students) include extensive web access to student admissions, records, registration, financial aid, and counseling through the College’s website and office sites; WebAdvisor, the online source for registration and student records; and emails to students. Students are advised in the catalog, class schedule, and at application that the College will communicate with them via email. All College offices and services have email addresses and contact numbers posted on the College website. Regular updates for registration, student elections, debit cards, academic progress, College crisis and emergency, safety and crime statistics are sent to students via email.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the College’s mission.

Quality is ensured by the Program and Services Review process, in which all student services programs participate (II.B.1). In this process, programs evaluate their activities and services every three years to ensure quality and effectiveness. Program quality can be measured by the achievement of student services learning outcomes, which are developed to reflect the Student Services Curriculum of responsibility, respect, integrity, leadership, and purpose (II.B.2). Programs engage in continuous quality improvement through the development of Program Improvement Objectives (PIOs), which outline programs’ specific goals and plans to achieve them. These PIOs are reviewed and prioritized for budget planning and funding as defined in Administrative Procedure 3250 Institutional Planning (II.B.3) and Program and Services Review (II.B.1).

The Spring 2013 Student Survey provides evidence that students are satisfied with the services the College provides via WebAdvisor. Over 93 percent of students expressing an opinion indicated that “I am comfortable using WebAdvisor to plan and register for classes” (II.B.4). Additional responses listed later under II.B.3.a also provide evidence that the quality of services provided meet student needs.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.B.2. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following:**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College provides a catalog for its constituencies that is precise, accurate, and current. In addition to listing information required by accreditation, the catalog includes all requirements set by the pertinent federal legislation, state regulations, the Board of Trustees, and the College. The catalog accurately conveys general information about the College including the College mission; course, program,
and degree offerings; descriptions of all areas of Student Services, including financial aid and learning resources; names and degrees of all full-time faculty and administrators; names of all District personnel; student requirements; and all major policies affecting students. The catalog is available on request in alternate format for individuals with disabilities.

Much of the catalog information is also available in the class schedule and student handbook (II.B.5, II.B.6, II.B.7). Policies are also accessible on the College’s website (II.B.8). In addition, printed copies of policies can be found in the office of the vice president, student services. The following
### Chart 3: Required Items in the Catalog and Class Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Items</th>
<th>2013-2014 Catalog Page(s)</th>
<th>2014 Spring Class Schedule Page(s)</th>
<th>Web Links (For Catalog)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official Name, Address, Telephone Number</td>
<td>1, Back cover</td>
<td>Front cover</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/20132014catalog-allpages.pdf">http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/20132014catalog-allpages.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Address</td>
<td>Front cover, 1, Back cover</td>
<td>Front cover, 1</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat006-visionmissionvaluesgoals.pdf">http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat006-visionmissionvaluesgoals.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course, Program and Degree Offerings</td>
<td>46-236</td>
<td>59</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat060-122-curriculumguides.pdf">http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat060-122-curriculumguides.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Calendar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat005-academiccalendar.pdf">http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat005-academiccalendar.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Learning Resources</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat007-014-welcome.pdf">http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat007-014-welcome.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names and Degree of Administrators and Faculty</td>
<td>246-254</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat247-254-districtpersonnel.pdf">http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat247-254-districtpersonnel.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of Trustees</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>120</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat247-254-districtpersonnel.pdf">http://www.ohlone.edu/catalog/20132014/cat247-254-districtpersonnel.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to being available online, the College catalog and class schedule are distributed to local libraries, local high schools, and college fairs to ensure that the community receives information about the College. The College catalog can also be purchased in the College bookstore. Portions of the class schedule are available in other languages to encourage and enhance accessibility for the diverse population of the community.

In addition to the printed catalog, a PDF version is available on the College website. Both versions are identical and no edits are made to the online catalog, thereby ensuring consistency of information and student catalog rights.

The College has a system in place to review all material in its publications for accuracy and currency. This review process includes the catalog, class schedule, and student handbook. One manager and a classified staff member oversee the final editing and production of the catalog and the class schedule. The initial material for these publications is provided by the department managers who are responsible for the accuracy and currency of their respective sections of the catalog and class schedule. The same process is applied to the student handbook, which is reviewed by Campus Activities prior to publication. The manager over each specific service maintains the accuracy and consistency of web pages.

Many instructors also publish the College policies in their class syllabi, on their class websites, or they include links to the policies on the College website.

SELF-EVALUATION
The layout of the catalog includes a table of contents and an index to facilitate access and provide an easy to understand organization. The College catalog is thoroughly examined each year for adherence to accreditation and legal requirements. Recent efforts to update all College Administrative Procedures have been incorporated into the publications review process resulting in numerous updates across the webpages, class schedule, and catalog. Examples of these updates include changes to Kindergarten-12th grade enrollment, registration priority, and the standards of student conduct.

In 2013 a great deal of discussion took place regarding the need for printing a class schedule. Student, faculty, counselor, and staff input was gathered in terms of impacts and the College Council formed a group who made recommendations which the president/superintendent (president) used in making decisions on the future of this publication (II.B.9). This review also provided some interesting information on students’ opinions regarding how they actually used the printed class schedule. The Associated Students of Ohlone (ASOC) recommendation was that the class schedule is necessary but that it could be provided electronically.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.B.3. The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College identifies the educational support needs of all students by regular examination of enrollment, matriculation, and research data. The most obvious illustration of this examination is the current Program and Services Review process in which each student services program is reviewed in terms of defining outcomes, incorporating assessments,
and developing PIOs. Each student services manager as well as several counseling faculty have taken part in this activity. PIOs are then shared by the student services managers and prioritized in terms of departmental efforts in light of student impacts.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Enrollment data is monitored by both student services staff and academic deans constantly throughout the registration period in order to be able to adjust quickly to low enrolled sections and/or the addition of high enrolled and/or waitlisted sections.

Staying involved with enrollment patterns and levels has also assisted in scheduling and/or cancelling placement testing and orientation sessions to support student needs. During fall 2012, when all English and math sections were filled and had long waitlists, placement testing for these two departments was reduced and counselors were then more available to meet with students. During fall 2013, the opposite situation took place with low enrollments in English and math, prompting the addition of placement tests and orientations sessions through the first week of the semester.

An example of how enrollment data was used to address learning support needs is seen in the Accommodations Program and Services Review where a study was conducted of students’ schedules and accommodation needs (II.B.10). This study identified peak impacts on the interpreting staff and allowed for more flexible scheduling of the interpreters and back up staff. Enrollment data regarding Deaf and Hard of Hearing students was shared with the academic deans who were able to spread out classes typically taken by students needing accommodations.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

II.B.3.a. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College offers instruction face-to-face at the Fremont campus, Newark campus, and other off-campus sites; via DE, facilitated through Blackboard course software; and in a combination of face-to-face and distance education formats, referred to as hybrid instruction.

A chart of available services offered by category was developed, reviewed, and validated by the student service managers and is available below.
CHART 4: Student Services by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Online Info</th>
<th>Fremont Service</th>
<th>Newark Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Services*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Delivered to Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Records</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC) / Campus Activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier / Student Accounts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSPS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Cards/Higher One</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Stop Career Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Testing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkAbility III</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Accommodation Services includes interpreting, captioning, and note taking services provided to DSPS students.

The majority of information and student services are available at all times to all students via the College website. This availability includes access to all registration functions including applications, request forms, appeals, complaints, counseling, student health, mental health, financial aid applications, information and individual awards, services for disabled students, accommodation services, campus activities, clubs and scholarship, and special programs access (II.B.11). The Fremont campus houses the majority of student services and all of the academic deans, with the exception of health sciences.

The Newark Center provides a generalist student services office with staff trained in admissions, student records, and financial aid. Additionally student services are provided for student health needs and counseling and by the WorkAbility III and One-Stop Career Center staff. The One-Stop Career Center provides career planning and job search support to College students and job seekers in the community. Computer kiosks are available in the lobby of Building 7 on the Fremont campus and at Newark in the Newark Student Services office space. To date, this level of service and referral has been found to be appropriate.

Students who only attend classes at off-site facilities receive registration information and support through online services as well as direct staff outreach. Necessary staff members visit these sites or establish contact directly with these groups to provide services directly to the students. This presence takes the form of admissions and student records;
financial aid, and counseling workshops or presentations.

Access to student information and services is continually being expanded through web access and technology.

SELF-EVALUATION
The student services managers used the availability table (above) to assess the distribution of services and consider staffing and location changes. This evaluation was taken a step further in examining the hours of operation of offices and resulted in adding extended hours until 6:00pm in both Counseling and Admissions and Records at peak demand times.

Responses from the Spring 2013 Student Survey support that services provided meet most student needs. (II.B.4) specifically:

TABLE 34: Results of Student Survey Related to Student Support Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>Strongly Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Strongly No</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors are available when I need them</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate support services for evening only students</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate support services for Newark students</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive the assistance I need in academic advising and education planning</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive satisfactory assistance from the Admissions and Records staff</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid offers good customer service</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the high number of responses indicating No Opinion is difficult to interpret.

Students have reported in the student survey as well as individual surveys that they utilize WebAdvisor for most of their enrollment and course planning needs. Research on actual student use shows that nearly 90 percent of all enrollments occur via WebAdvisor. Students have raised concern about the need to access web pages and sites from mobile devices as well as regular computers.

The most recent PIO involving the adoption of a mobile application to access the student information system, calendar, and campus maps was just adopted by both information technology and student services areas and is a College priority.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.B.3.b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The mission, vision, values, and goals of the College are the foundation for creating an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development opportunities for all of its students (II.B.10). In addition, the student services area has developed SLOs and practices specific to the five learning concepts of respect, responsibility, integrity, leadership, and purpose. Students are given the opportunity to develop their skills in these areas through multiple avenues including coursework, clubs, student government, World Forums, Earth Week activities, and personal development classes (II.B.12, II.B.13).

Student services counselors, both in the Counseling Department and those serving special populations in DSPS, EOPS, Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE), and the Deaf Studies Division, encourage students to enroll in courses that promote personal and civic responsibility (II.B.13, II.B.14). Counselors encourage students to become involved in College activities that promote these values. Through the personal development curriculum students develop skills in self-advocacy, civic engagement, and personal responsibility.

The College maintains a Fine Arts requirement for the associate degree. This requirement encourages students’ aesthetic development by exposing them to the world of art, music, theater, drama, and dance. The Gary Soren Smith Center for the Fine and Performing Arts offers a wide variety of events, performances, and gallery shows throughout the school year. Student art is exhibited in various areas around the Fremont campus including the president’s office and the Student Services Building (II.B.15).

A great deal of research has been conducted regarding the effect that the environment (physical spaces, furniture, color, and light) have on teaching and learning. These values have been taken into consideration in terms of the design and furnishing of the Newark campus and classrooms, Building 7 on the Fremont campus, the cafeteria, in the plans for new facilities, and will continue to be used as the Fremont campus is redesigned.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The Student Services managers meet bimonthly to engage in dialogue and strategic planning within Student Services
and across the College community. In addition they meet twice a year with the academic deans to share and develop ideas that promote the academic and Student Services Curriculum in an integrated approach across curriculum.

The student services managers address the five learning concepts of respect, responsibility, integrity, leadership, and purpose in their Program and Services Reviews. At least one of these values is addressed in each Program and Services Review and is attached to student services learning outcomes, with strategies for assessing student success.

An organizational change was implemented in 2012-2013 due to the sense from managers and staff that students were not making adequate progress in terms of understanding their responsibility and independence, especially in being able to represent themselves in terms of complaints or concerns. A manager was assigned a new role as ombudsperson to assist students in better understanding College policies and procedures and how to advocate for themselves. That role continues during 2013-2014 and the office name shifted to Student Life.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.B.3.c. The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

DESCRIPTION SUMMARY
Through the student services area the College designs and maintains a wide-range of counseling and advising services offered through a variety of programs, including the Counseling Department, DSPS, EOPS, the Deaf Studies program, and personal and mental health counseling (part of the Student Health Center). The Counseling Department also provides specialized counseling and advising for athletes, health science majors, Puente, veterans, and international students. Online counseling and advising is offered to all students through the Counseling Department. Both individual and group counseling and advising services are provided; group counseling and advising are provided through workshops and webinars. Career and college success courses are taught by counselors and offered through the Personal Development Department.

Distance Education students can access all services and set up appointments online through the Counseling Department website and/or receive counseling services through the online counselor. This service has been highly utilized and now includes a request form which allows the counselor to respond more quickly and accurately.

The 2012-2013 Counseling Department program review states that, “The full range of counseling services offered via individual appointments and drop-in counseling is available via online counseling services. Students may submit a request for online counseling through the Ohlone College website. Online counseling is cross-referenced in multiple places on the website for maximum visibility. Upon submitting a request for services, a counselor will typically respond via email within one to three business days” (II.B.16).

The Counseling Department collaborates with other College departments through the governance process. Counseling faculty participate in College wide committees, including Faculty Senate, College Council, and the Curriculum Committee (II.B.17, II.B.18, II.B.19).
The Counseling Department designs its counseling and advising programs to meet the guidelines of the California Community College Matriculation Act and the new Student Success Act (II.B.20), as well as the Standards of Practice for California Community College Counseling Faculty and Programs. Special programs like EOPS, DSPS, and Puente follow the statewide guidelines for their counseling services (II.B.21, II.B.22, II.B.23). The One-Stop Career Center designs its counseling services according to the guidelines from the Alameda County East Bay Works program.

All full-time and adjunct counseling faculty meet the minimum qualifications and are monitored by the dean, counseling to maintain their qualifications.

The Student Success Act, which became law during the 2012-2013 academic year, has been a major focus of all counselors starting in fall 2013. Planning efforts have already occurred beginning in fall 2012 and spring 2013 with the implementation of priority registration. Briefly, this act calls upon all California community colleges to implement mandatory orientation, electronic education plans (initial and comprehensive), electronic transcripts, and embedded measures of student success. The Student Success and Support Programs Committee (which is co-chaired by a counselor and includes the dean, counseling) is overseeing the design and implementation of the Student Success Act requirements. The vice president, student services is providing College wide leadership to this effort.

Day-to-day oversight of counseling services is provided by the dean, counseling and the directors of EOPS, DSPS, Financial Aid, and the One-Stop Career Center. Oversight of this project is provided by the vice president, student services.

Education of counselors takes place in several ways:

- Counselors participate in professional development activities (II.B.24);
- New counselors and counseling interns participate in a New Counseling Training program (II.B.25);
- New counselors are assigned a counseling mentor during their first year;
- The bi-monthly Counseling Department meetings provide a forum for updating counselors on information important to counseling and advising services;
- All full-time counselors participate on College wide committees and share relevant information through Counseling Department meetings and email reports;
- Evaluation of counseling and advising services.

The ongoing evaluation of counseling services takes place through:

- Program and Services Reviews of Counseling, New Student Orientations, Personal Development, Transfer Programs, EOPS, DSPS, Financial Aid, Puente, and the One-Stop Career Center (II.B.1);
- Bi-monthly Counseling Department meetings to discuss issues affecting counseling services;
- Student Opinion Survey, conducted every two years (II.B.26);
- Data/statistics gathered by program coordinators (II.B.27, II.B.28, II.B.39) especially as they relate to student development and success.

SELF-EVALUATION

Initiated by feedback from Counseling Department meetings, the Counseling Department worked on several improvements during spring 2013. A website was developed to support undocumented (AB 540) students and provide clear information about special requirements for admissions and financial aid. The AB 540 counseling task force is planning other outreach efforts (II.B.30). More counselor training was incorporated into the Counseling Department.
meetings. Training was conducted on crisis intervention and suicide prevention; a speaker from University of California at San Francisco held two 2-hour training sessions on suicide assessment and prevention for counselors at the One-Stop Career Center at the Newark campus and for general counselors on the Fremont campus. A representative from San Francisco State University’s Teacher Education program conducted a workshop for counselors in April 2013. Counselors are in the process of finalizing a Crisis Intervention Policy and Procedure manual that will be available for the entire College (II.B.31).

The Student Success and Support Programs Committee has established the following priorities based on needs to be addressed and that affect counseling services:

- Implementation of mandatory orientation: how to block and clear registration, expanding orientations throughout the summer and winter breaks, and improvement of the online orientation delivery system.
- Selecting and implementing an electronic Student Educational Plan program.
- Improving data collecting and reporting for counseling services, including orientations, counseling contacts, and student educational plans.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The Student Success and Support Programs Committee is currently reviewing the data collection processes utilized by the Counseling Department. Data collecting processes utilizing Ellusion’s Colleague® and the SARS® scheduling system (by SARS Software Products, Inc.) will be evaluated and modified in order to get a more accurate evaluation of how counseling and advising services enhance student success. Specifically, more accurate information is needed about how many students are getting orientation, counseling, and advising, and how many students are completing initial and comprehensive student educational plans. One of the focuses of the Student Success Act will be how many students are completing Student Educational Plans, and how this affects student success.

Beginning in 2013-2014, the state will also be providing a new metric which will look at the ratio of counselors to students of each college. This information will be analyzed in terms of effective deployment of counselors to the general and special populations currently served.

**II.B.3.d. The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College motto illustrates how diversity is one of the College’s principal values: “A world of cultures, united in learning.” The College is more than a multi-cultural College; Ohlone is a college driven by a global education imperative.

The College offers a number of programs, practices, and services which promote student understanding and appreciation of diversity. Through encouraging individuals from many cultures to attend the College, the entire student body benefits from the experience of interacting with a diverse student population. The student services area engages in multiple outreach activities to encourage and support a wide range of students to apply to and attend the College.

Over the past several years the College has been making steady progress towards increasing the presence of international students and the provision of study abroad opportunities. Several faculty have also taken part in opportunities to teach in different countries. The International Programs and Services strategic plan was developed to support the College effort in these areas and to insure the stability of
international students within the student body (II.B.32).

Another aspect of diversity that is unique at the College is the high number of Deaf and Hard of Hearing students and faculty, as well as the Deaf Studies and Interpreting Preparation programs. This population is represented in the College’s overall demographics. Collectively, the presence of a high Deaf population brings a different culture and language, American Sign Language, into the day-to-day experience at the College.

Within student services, a number of specific programs are offered to support students from diverse backgrounds, such as Latino/a students (Puente Program), Deaf students, and international students (II.B.33, II.B.34, II.B.35). These programs are designed to promote an environment of inclusion for diverse students.

A variety of clubs and student organizations allow students to share their cultural experiences with the student body at large, which provides all students the opportunity to enhance their understanding and appreciation of diversity. An array of events strive to enrich the cultural experience of the College community by offering guest speakers, performances, art displays, and other opportunities for cultural expression (II.B.15, II.B.36, II.B.37, II.B.38).

In addition to a General Education requirement for a cultural appreciation class, the faculty are dedicated to infusing cultural awareness opportunities across the curriculum.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College uses a number of tools to evaluate the effectiveness of the services that support student appreciation of diversity. The College conducts regular surveys and statistical analysis to ensure the College maintains an awareness of the needs of students and the diverse community (II.B.29, II.B.30, II.B.41, II.B.42).

The student services area reflects the College’s appreciation for diversity through the diverse background of its staff and faculty. Counselors and many staff are trained in gender and cultural sensitivity. Designated counselors serve students with particular ethnic backgrounds or special learning needs: EOPS, DSPS, Puente, mental health, and international students. Additionally, the Human Resources Department offers professional development workshops on diversity during Learning College Week in order to support the continued need for staff development in the area of cultural awareness.

By providing employment services to individuals with disabilities, the WorkAbility III program promotes diversity and assists a population which is often overlooked and under-served. The College promotes diversity by educating employers about the contributions disabled job seekers have to offer. A diverse workforce provides the opportunity to learn from one another, achieve better business performance, and connect with the widest range of customers.

While the specific offerings and frequency of services provided may vary year to year, the College maintains a strong commitment to supporting and offering these services.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.B.3.e. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The student services area ensures that admissions and
placement instruments and practices are effective and biases are minimized. The review of these instruments is ongoing and involves admissions and records and counseling staff.

SELF-EVALUATION

The dean, enrollment services prepares a regular Program and Services Review. In addition, there are several other ways that the Office of Admissions and Records evaluates their practices and tools in an on-going way. The admissions and records staff meets approximately once a month to discuss issues affecting the admissions process. All staff are encouraged to give feedback on existing processes. Once admissions and records staff members identify problems with specific tools they work together to come up with ways to fix the problems. Admissions and records staff are constantly evaluating forms and documents to ensure quality and make sure that the student information collected is necessary and up-to-date. Feedback from students helps the office understand which tools are user-friendly and which are not. Before each semester, the admissions staff performs registration testing to ensure that all student WebAdvisor tools work correctly before registration begins. In addition, staff perform additional testing every time the Colleague® system is updated in order to make sure the Colleague® and WebAdvisor systems are working properly.

The dean, counseling; the assessment coordinator; and the student services assistant in the Placement Testing Center conduct a regular review of assessment services and instruments. In addition, every three to four years the Placement Testing Center conducts a validation study to ensure that the placement testing instruments are accurately placing students into English composition, reading, math, English as a Second Language (ESL), and general chemistry courses. The validation studies for English composition, reading, and math were last completed in 2011 (II.B.41, II.B.42). The validation studies for ESL and chemistry are in the process of being completed. Validation studies are reviewed by instructional faculty in specific subject areas. In addition, placement data is gathered every semester to look at longitudinal placement trends (II.B.43).

The assessment coordinator and the student services assistant in the Placement Testing Center attend conferences and meetings on a regular basis to ensure that admissions and placement practices are current. In 2012 they attended the Northern California Community College Assessment Association conference and the Accuplacer National Conference.

The Office of Admissions and Records and the Placement Testing Center work to minimize cultural and linguistic bias through both an inventory of staff who speak different languages and translations of materials (II.B.44).

The Admissions and Records Office staff is culturally diverse, and works in close proximity to the diverse staff of the Financial Aid Office and the EOPS Office. These offices have staff who are bilingual in Vietnamese and Spanish. The Admissions and Records Office can also draw on other student services staff closely located in the same building who are fluent in Chinese (Cantonese and Mandarin), Farsi, Hindi, and American Sign Language. The class schedule includes the Equal Educational and Employment Opportunity Policy translated in a variety of languages (II.B.6).

DSPS works closely with the Placement Testing Center to provide accommodation services to disabled students. If a student discloses he has a disability and needs special accommodations for the placement test, the Assessment Center staff will bring the student to the DSPS Office and the DSPS staff will set up and proctor the placement test for
the student with the necessary accommodations. DSPS also has the Accuplacer Companion version of the placement test and is for low vision/blind students. The test has three formats: Braille, large print, and audio.

The placement instruments used for English, math, and ESL are all developed by recognized third party test publishers and approved by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. These test publishers conduct their own studies of test bias (II.B.43, II.B.44).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.B.3.f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College’s Colleague® program serves as the main (electronic) depository for all student enrollment records, counseling contacts, student accounts, financial aid, and academic records. Applications are submitted by students electronically and all incoming transcripts are scanned and stored as electronic documents. When students apply to the College with a paper application, the paper application is scanned into the College’s On Base system and the paper application is immediately shredded. In the cases of petitions or add cards, the documents are maintained in locked storage for one fiscal year. Counseling appointments are made electronically using the SARS system. Counseling notes are kept in SARS which can be locked based on access levels to ensure confidentiality of these records. Colleague® is backed up by copying onto a hard drive system. Weekly copies are also burned to CD drives and stored offsite in fireproof vaults (see Standard III.C.).

All student discipline records are maintained in locked files in the office of the vice president, student services. Access to those files is limited to the vice president, student services and his confidential assistant. These records are only shared with the student involved, through a signed release by the student, or through a court subpoena. A log is maintained to record any files provided without student consent.

Specialized or program specific information not needed by other departments (EOPS, DSPS, Financial Aid, One-Stop Career Center, Workability III) do maintain records which are not shared across the College. These files are held in locked cabinets and access is limited to staff in those offices. Any release of information must have an Authorization for Release form signed by the student.

The Student Health Center uses the EPIC electronic medical record system through Washington Township Medical Foundation. When students are seen at the Health Center they sign a Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) release of records form acknowledging that records may be shared with other health care providers that are part of the medical system. HIPPA regulations always supersede the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

All departments in the student services area adhere to federal and state laws, Board policies, and FERPA that define maintenance and classification of student records. Electronic records are stored in a secure database and access to that database is limited to those who have been designated by their managers as needing access. Those
individuals have secure log-in information and must read and agree to a confidentiality statement. Ongoing staff training ensures that the proper handling of student records. Board Policy 5040 regarding the release of student records is available on the admissions and records webpage, in the College catalog, and in the class schedule. Students must authorize any sharing of information through a written request. Security access to edit or change data is also assigned by supervisors to employees and monitored to protect data safety. Students are never provided access to edit grading screens.

SELF-EVALUATION
All student enrollment records were electronically transferred to Colleague® in 1999. The practice of scanning documents was fully realized in 2011 when all of the student services offices vacated Building 1 on the Fremont campus and moved into a new building on the Fremont campus. At that time, only new documents were scanned. A large (paper records) vault was still maintained in Building 1 for all documents that needed to be maintained for one to three years. In the shift toward scanning, the on-site paper vault was eventually retired. All other permanent paper documents were shipped to a secure offsite storage facility in Alameda County.

This new system has been extremely helpful in working with students. Records can be easily accessed by student services staff regardless of campus location. This system has improved efficiency, reduced workloads, and improved security of records.

As of spring 2013 the current data scanning software and hardware are reaching 90 percent capacity and will need to be replaced and further expanded. This expansion is supported by the current Program and Services Review, and program improvement planning process in the Student Services Area, the Business Office, and Human Resources.

The resulting PIO was funded for 2013-2014.

In planning for the Student Success Act, WebAdvisor may be utilized for electronic student educational planning and degree audit.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College engages in systematic evaluation of its student support services and whether these are meeting student needs. The main vehicle for this evaluation is the Program and Services Review process. The following student services departments conduct Program and Services Review: Admissions and Records; Placement Testing; ASOC and Inter-Club Council (ICC); CARE; CalWORKs; Campus Activities; Counseling; DSPS; EOPS; Financial Aid; International Programs and Services; Interpreting and Accommodation Services; Ombudsperson; One-Stop Career Center; Personal Counseling and Life Coaching; Puente Project; Student Health Center; Transfer Center; Transitional Services; Veterans’ Affairs; and WorkAbility III (II.B.1).

Other tools used to systematically gather data useful to student support services include the Environmental Scan (II.B.40). This scan is regularly conducted by the Institutional Research and Planning Office, and yields rich
data which informs College and student services-related planning. The Institutional Research and Planning Office also generates additional material for student support services evaluation in the form of the biennial student surveys it administers, and the regular Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report it assembles on student retention, persistence, graduation, and university transfer (II.B.41).

Numerous student services departments conduct and share mandated student support evaluations with external agencies. The Student Health Center regularly conducts a student survey as part of the National College Health Survey administered by the American College Health Association (II.B.46). The Financial Aid Office organizes, evaluates, and reports data to state and federal governments on student financial aid participation, as in the numbers of students applying for federal and other forms of financial aid and the percentage of students fulfilling their responsibilities to maintain satisfactory academic progress. Student support staff service levels and approaches are adjusted on the basis of these reports and supplementary data. The Department of Rehabilitation, EOPS, DSPS, the One-Stop Career Center, and the International Programs and Services Office are other student support units which work with external agencies on the mandatory tracking and reporting of student data. The information gleaned therein informs the planning and provision of student support services by the respective departments.

During registration periods the vice president, student services provides enrollment management reports daily, so that accurate, up-to-the-moment enrollment patterns are understood and so that services can be deployed accordingly. Academic deans and the vice president, academic affairs have access to these enrollment reports at all times and use them to plan future schedules or test the full-time equivalent student production levels of various scheduling options. A sample Enrollment Report is provided as a source of evidence (II.B.47). The College is then able to utilize the information from fill rates and active waitlists, and qualitative data from counselors to define course offerings. Online counseling patterns are also closely tracked and monitored, so that students of the eCampus and others can access reliable and timely electronic counseling advice.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The student services Area is committed to providing high quality support services to students and to ongoing improvement of these services. Student Services Learning Outcomes and the Student Services Curriculum of which they are a part have been in use at the College since 2004. The student services management team has reviewed and discussed the Student Services Learning Outcomes and Student Services Curriculum frequently since their initial adoption, most commonly at its regularly held meetings and retreats. This dialogue has enhanced understanding of how best to implement measures to meaningfully assess Student Services Learning Outcomes and student needs. The Student Services Curriculum is in the College catalog and are included in Student Services Program and Services Reviews (II.B.1).

Student Services Program and Services Reviews include program analysis and PIOs, and these contribute to ongoing improvement of student support services. Student services SLOs are also identified in Program and Services Reviews.

The methods cited in the Descriptive Summary yield insights and analysis which feeds into calibrated student support approaches, and also the continual improvement of these. For example, the Student Health Center reporting has generated actionable data which has positioned the College to successfully acquire a Step Up mental health-related grant (II.B.48). This grant has enabled the College to enhance and diversify significantly available mental health
support resources for students and faculty. EOPS and DSPS utilize advisory committees which, acting on quantitative and qualitative data and program analysis, conduct oversight and contribute quality improvement ideas. The Admissions and Records and Financial Aid Offices, respectively, actively monitor student inquiry data and adjust in-person and online staffing levels accordingly.

Diligent enrollment checking, the use of case management file processing within the Financial Aid Office, and the regular attention by faculty to drop students for non-attendance have all contributed to maintaining accurate state compliance and the avoidance of financial aid fraud. The College was involved in reporting and supplying evidence to the Department of Education which led to the prosecution of a fraud ring of individuals during the 2012-2013 fiscal year.

Interpreting and accommodations services recently undertook a comprehensive evaluation of their services. This process included an analysis of the different categories of services provided in the context of the timeline of a student’s educational journey at the College—submitting an admissions application, registering for classes, meeting with a counselor, and so forth. On the basis of this comprehensive student support services analysis the DSPS and interpreting and accommodations services were disaggregated into two separate, complementary departments. This division of responsibilities parallels the aforementioned student timeline, and is aimed at enhancing student services delivery. Interpreting and accommodations services also utilized student enrollment and related data to better streamline the deployment of interpreters. Specifically, the department was able to realize cost savings in the form of reducing and later eliminating its reliance on external agency-provided interpreting services.

WorkAbility III reports to the California State Department of Rehabilitation on its successes with assisting disabled students with job readiness and acquisition. Every three months WorkAbility III is visited by a state official with whom they collaborate to ensure that student support delivery is such that students are adequately served and the department is able to meet its job placement targets.

The International Programs and Services Department, under the auspices of the International Education Committee, created a comprehensive 2011-2015 International Programs and Services Strategic Plan. This plan is comprised of 41 inter-related goals. A number of these goals directly relate to student support, including Goal 21, “Develop International Student Mentor program” and Goal 22, “Support development of International Peer Mentor Program.” Both goals have been accomplished since their establishment.

DSPS and the Transfer Center are just two departments which have thoughtfully incorporated the Student Services Curriculum into analysis of student support services, in context of Student Services Learning Outcomes.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Although the College has made progress in implementing Student Services Learning Outcomes, efforts to create and implement effective metrics to meaningfully assess the same should be redoubled.
Standard II.B. Sources of Evidence

II.B.1 Student Services Program Reviews
II.B.2 Student Services Curriculum
II.B.3 Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning and Program Review
II.B.4 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey
II.B.5 College Catalog
II.B.6 Class Schedule
II.B.7 Student Handbook
II.B.8 Student Services Policies/Procedures
II.B.9 College Council Meeting Minutes about Class Schedule
II.B.10 Accommodations and Services program Review
II.B.11 Guide To Student
II.B.12 Student Activities
II.B.13 Personal Development
II.B.14 DSPS
II.B.15 Smith Center
II.B.16 Personal Counseling Program Review 2011-2012
II.B.17 Faculty Senate Membership
II.B.18 College Council Membership
II.B.19 Curriculum Committee Membership
II.B.20 Student Success Act, 2012
II.B.21 EOPS Program Review
II.B.22 DSPS Program Review
II.B.23 Puente Program Review
II.B.24 Professional Development Activities and Committee Assignments for Counseling
II.B.25 Curriculum for New Counselor Training/List of Training Sessions
II.B.26 Student Survey Website
II.B.27 Community College Counseling, Student Educational Plans, And Educational Outcomes: A Quantitative Analysis
II.B.28 Personal Development Statistics, 2010
II.B.29 Orientation Data: Retention, Success, and Persistence Rates for Freshman Connection Students
II.B.31 AB540 Website
II.B.32 Crisis Intervention Policy & Procedure, 2013
II.B.33 International Program/Services Strategic Plan
II.B.34 Puente Events
II.B.35 Deaf Studies Events
II.B.36 International Program and Services
| II.B.37 | Dia de los Muertos |
| II.B.38 | Indigenous Peoples Day |
| II.B.39 | Intercultural/International Studies GE Requirement |
| II.B.40 | Environmental Scan |
| II.B.41 | 2012 Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) |
| II.B.42 | Accuplacer English Validation Study 2010-11 |
| II.B.43 | Accuplacer Math Validation Study 2010-11 |
| II.B.44 | Placement Testing Trends 2008FA to 2012FA |
| II.B.45 | Evidence that cultural and linguistic biases are minimized |
| II.B.46 | Student Health Center Survey |
| II.B.47 | XEMGT (Enrollment) report |
| II.B.48 | Step Up Program |
STANDARD II.C.
Library and Learning Support Services
This page intentionally left blank for printed version.
The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student-learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution’s instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student-learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.

II.C.1. The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Library and other learning support services support the College’s mission and facilitate student learning across the curriculum. As a central resource supporting the entire College, and by means of the services and resources detailed in the subsections of this standard, the library serves students, faculty, and the entire College community in various ways: as an instructional unit, as an academic support resource, and as a locus of learning of all kinds.

SELF-EVALUATION
Specific analyses covering the range of library resources and services including equipment and materials, information competency, support of remote users, and facilities demonstrate that the College meets this standard. In general, recent survey results show that library and learning support services
are sufficient to meet the learning needs of all users (II.C.4, II.C.8, II.C.14, II.C.16).

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.C.1.a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College provides students with access to a variety of library and learning resource services that support and enhance student learning success. The Fremont campus library includes seating for over 400 students; eight group study rooms; a computing area with 30 personal computers with Internet access and Microsoft Office applications; and adaptive software for blind and low-vision users on selected workstations. The Fremont campus houses the College’s print collection; periodicals in print format; and the course reserves collection including textbooks, supplemental readings, music CDs, instructional video collection, and audiovisual materials. The Learning Resources Center (LRC) at the Newark center offers seating for 90 students including six group study rooms and 29 computers for student-use, primarily laptops available for use only within the LRC.

The library’s electronic resources greatly expand the information sources available to students both on and off campus; these electronic resources are an important part of ensuring comparable services to Distance Education (DE) and other off-campus learners. Electronic resources include electronic books and full-text journals available through subscription and open-access databases. Access to licensed electronic resources from off-campus is seamlessly provided via a proxy server that authenticates off-campus users based on their student identification number and last name. Print and electronic book and media collections are maintained through an Integrated Library System (ILS), the Voyager system from ExLibris, which includes a web-based public access catalog (HANS), as well as circulation, cataloging, acquisitions, and serials modules. To assist students with navigating the numerous and diverse resources, a discovery search function allows for simultaneous searching across all resources collectively. This functionality was delivered via Serials Solutions’ federated search from 2006-2012 and via Ebscohost’s Discovery Service beginning in 2012. In addition, the library subscribes to an open-URL resolver to redirect results from citation databases to full-text holdings where they are available, and to an A-Z list allowing users to locate specific journals in any of the databases.

The library website (II.C.1) acts as a portal to all this information as well as to recommended Internet resources and to information about the library and its services. In addition to providing the website as a virtual gateway to information resources of all kinds, library services are embedded into other spaces where student learning already takes place. Library search boxes are integrated into DE courses, faculty blogs, and websites; a toolbar, installed on all library computers and available for students to download, integrates library search options directly into the web browser; holdings information is shared with web-based search tools such as Google Scholar so that the library’s resources are integrated into search results from these services; and librarians use social media channels such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube to provide instructional tutorials, to share news and information, and to otherwise engage with library users. All of these electronic modes of
interacting with students help to ensure that DE learners and off-site students receive a comparable level of service to that of on-site students.

The College has systems in place to ensure that faculty and students have input into the assessment and selection of library materials. The librarians work one-on-one with students throughout the semester and track student requests for research materials, noting when the collection meets or fails to meet student learning needs. The course review and the Program and Services Review processes, fully implemented through CurricUNET® (II.C.2), ensure that the collection development librarian is apprised of all new programs and courses and can work with relevant faculty to assess existing materials and enhance collections as required. A librarian has been a member of the Curriculum Committee consistently since 1999, and chaired the General Education Committee recently. In addition, the library has sponsored several faculty development Flex activities where classroom faculty have assumed responsibility for assessing, deselecting, and suggesting additions to holdings in their disciplines. The collection development librarian regularly solicits and responds to faculty requests for materials, and makes selection decisions based on these suggestions along with regular monitoring of standard review sources, regular assessment of interactions between students and reference librarians, and curricular changes as tracked through CurricUNET®.

Learning Centers offer assistance to students in a variety of locations spread between the two campuses. Discipline-specific centers support mathematics, physics, engineering, English, English as a Second Language (ESL), computer science, speech communication, disabled students programs and services, Deaf studies, American Sign Language, multimedia, biology, chemistry, accounting, and, by appointment, registered nursing and respiratory therapy. The English Learning Center, while primarily focused on English and ESL, also oversees the provision of tutoring for subjects not covered by discipline-specific centers, such as history and foreign languages. The College also supports course-associated tutors for instructors who want them. These tutors offer structured supplemental instruction for groups of students in a specific course. This type of tutoring is referred to as the Learning Assistant Program/Supplemental Instruction (LAPSI) program (for non-basic skills) and embedded tutoring (for basic skills). All tutoring services are offered free of charge to currently enrolled students. These services include the course-associated tutors previously mentioned, drop-in tutoring with faculty, and peer-based tutoring on a drop-in or appointment basis. Tutors also work alongside instructors in self-paced mathematics and English classes. In addition to tutoring, the variety of centers provide access to self-paced courses in subjects such as vocabulary building, reading comprehension, spelling, and learning techniques; subject-specific software such as Mathematica, Matlab, and Maple; and equipment such as microscopes and spectrophotometers.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

To assess the effectiveness of its collections and determine whether materials are sufficient in quantity, quality, depth, and variety to meet the learning needs of students, the library regularly monitors its usage statistics and solicits feedback from students and faculty. Usage data and survey results indicate that the collections—which include 56,000 book volumes, 163 print periodicals, over 5000 music CDs, a course reserve collection with over 5700 items including textbooks, and an instructional video collection of over 2800 titles—are meeting student learning needs. Along with formal assessments of institutional, program, and course Information Competency Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as described in subsection II.C.b, the library uses information including usage statistics and survey results to determine whether it is enhancing student achievement of identified learning outcomes. These data show high use of
library resources such as electronic reference sources and periodical databases, reflecting student achievement of the identified Information Competency SLOs (II.I.C.3).

Results from the Spring 2013 Student Survey (II.I.C.4) indicated that of the 1083 student responses with an opinion, 89.2 percent answered Strong Yes or Yes to the statement: "the Ohlone library/learning resource center provides me access to the information I need for my assignments." Sixty-three percent of the faculty who responded to the Spring 2013 Faculty Survey indicated a Strong Yes or Yes that the library collection had enough breadth to meet the needs of faculty and students. At the same time, 97.2 percent of faculty who responded answered Strong Yes or Yes to whether they agreed with the statement that library staff was "responsive to faculty input and needs" (II.I.C.5, II.I.C.6). This data is reflective of the faculty's perception that the College’s library staff are responsive to their curricular needs.

The library meets the vast majority of student research needs with existing print and electronic collections. However, to guide collection development efforts, reference librarians keep daily records of interactions with students who specifically request books or whose research needs are best served by print materials. An analysis of these Reference Desk Subject Logs reveals that out of 152 such interactions over the 2012-2013 academic year librarians noted 106 instances (70 percent) where the print collection did not meet the demand (II.I.C.7). The library recognizes that print collections—particularly in periodical and reference collections—play an increasingly smaller role in total library holdings. Printed books remain an essential intellectual resource for the College community, and an updated, vibrant circulating book collection still plays a critical role in support of student learning.

Results from the fall 2012 survey conducted by the librarians to ensure faculty input and to gather suggestions for improving library collections, services, or physical facilities indicated 31 percent of those who responded specifically referenced the need for more and/or more current books in their subject areas. When asked to select the single "most important library resource for [their] students,” 23 percent of faculty selected books, both on “academic topics” and on “general interest topics including current events and fiction/literature” (II.I.C.8). Statistical analyses as presented in the LRC Program and Services Review (II.I.C.3) demonstrate that circulation statistics rise and fall along with the rise and fall of the book budget. Simply put, when the library provides current, appealing, and relevant materials, students use them more.

The library recognizes a need to review its existing print and media collections, discard materials no longer of use, and acquire up-to-date print materials to support student learning; these goals are documented as a Program Improvement Objective (PIO) in the LRC Program and Services Review (II.I.C.3). The College prioritized this PIO and in fall 2012 reallocated $20,000 from the General Fund budget to address the book budget. In addition, the College’s Foundation recently raised $10,000 for books at their 2013 Citizen of the Year fundraiser event. Despite these efforts, maintaining the budget for printed books is an ongoing challenge for the College.

Library and learning support services have continued to be an integral part of student learning at the College, and numerous improvements have been made especially in the areas of electronic resources and technological support. Despite a downturn in the economy and the loss of state Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds dedicated to electronic databases, the College has done an outstanding job of maintaining and even expanding electronic collections in support of student learning. Highlights of this growth include more than doubling the electronic book collection and a fivefold
increase in the online periodical holdings. Remote access to all licensed content remains straightforward and reliable. The website has been continually updated incorporating web 2.0 elements as appropriate and useful.

There is evidence also that the instructional media collection could be strengthened to better facilitate educational offerings. When asked if they agreed with the statement “library media collections (CDs, VHS, and DVDs) are adequate to support my program,” 40 percent of faculty respondents answered disagreed or strongly disagreed, while the remaining 60 percent agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (II.C.8). Central to addressing the faculty request for media will be determining best format(s) to move forward with, including streaming media options.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.C.1.b. The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Through the Library Science Department, by offering customized library instruction sessions and more broadly through the General Education (GE) Plan A Area VII, Information Competency graduation requirement, the College provides ongoing instruction to assist all students in developing skills in information competency. The specific information competencies to be acquired by all students are summarized by the Information Competency GE SLOs:

1. Develop effective research strategies.
2. Locate, retrieve, evaluate, and use information ethically and legally.

Beginning with the 2004-2005 academic year, the College has had in place a General Education requirement for information competency for GE Plan A (II.C.9). Intended to ensure that graduates are able to locate and use information effectively and efficiently, the requirement combines basic computer literacy with research and critical thinking skills. Students may fulfill the requirement either by taking courses offered through the Library Science Department or by demonstrating competency using a test-out option. Two academic programs, Registered Nursing and Physical Therapy Assistant, have, in collaboration with library faculty, incorporated information competency modules into their coursework; students within these programs do not need to take further coursework to fulfill the information competency requirement. In addition, information competency has been embedded into two speech and communication studies courses and two history courses, so that students may fulfill the information competency requirement by successfully completing SPCH-101, Introduction to Public Speaking; COMM-100, Introduction to Communication Theory; HIST-119A, Bad Girls: Women in America before 1890; or HIST-119B, Bad Girls: Women in America from 1890. Librarians and English Department faculty also collaborated to create a DE lab for ENGL-101A, Reading and Written Composition, which incorporates information competency concepts in depth, reaching the large number of students who take this transfer requirement course.

In addition to the GE requirement and the ENGL-101A lab, information competency is the SLO identified for the library program (II.C.3), and the program addresses this SLO by several means, including formal library science coursework, library instruction sessions offered to groups of students throughout the semester, daily one-on-one
reference interactions, and online tools set-up by library staff. Beginning in spring 2012, the library has improved the effectiveness of its on-campus information competency instruction by creating a technology-enabled classroom dedicated to information competency instruction and ongoing workshops. The space is equipped with a projector, 20 student-use laptops, a wireless access point, and flexible seating for approximately 30 students. Having a dedicated space for library instruction has certainly positively impacted the program. The room allows for hands-on instruction, which was not always possible when librarians visited classrooms.

In addition to routinely posting instructional session guides and handouts on the library website, the library has designed a series of instructional videos (the “Go for Coffee” Research Series) available to students, faculty, and the broader community on the library’s YouTube channel (II.C.10). Linked from the library website, the videos have also been embedded into the ENGL-101A DE research lab. Since fall 2009 the videos have garnered over 30,000 views and many positive responses.

Beginning in spring 2010, the library has awarded an annual “Outstanding Research Paper Award” as part of the College wide Student Awards Ceremony held each spring. Along with recognizing excellence in student work, the prize has raised awareness and sparked dialogue College wide about expected information competency skills and SLOs.

SELF-EVALUATION
The Library Science Department offers two formal for-credit courses and, as their course outlines reflect (II.C.11, II.C.12), each explicitly addresses information competency concepts in its expected SLOs. By definition then, students who successfully complete these courses are achieving success with the program learning outcomes. Analyzing data from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Datamart system reveals positive trends in the numbers of students being reached through library science coursework, in their retention in these courses, and in successful course completion rates (II.C.13). For example, the average success rate for LS-101, Steps to Successful Research, and LS-151, Internet for Research, between fall 2006 and spring 2009 was 62 percent, while the average success rate between fall 2009 and spring 2012 was 69 percent, a seven percent increase in student success over the past three years.

The library evaluates its effectiveness in teaching information competencies and sets goals for improvement via many channels, including student evaluations, student and faculty surveys, and the Program and Services Review and course assessment processes. In 2012 faculty librarians developed an instrument to measure student learning in the instructional sessions they teach. Data yielded by this instrument demonstrate that students have learned how to access library services and resources, and understand specific information competency concepts such as research strategies and web evaluation. One hundred percent of students reported that they will use the library resources they learned about in the instructional session. Based on recent assessments across the information competency instructional program, librarians have developed a standardized curricular approach to delivering information competency concepts and application. Preliminary data are showing that this consistent approach to library skills instruction is an effective teaching strategy. When asked whether they noticed an improvement in their students’ research skills following a library instruction session, 94 percent of surveyed faculty answered in the affirmative (II.C.8). Students also highly rated their instruction sessions in the student survey, with 88 percent describing the session as either Excellent or Good, and all of the remaining 11 percent selecting Average rather than Poor (II.C.14).
A recent assessment of the GE Plan A Area VII, Information Competency requirement as embedded in SPCH-101 indicated that students who completed this course achieved the intended learning outcomes, and the assessment yielded useful information for improving the course and increasing student mastery of these skills (II.C.3). Beginning in spring 2010, librarians worked closely with English faculty to create a DE version of the ENGL-101A research skills lab. The lab is required for all ENGL-101A classes and delivers significant instruction in and practice with information competency skills. An assessment of the DE ENGL-101A research skills lab is available as an attachment to the LRC Program and Services Review (II.C.3); this initial assessment concludes: “overall the data indicates that students are meeting or exceeding expectations…with an overall increase in performance in the area related to Sources.”

As documented in the Program and Services Review (II.C.3), library faculty members have recently conducted a course assessment of the department’s core library skills course, LS-101, Steps to Successful Research. This assessment project focused on student mastery of course student learning outcome (SLO) number four: “analyze and evaluate information.” Because LS-101 fulfills the GE Plan A Area VII, Information Competency, requirement, the project was also useful in assessing student mastery of GE SLO number two: “locate, retrieve, evaluate, and use information ethically and legally.” The assessment analyzed data from students’ culminating “annotated bibliography” projects; this analysis indicating that most students met expectations. While not a significant number, enough annotations failed to achieve a level of mastery to warrant adjustments to instructional approaches; these adjustments have been implemented and will be assessed once data from current terms become available.

The evidence demonstrates the range of effective modes of ongoing instruction that ensure students are able to develop skills in information competency. The College has acted purposefully to institutionalize the commitment to information competency by instituting this concept as an institutional student learning outcome via the information competency GE requirement. Faculty librarians make daily progress improving students’ information competency skills via library skills coursework, customized library instruction sessions, the design of online tutorials, and daily reference interactions. With the development of a classroom within the library dedicated to library instruction, librarians have been able to provide more consistent and hands-on instruction sessions, resulting in improved learning outcomes as demonstrated by instructional evaluation instruments (II.C.15). The recent work to embed fulfillment of the information competency GE requirement in core speech and communication studies classes has resulted in improvements to how research skills are taught in these courses, and the ongoing course assessment process has resulted in improved information competency learning outcomes for core library courses (II.C.3).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.C.1.c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student-learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College provides all students and faculty with access to library resources and other learning support services,
Regardless of their location, department, means of access, or any other factor. The library website (II.C.1) provides students and staff with “always on” on-site and remote access to the online catalog, the periodical databases, electronic book collections, and other library-generated learning resources. Remote access to the electronic collections is seamless and generally trouble-free: students, faculty, and staff log in once per browser session, using their student or staff ID and last name, to access any licensed content they encounter during that session.

The quantity of electronic resources available from any location has increased steadily over the past several years. Electronic collections are robust and support programs across the entire curriculum, providing equal access to students on the Fremont, Newark, or eCampus. Since the last self-study, the number of electronic databases licensed has increased from 11 to 51, and the number of electronic books available has more than doubled. Beginning several years ago, library faculty have reached out to online educators, presenting workshops and technical support on how to embed customized library resources into their course management shells. As of spring 2013 the library has enhanced this service with a subscription to the online portal resource LibGuides. LibGuides allows for the easy generation of attractive and media-rich course or subject specific research guides, which can be designed in collaboration with subject instructors and easily integrated into DE courses. In addition, the library has greatly increased its reach into social media outlets and other Library 2.0 initiatives (an interactive model for the design and implementation of technology-driven LRC services and applications) to reach all students regardless of location or means of access. This increase has included the incorporation of social media tools, including Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and SCVNGR, to engage with and provide instruction for users, and to promote library resources to students and faculty (II.C.1).

The Fremont campus library’s current open hours are 7:45am-7:45pm Monday through Thursday and 7:45am-4:00pm on Friday. The Newark campus LRC hours are Monday through Thursday from 9:00am-8:00pm. Since the opening of the Newark Center in 2008, library faculty members have worked to develop support services appropriate to the Newark campus. Such services include scan-email, laptop check-out, small group study room reservations, and a series of user guides for the technology available for use within the LRC, as well as providing assistance to students using Newark Center specific technology for classroom presentations. Library faculty instituted a popular one-on-one research assistance program encouraging students to make appointments with librarians for uninterrupted individualized attention locating high quality sources for research projects in addition to traditional reference service, and a series of customized instructional sessions have been developed and are delivered each semester to various discipline clusters such as the registered nursing and allied health programs. Although the great majority of print materials are held at the Fremont library, the College provides an inter-campus delivery program for books and media; turnaround time is generally within 48 hours.

The College offers learning assistance through learning centers located on both the Fremont and Newark campuses and via DE. Currently, a number of learning centers are located across each campus, settling where sufficient space became available. With the passage of the Measure G Bond and planning of new academic core buildings on the Fremont campus, the College has developed a Library/Learning Commons model which will centralize the learning services for English, ESL, mathematics, and speech and communication studies. In addition, specialized learning centers, such as those for multimedia studies and accounting, may be brought into the Learning Commons in order to make better use of resources and provide a more
convenient center of support for students. The Learning Commons will provide a model that can later be adapted to the Newark campus. Tutorial services for biology and chemistry will be housed in the new Science Center.

For the areas of mathematics and English/ESL, learning centers are situated physically at both campuses to offer drop-in and by-appointment tutoring from 9:00am-8:00pm Monday through Thursday and 9:00am-5:00pm on Fridays in Fremont, and 9:00am-5:00pm Monday through Thursday in Newark. Online tutoring through the English Learning Center was added in fall 2010. Online tutoring involves tutors using tablet PCs with Skype, Mikogo, and Microsoft OneNote software (which allows active markings of documents) in live-time to help students who have scheduled online tutoring appointments.

Tutoring for registered nursing and respiratory therapy is only offered on the Newark campus, the home for all allied health programs. Tutoring for accounting is only offered at the Fremont campus, the location for all accounting classes. However, in the areas of speech communication, biology, and chemistry, courses are offered at both the Fremont and Newark campuses. However, all speech communication, biology, and chemistry students, whether at the Newark or Fremont campus, must go to the Fremont campus for tutorial assistance.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College and the library follow procedures to ensure that library holdings are related to educational programs and that all educational programs have adequate materials in the library. Through the course and Program and Services Review processes, the collection development librarian is kept aware of all new programs and courses and can work with relevant faculty to assess existing materials and enhance collections as required. Librarians serve on the Curriculum Committee and the GE Committee where they collaborate with classroom faculty on curricular changes, and faculty and student requests are important drivers of selection and acquisition decisions.

Recent student and faculty survey results indicate that, overall, College educational program needs are adequately supported by library holdings. There is strong evidence that the library’s electronic resources are heavily used by remote users including DE students; during the 2011-2012 academic year students performed nearly 700,000 searches in the periodical databases, retrieving over 600,000 full-text articles (II.C.3). Worth noting is that when students were asked in a recent survey how often they visit the Library/Learning Resource Center 33.8 percent indicated occasionally, 19.3 percent indicated two times a week, 18.6 percent indicated three or more times per week, and 17.9 percent indicated they never visited the library on campus. Strategies to ensure that all students regardless of location or means of access have access to library resources include offering such resources through social media channels and making web content accessible to mobile devices. The library has had some success in reaching students via these channels; for example, the library’s locally produced instructional videos have garnered nearly 40,000 views on YouTube.

In 2012 a survey was conducted to obtain input for planning the new Library/Learning Commons area. The results indicated that the top three reasons that students do not visit the Fremont campus library more often include lack of comfortable places to relax (39.3 percent); they do not study on campus (37 percent); and they use other sources for research and information, such as the internet (28.6 percent). Eighteen percent of the students indicated that the hours of operation are too limited, and 13.8 percent selected lack of variety and quality of resources (books,
periodicals, and support staff) (II.C.16). Given the history of low usage during later evening and weekend hours and given budget and staffing priorities, extending the open hours in the existing facility probably is not feasible. Student needs and use in this area are monitored continuously, and library open hours will be reevaluated in the context of planning the new library within a Learning Commons being planned in the Measure G implementation.

Along with library services, multiple labs and learning centers on campus support the curriculum and contribute to student learning. Eighty-three percent of the students who expressed an opinion in response to the Spring 2013 Student Survey (II.C.4) agreed with the statement that “Sufficient tutoring resources are available in a variety of subjects,” and, of those with an opinion, 55.4 percent agreed with the statement, “my grade in class has improved because I used the on-campus tutoring services.” Although these student survey results reflect positively on the labs, a recent survey of faculty and lab technicians revealed that there was room for improvement in the tutoring services offered to evening students and to certain disciplines. According to the 2012 survey (II.C.17), the Math Lab, Science Lab, and English Learning Center Coordinators report need for more tutors, tutor training, and space.

The English Learning Center (ELC) exists to support the lab component of several basic skills English reading and writing classes; to provide a number of self-paced, skill-building English classes; and to provide free English tutoring in writing, reading, speaking, and listening for all currently enrolled (transfer level and basic skills level of students), regardless of discipline. During fall 2012 and spring 2013, the ELC supported an average of 71 basic skills courses each semester. The ELC also supports as many of the same courses as are offered during the summer term. In conjunction with program coordinators and the ELC Coordinator, four instructional assistants collect and store lab data for ENGL-101A courses (approximately 33 sections per semester), and create, duplicate, oversee, and facilitate the lab work and manage the lab data and grades for several English courses at both the Fremont and Newark campuses.

To support speech communication students, the Maggie Morrison Communication Lab was established in 2006, and now serves between 400 (in the fall) and 500 (in the spring) speech communication students per semester with tutoring in oral communication, organizational and critical thinking skills including information competency skills. The Communication Lab manual also has a section on research and information competency that includes evaluating information and evidence found online.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

II.C.1.d. The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College provides adequate security for its Fremont campus library and Newark LRC, and other learning centers and support services. 3M security gates at both entrance and exit doors secure physical library materials within the library buildings; however, security of materials can be negatively impacted as students with disabilities must bypass the security gates to use the elevators which are external to these gates. Regular backups secure daily database updates to the library’s automated Voyager system. A reliable remote authentication system for the library’s electronic resources ensures that only registered students or staff members have access to the licensed
materials. College security personnel respond rapidly to any requests for their assistance.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College has long recognized a need to modernize and improve existing library facilities on the Fremont campus to increase the security and effectiveness of learning support services. The recent passage of Measure G will allow for a completely new library on that campus. Initial plans for this building show strong support for keeping the library at the center of institutional life and for developing new facilities around a learning commons model, which will provide upgraded facilities for many of the existing basic skills learning centers. With the passage of bond Measure G and pending plans for replacing buildings, the College is effectively positioned to excel with respect to this standard. The focus over the next few years will be on designing transitional temporary space that meets student needs during construction, along with planning for a new library to meet student needs well into the future.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**II.C.1.e. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The library relies on outside consortia and vendors to support and supplement collections and services. Consortia memberships are maintained where such membership provides cost-savings and other benefits to students; for example, the participation in the Community College Library Consortium through the Community College League of California provides for substantial group buying discounts for electronic resources such as eBooks and online databases.

The following formal agreements exist and are on file in the library offices (II.C.18):

- Maintenance contracts with the Integrated Library System (ILS) vendor, ExLibris
- Contracts with the bibliographic utility and Interlibrary Loan (ILL) provider, OCLC
- CCL League Contract
- Standard licensing agreements with providers of eBooks and online databases

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Practical and cost-saving contracts with consortia and outside vendors allow the library to maximize the resources available to students, thereby contributing to several College values and goals, including stewardship of financial resources and improving student learning.

Contracted services are reviewed on a continuous basis to ensure they continue to meet users’ needs. For example, librarians review electronic database subscriptions annually, incorporating information such as feedback from students and faculty, database use statistics compiled locally, and product reviews provided by the consortium.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
II.C.2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student-learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Librarians regularly evaluate services and assess learning outcomes as part of the Program and Services Review process every three years, through departmental course assessment, and through additional assessments such as those related to GE Information Competency SLOs. The Program and Services Review is the primary method that the College uses to evaluate its library and library services. Library PIOs are identified in the Program and Services Review, and it is through this process that the library identifies its needs and communicates those needs at the institutional level.

The library’s evaluation and review processes are informed by faculty, staff, and student input through many channels. Librarians participate on Curriculum and GE Committees, thereby keeping abreast of new courses and programs, and communicating directly with faculty about their needs for instructional material at the point of updating and developing curriculum. Librarians also work closely with individual faculty to determine if library materials are adequate for their courses; particularly strong relationships exist with faculty from the Communication and English Departments and faculty teaching in the humanities and social sciences.

Circulation and database usage statistics help to guide purchases of print and electronic resources, as do faculty and student surveys and data collected at the library reference desk (II.C.7, II.C.8, II.C.19). In anticipation of a planned new library on the Fremont campus, a major collection reduction project is underway for the circulating collection, and materials usage is an important criterion for these de-selection decisions.

To determine if tutoring services are adequate and meeting student needs the College includes questions in the student survey conducted by the Institutional Research and Planning Office. The English and Speech and Communication Studies Departments include the learning support labs within their respective departments Program and Services Reviews. Currently the College is exploring software tracking options for its learning support services which will provide options for data analysis, and linkage to SLOs.

SELF-EVALUATION

Ongoing efforts at assessing SLOs related to information competency have yielded data which have resulted in improved instruction for students. For example, based on recent assessments across the information competency instructional program, library faculty developed a standardized curricular approach to delivering information competency concepts and application. Preliminary data are showing that this consistent approach to library skills instruction is an effective teaching strategy (II.C.3). As another outcome from these recent assessments, library faculty developed an improved instrument to measure student learning in instructional sessions taught by library faculty. Data yielded by these instruments demonstrate that students have learned how to access library resources and services and specific information competency concepts such as research strategies and web evaluation. Further, 100 percent of students surveyed by the instrument reported that they planned to use the library resources they learned about in the instructional session. Anecdotal evidence from instructors suggests students do increase their use of appropriate academic sources following library instructional sessions.
Additional evidence showing a positive relationship between library use and student learning comes from a recent assessment of students’ research skills following the adoption of a new ENGL-101A research skills lab jointly developed by librarians and English faculty. The initial assessment (II.C.3) demonstrated that overall, students were meeting or exceeding expectations in all three research skills areas measured, and that performance on at least one measure, selecting varied and credible sources, may have improved following the adoption of the new DE research skills lab.

Tutoring is the primary function for most of the learning centers. A comprehensive examination of the relationship between tutoring and course success has not been possible because of the lack of a system that would track tutoring for specific students in specific classes. However, very small scale examinations of student success rates in classes with course-associated tutors (LAPSI and embedded) suggest the effectiveness of this type of tutoring. The challenges of increasing the use of course-associated tutors stem largely from the absence of a coordinator for this program. A math faculty member has taken on a large amount of the responsibility for helping faculty with the process of finding students qualified to be course-associated tutors, but the faculty member does not have the time needed to reach out to faculty about using course-associated tutors, or to provide support for the tutors once they are attached to a course.

The effectiveness of tutoring also depends on the quality of the peer-tutors. The College currently offers tutor training that provides College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) certification through a pair of courses, EDUC-191A, Tutor Training I, and EDUC-191AL, Tutor Training I Lab Consultant. However, because the course is not required in order to be a tutor, only a limited number of students access the training. As a result, many of the tutors working in the learning centers are not CRLA certified. The tutor training classes were worked on extensively in order to comply with the new CRLA requirements and to make them even more effective. As a result the tutor training classes were awarded recertification in 2011.

Tutoring is also most effective when a faculty member knows that a student is receiving tutoring assistance. This knowledge gives a faculty member the opportunity to work with a tutor to provide the timeliest assistance to the student. Currently, the College lacks the resources needed to establish an effective and on-going system to inform instructors and tutors about specific students and their needs. To address this issue, academic deans are currently discussing strategies for improvement, including tracking programs that can facilitate communication between tutors and instructors and provide data about student access to tutoring for specific classes, and the possibility of establishing a position to coordinate all tutoring, including tutor training, faculty outreach, communication, and tracking of tutoring sessions.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None
Standard II.C. Sources of Evidence

II.C.1 Ohlone College Library website
II.C.2 CurricUNET
II.C.3 LRC Program and Services Review
II.C.4 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey
II.C.5 2013 Spring Faculty Satisfaction Survey
II.C.6 2013 Spring Staff Satisfaction Survey
II.C.7 Reference Desk Subject Logs
II.C.8 2012 Fall Faculty & Staff Survey Conducted by the Library
II.C.9 College Catalog, GE descriptions for Information Competency requirement
II.C.10 Ohlone Library YouTube channel
II.C.11 Library Science Courses Syllabi
II.C.12 Library Science Course Outlines
II.C.13 Datamart enrollment, success and retention data
II.C.14 2012 Fall Student Survey Conducted by the Library
II.C.15 Instructional Evaluation Instruments
II.C.16 Measure G Survey
II.C.17 Tutorial Needs Survey of Lab Managers, 2012
II.C.18 Contracts on File in the Library
II.C.19 LRC Program and Services Review
STANDARD III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.
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STANDARD III.A.

Human Resources
The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support programs and services. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.

III.A.1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The Program and Services Review Process provides the College with specific information about the needs and strategic direction for the programs and services it offers. The Program and Services Review process is connected with the College’s Mission Statement and major College plans. Requests for additional personnel must be reviewed by the appropriate dean, director, vice president, or associate vice president prior to being submitted to the president and vice presidents for review. Departmental needs are reviewed within the context of the College’s staffing plan. Each vice president or associate vice president must provide justification for filling any position that is vacant or newly created (III.A.1).

The College’s vision, mission, and values are used as a guide when determining job duties and job descriptions. The deans or directors work closely with staff to develop new or revised job descriptions. New or revised job descriptions for classified staff are reviewed by the president and vice presidents prior to being negotiated with the respective bargaining units. Revised or new management job descriptions are not negotiable but are reviewed by the president and vice presidents prior to being approved. Faculty job descriptions are developed in collaboration with departmental faculty. Replacement of faculty positions undergo an annual review process, through which recommendations to hire are submitted to the president/superintendent (president) for final decision.

Faculty must meet the qualifications listed in the Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges adopted by the Board of Governors in 1988 and updated annually (III.A.2) or provide evidence of equivalency. The District has an established process for determining equivalency to minimum qualifications. The process is overseen by a committee of full-time faculty and the vice president, academic affairs. Procedures for the Equivalency Committee are in place and frequently reviewed by the Faculty Senate in collaboration with the vice president, academic affairs (III.A.3).
Academic administrators are required to meet minimum qualifications similar to those of faculty. Classified administrators must have at least a master’s degree or possess extensive equivalent experience in the functional area being hired. Confidential employees must demonstrate their abilities through a combination of education and/or experience.

All job descriptions are reviewed at the time of a vacancy or when the needs and direction of the department has changed. The College is in the process of preparing for a comprehensive job classification study to be conducted during fiscal year 2014-2015. All classified bargaining unit positions and management positions will be reviewed to ensure that job descriptions properly reflect the duties the incumbent is performing and/or the needs and directions of the College.

SELF-EVALUATION
The District has an ongoing Program and Services Review process that results in the identification of Program Improvement Outcomes (PIOs). PIOs can lead to the need for additional staffing or a change in services to be provided in the future. These needs are reviewed by the president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents, and analyzed in relation to the overall vision and mission of the College, resources available, and staffing needs. If additional personnel are required to achieve the District’s mission, job descriptions are developed and vetted with the appropriate employee groups.

Currently the College has 113 full-time faculty members. All full-time faculty meet the required state minimum qualifications to teach in their specific disciplines, and 20 percent of them exceed the state minimum qualifications by having a doctoral degree in their respective field (III.A.4). The College has 15 executive and academic administrators. All administrators meet minimum qualifications, and several exceed minimum qualifications as they hold both master’s and doctoral degrees (III.A.5).

The College meets this standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

III.A.1.a. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalency has been established.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Recruitment and hiring is governed by Board Policy 7120, and recruitment and hiring procedures are being updated by the president to support the policy (III.A.6).

All hiring criteria—including committee make-up, screening tools, and interview questions—are reviewed and approved by the associate vice president, human resources and training in consultation with the president.

Pursuant to state regulations, the College actively recruits from both within and outside the College to attract qualified applicants for all new and vacant positions. In general, job openings are posted on bulletin boards throughout the College and current employees are notified via email. The College utilizes a wide range of external advertising venues (III.A.7). Many of these sources offer weekly tracking
statistics that allow the College to monitor the number of possible candidates who view the job announcements. Job announcements are advertised in local and statewide newspapers, professional journals, publications, and newsletters of professional organizations. Recruitments for full-time faculty and academic administrator positions are advertised at least statewide and are always listed with the California Community Colleges Equal Employment Opportunity Registry (CCC Registry) (III.A.8).

Prior to the start of an active recruitment process, faculty job announcements are reviewed by the appropriate academic dean, in collaboration with faculty from the respective department, to ensure that specific and emergent needs of the discipline, department, and College are reflected. Faculty job announcements provide information about the District’s mission, vision, and values. Job announcements list the minimum and desired qualifications, ideal candidate statement, and minimum education requirements that are specific to the academic discipline and the department’s focus (III.A.9).

Full-time faculty play a significant role in hiring new faculty. The hiring and recruitment guidelines require that the make-up of the screening committee includes at least three full-time faculty members, two of whom are from within the discipline (III.A.10).

Most faculty screening committees are comprised of up to five faculty members in addition to administrators, classified staff, and the student body, if applicable. Equal Employment Opportunity covered in Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 3420 requires that the constitution of screening committees are representative of the College community; include administrators, faculty, and classified staff; and require that every effort is made to ensure that the membership is diverse (III.A.11).

The College follows the procedures outlined in Administrative Procedure 3420 to ensure that hiring procedures are consistently applied. Every screening committee includes an individual trained to monitor conformance with Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) requirements. The associate vice president, human resources and training is responsible for overseeing the overall screening and selection process, including preparation of job related questions and other screening tools. A standard presentation/training is presented during the committee orientation process that includes training on the EEO policies and procedures of the District, confidentiality of the process, conflict of interest, and the requirements of applicable state regulations and federal nondiscrimination laws (III.A.12).

Applicants are required to submit unofficial transcripts to determine if minimum qualifications are met. Minimum qualifications are verified by each candidate’s college coursework and transcripts or the candidate must successfully complete the College’s equivalency process (III.A.13). Once hired, faculty must provide the College with their official academic transcripts and/or have their foreign degrees verified by a certified verification and equivalency agency.

The screening committee develops an applicant screening device (III.A.14) which evaluates an applicant based on minimum qualifications and attributes that are directly related to the job duties. The screening committee develops questions for candidates designed to extract knowledge of the discipline as well as evaluate problem solving ability, communication skills, diversity awareness, and performance related achievements. An Interview Questions and Committee Scoring Form is created (III.A.15), which is used during the interview by each screening committee member to score the responses given by the candidates. The screening committee completes an overall Strengths and
Weaknesses form for each candidate (III.A.15). In addition to the candidate’s interview performance, the following is also used in the judging the scholarship of candidates:

- a personal statement reflective of life experiences and how those experiences have been incorporated into teaching practices and philosophy;
- essays to describe expertise in a certain academic area;
- a teaching demonstration;
- scope and quality of professionalism;
- experience and skills related to the position;
- demonstrated skills and preparation to work in a multicultural, multilingual educational environment, and sensitivity to and understanding of diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students.

Typically at the end of the initial interviews, the committee compiles its scores and works together to recommend at least three candidates to move on to the final interview process.

Final candidates for full-time faculty positions are interviewed by the president and vice president, academic affairs. The final interview process is a time for the president and vice president, academic affairs to determine whether or not the candidate aligns with the mission of the College and to learn more about the candidate’s teaching and learning styles. If a final candidate is selected from this process, reference checks are conducted and a job offer is made.

Adjunct faculty members are selected for hire by the academic deans in consultation with full-time faculty members from the department. Human Resources (HR) advertises for adjunct positions and the academic dean, in collaboration with faculty members, screen applications for the best qualified candidates. Qualified candidates are contacted and remain in an eligible pool until there is a vacancy and the need to hire an adjunct. Candidates for adjunct faculty positions must also possess the required state minimum qualifications to be an instructor. The equivalency process is the same for adjunct faculty as it is for full-time faculty.

Administrators follow a similar hiring process as faculty. Once hired, administrators must provide the College with their official academic transcripts to verify their educational degrees and certifications.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College is committed to casting as wide a net as possible to attract a broad base of applicants for faculty and staff job openings and conducts extensive advertising efforts (III.A.7). The College’s budget for advertising varies each year, and averages $9000 per recruitment. Jobs are advertised a minimum of three weeks for classified positions and five weeks for faculty and administrators. The College often receives more than 100 applicants for faculty recruitments depending on the discipline being recruited.

Faculty members are very involved in the selection of new faculty. Faculty members participate as members of the Faculty Position Prioritization Committee (III.A.16). One of the committee’s charges is to review new faculty vacancies annually and advise the president on filling them. Depending on the College’s budget, the president determines the number and discipline of the faculty to be hired. Following approval from the president, the department faculty members work with the appropriate academic dean to develop the job description and the job announcement for the newly approved position(s).

The Faculty Senate appoints faculty members to each faculty screening committee. Faculty members assist in designing the hiring criteria such as supplemental questionnaires,
educational philosophy, diversity statements, teaching history, and demonstration of innovative teaching methods.

Screening committees for faculty are made up of faculty and administrators and can include classified staff as appropriate. The committee develops the screening tool as part of the process to evaluate each applicant during the initial application screening process. The tool is specific in evaluating the applicant’s ability to meet the requirements of the position as outlined in the job description and announcement. The initial interview always includes a teaching demonstration designed for the applicant to exhibit the effectiveness of his/her teaching style and ability. Candidates also need to discuss their commitment to the mission of community colleges and explain how they would embody the vision, mission, and values of the College.

Commitment and assurance that the most qualified candidates are put forward by the screening committees is evidenced in College wide training and a standardized orientation process. In December 2012 HR presented a workshop entitled “Recruitment and Hiring Procedures” which outlined in detail the hiring and recruitment process from a legal background to a complete walk-through of the College’s recruitment guidelines (III.A.12). Once the screening committee is established all members must attend a standardized orientation meeting which includes review and signing of the General Guidelines and Confidentiality Acknowledgement for Candidate Selection Committee (III.A.17).

Critical to the committee being able to identify the most qualified candidate is the discussion and description of the ideal candidate. The ideal candidate is part of the job announcement and it is a statement to encompass what type of faculty member the College is seeking (III.A.18). The hiring manager attends the first part of the committee orientation and discusses the attributes and qualifications of the ideal candidate.

Applicants are informed through the job announcement that they may be required to have part of their teaching assignment taught via Distance Education (DE) (III.A.19). In general, the College does not specifically advertise for personnel with expertise in DE. If a portion of a full-time faculty load is to be taught through DE, the faculty member is provided instruction and continued support through the College’s eCampus department. The College has an Effective Contact Policy that complies with state regulations and provides guidelines for Distance Education (III.A.20).

The College focuses on hiring the most qualified faculty. For faculty who teach DE courses, the teaching delivery method is evaluated through the regular faculty evaluation process. The applicant’s expertise in DE is secondarily considered as a criterion for hiring, as training and coaching is available through the College’s Faculty Development Program.

New faculty members are given extensive support to succeed. For the first several years new faculty are paired with a full-time faculty who serve as their mentor (III.A.20). The president provides on-going support to tenure-track faculty by meeting with them at least twice per semester and exposing them to College resources. These sessions allow the new full-time faculty to develop a cohort type relationship with each other as they navigate the College.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

***III.A.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise.***
Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Performance evaluation processes are a subject of collective bargaining. Each bargaining unit contract has a section devoted to the process and the frequency of performance evaluations (III.A.21). Managers and confidential employees are unrepresented; however, both groups have timelines outlined in their individual employment contracts and/or in a procedures handbook (III.A.22).

The District has established an annual performance evaluation period which is April 1-June 30 each year. Prior to April 1 HR prepares for the performance evaluation period by providing training for managers on how to write and conduct performance appraisals (III.A.23). All evaluations are due to HR no later than June 30 each year.

New classified employees have a probationary evaluation completed at their third, sixth, and ninth months of employment. If issues are identified during the probationary period the employee has an opportunity to correct any deficiencies. Prior to the end of the probationary period, and if an employee continues to fall below the expectations of the position, the employee may be released from employment.

After probation, if any areas of performance fall below satisfactory, the evaluation is flagged for a follow-up within 30-90 days. If the employee receives a rating of “needs improvement” in a number of critical areas, the manager must also submit a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) that has specific improvement benchmarks. Employees have the right to include a response to the evaluation, in particular if the evaluation contains derogatory information.

The evaluation procedures for adjunct faculty, tenure-track faculty, and tenured full-time faculty differ in terms of frequency and process. Adjunct faculty members are evaluated during their first year of teaching at the College and thereafter at least every six semesters. Tenure-track faculty members undergo a consecutive four-year review process and are evaluated at least once per academic year in the fall semester. The third-year process may be waived by the vice president, academic affairs upon recommendation of the Peer Evaluation Committee (III.A.24). Tenured full-time faculty members are evaluated at least once every three years.

Components of faculty evaluations include self-evaluation, student feedback, peer review, and administrative review. Each part of the process has specific goals and criteria that must be met. For example, the self-evaluation process is in place to assist the faculty member in being more aware of his/her teaching objectives, premise, and techniques. The self-evaluation also provides others in the review process with an understanding of the faculty member. Student feedback provides information directly from students about the faculty member’s performance. There are slightly different processes depending on whether the faculty member is a classroom instructor, counselor, or librarian.

For administrators, academic managers, classified managers, supervisors, and confidential staff, a common performance appraisal form is used, which provides a rating scale of exceeds expectations, satisfactory, needs improvement, unsatisfactory, or no basis for assessment (III.A.25).

The performance appraisal form has twenty-one categories related to personal and professional characteristics, as well as a section related to establishing measurable goals to be accomplished during the course of the next evaluation period. If any of the areas being measured is
noted as needs improvement or unsatisfactory the manager must develop a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). In addition to the performance appraisal form, managers can use a customized survey to get direct feedback about the employee’s performance from others such as peers and subordinates. The employee can assist the supervisor with the development of the list of peers to be surveyed. Feedback from the survey is confidential and is used to augment the evaluation, but is not the sole basis. The survey asks questions covering a broad range of workplace competencies (III.A.21). Classified and academic managers are evaluated every two years or as outlined in their employment contracts. New managers are given a first year evaluation and thereafter evaluated every two years. Confidential employees are evaluated annually during the same time period (April 1-June 30).

The associate vice president, human resources and training reads all performance evaluations as they are submitted. The purpose of this reading is to identify College wide training needs, trends in performance, and areas of deficiencies, and to ensure consistency in ratings for employees in similar departments doing like work.

SELF-EVALUATION

In the Spring 2013 Faculty Survey and the Spring 2013 Staff Survey, 61.0 percent of faculty who expressed an opinion and 66.0 percent of staff who expressed an opinion agreed “Evaluation processes help improve the quality of employees’ job performance” (III.A.26).

HR is committed to assisting managers in completing performance evaluations. Although it is difficult to get 100 percent completion of annual evaluations for classified employees by June 30 each year, in general all evaluations are completed before the fall semester begins. Factors for delay can be contributed to the turnover in management positions. Generally new managers are hired in the spring and therefore many start their employment towards the end of the evaluation period. To allow for an accurate and fair employee assessment new managers are either accompanied by the overseeing vice president or associate vice president to complete the annual evaluation or they are asked to complete baseline evaluations for their classified staff members that would establish their expectations for the next evaluation period.

Full-time and adjunct faculty evaluations are administered by the academic affairs office. Strict procedures are in place for ensuring timely completion of faculty evaluations.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

None

III.A.1.c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

While only administrators responsible for student progress toward achieving Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes as a component of their evaluation, faculty engage in a cyclical review and evaluation of all course and program SLOs. Faculty evaluate and revise all course level SLOs every six years, and faculty and administrators across the disciplines have input into these SLOs as part of the curriculum review and approval process. Every three years faculty evaluate program level SLOs as part of the Program and Services Review process. The SLOs for courses included on the Master Course list for Assessment are evaluated every three years by faculty. Faculty and administrators participate in providing feedback as part of the program and course SLO
review process. Through these three cyclical SLO evaluation processes faculty are held accountable for the effectiveness in producing SLOs. More importantly, this process encourages faculty to regularly modify and alter their instruction as needed when outcomes are not met or not met at the level faculty feel they should be.

Although effectiveness in producing SLOs is not a specific component of the faculty evaluation, as part of their self-evaluation process instructional faculty have the opportunity to provide an extensive analysis of a selected course and to reflect on their effectiveness teaching this course. As described within the faculty contract:

Choose one course that you teach in any one semester and give an extensive analysis of the course. Outline the goals that you set in this course, what you want your students to know at the completion of the course, how you would like the students’ attitudes to be enlarged by the course, the methods you use to accomplish your goals (tests, labs, study guides, course outlines, reference materials, etc.), procedures used to measure the attainment of goals (III.A.27).

Academic deans and managers have as part of their performance evaluation process under 2.21 the following (III.A.25):

**Student Learning Outcomes/Program Learning Outcomes:**
Effectively leads faculty and others to identify Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program, and/or College levels, to assess achievement of those outcomes on a regular basis, and to make improvements based on the results of the assessment.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
It is evident that faculty value student learning and engage in ongoing assessment of SLOs at the course, program, and College level. The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) is one of the largest and most well attended committees at the College. The quality, thoughtfulness, and innovation of faculty assessment of student learning are regularly highlighted during meetings, through faculty presentations of assessment projects and lively dialogue about the results. Even so, the College only partially meets this standard. Administrators responsible for overseeing faculty have a component of their evaluation that addresses effectiveness in producing learning outcomes, and they are evaluated every two years on this criteria.

Although not consistent among faculty, the following examples illustrate faculty are including within their self-evaluations a reflection of their teaching effectiveness in relation to student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes; (III.A.28)

“I use a series of formal and informal assessment to measure student learning and their mastery of course objectives, as well as assess my own teaching. The most productive formal assessment that I conduct is an anonymous self-evaluation survey after the midterm exam. I typically find that students either earn an A or B or completely fail them. Since I have begun doing the midterm exam self-evaluation the scores have gone up significantly on the final exam.”

“All three examinations map each question to a specific learning outcome to ensure that all outcomes area assessed and to learn if students are underperforming in any specific learning outcome . . . I find that it is very important to informally quiz random students to ascertain their level of understanding, so I can make adjustments for each class.”

“One of the challenges I am taking on this semester is to bring the pedagogical concepts that led to success in basic skills courses with me into my transfer level classes. I am
interested to see my student evaluations and compare them to evaluations in the past semesters.

When applicable, academic deans have included comments such as "she is active in professional development, and helps the department with SLO course review and assessment."

The College partially meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

While some discussions have already occurred, the College administration will continue to work with the faculty, through the Faculty Senate and the faculty bargaining unit, on the inclusion of SLO assessment in faculty evaluations, ultimately developing an evaluation method that is mutually agreeable to all involved.

**III.A.1.d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Board sets the framework for ethical behavior by its own adoption of a “Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice” in Board Policy 2715, which outlines a standard of behavior and ethical conduct expected from all trustees. Alleged violations of the Code of Ethics policy are addressed through Administrative Procedure 2715 (III.A.29).

The College has a set of core values outlined in Board Policy 1200 that is integrated throughout the organization which reinforces the College’s emphasis on trust, respect, and integrity (III.A.30).

Administrative Procedure 3050 Institutional Code of Ethics requires that all College employees share the fundamental responsibility to always act with integrity and in a manner that reflects the best interests of the College and its students. These procedures are reviewed with new employees during their new employee orientation and are posted on the College’s website. Employees have electronic access to all of the College’s policies and procedures (III.A.31).

The United Faculty of Ohlone (UFO) bargaining agreement has language that specifically addresses the faculty’s commitment to a high ethical standard. Article 18 of the UFO contract describes as a general duty and responsibility of a faculty member that he/she will adhere at all times to the high standards of professional ethics expected of the teaching profession (III.A.32).

The Faculty Senate adopted the Ohlone College Faculty Ethics Statement (based on the 1987 American Association of University Professors’ Statement on Professional Ethics) in February 2008 that sets out five specific areas of ethical standards (III.A.33).

In addition to the Code of Ethics statements which govern the Board, the College, and the faculty, the College has a number of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures that serve as a framework, set expectations, and further reinforce the District’s commitment to expectation of ethical and professional behavior.

The Drug-Free Environment and Drug Prevention Program (Administrative Procedure 3550) gives notice to all employees of the prohibition and consequences of unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of controlled substances (drugs). Compliance is required and is a condition of employment with the District (III.A.34).

The Gift Acceptance Policy (Board Policy 3820) states that in no event shall the College accept a donation from any donor who engages in practices or policies that discriminate against any person on the basis of race, gender, color, religion, national origin, age, disability, or sexual preference, or when the stated purposes of the donation are to
facilitate such discrimination in providing educational opportunities (III.A.35).

The Political Activity Policy (Administrative Procedure 7370) prohibits employees from using College funds, services, supplies, or equipment to urge the passage or defeat of any ballot measure or candidate, including, but not limited to, any candidate for election to the Board. This policy prohibits political activity during an employee’s working hours, but shall not be construed to prohibit an employee from urging the support or defeat of a ballot measure or candidate during non-working time (III.A.36).

The Whistle Blower Protection Policy (Administrative Procedure 7700) provides protection for employees from retaliation should they report suspected unlawful activities by other District employees (III.A.37).

In addition to an overall expectation of professionalism in the College at large, individual departments may be governed by laws and regulations from an outside governing body as related to a specific professional industry. The College’s Campus Safety Department adheres to the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics set forth by the police academy (III.A.38). The Interpreting and Accommodation Services Department follows the National Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf Code of Professional Conduct and has made this document available in all Interpreters, Deaf students, and faculty handbooks related to department procedures (III.A.39).

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The District conducts an annual climate survey that assesses a number of areas including the service received from departments. All exiting employees complete a written exit interview that provides feedback about their employment and suggestions for improvement. Areas needing improvement or specific unethical behavior reported are promptly addressed. All employees are evaluated and have as a component of their evaluations areas directly relating to the code of ethics, including honesty, integrity, a good work ethic, respect of confidentiality, and modeling appropriate behavior.

Complaints that violate the College’s Code of Ethics and supporting policies are extremely rare. The College received one complaint over the past four years; that complaint was immediately handled and the behavior corrected.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.A.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College engages in a number of planning and assessment processes to continually assess the human resources needs of the organization. The Program and Services Review process is at the core of resource allocation, including human resources. PIOs that result from Program and Services Reviews are evaluated, assigned priority in accordance with strategic goals, and integrated within the budget planning process.

Although PIOs include the identification of the need for additional faculty, staff, and administrators, the College keeps a model staffing plan that compares staffing levels of other community colleges that are similar in size and full-time equivalent students (FTES). Every request for additional staffing is reviewed using the staffing plan as a guide (III.A.40).
The Environmental Scan, conducted by the Institutional Research and Planning Office, includes a review of statewide districts and determines which districts closely compare to the College in terms of full-time equivalent students (FTES). Using those particular districts, the data is further analyzed into services and number of personnel in each program. The unique needs of the College’s students are considered in determining optimal staffing levels. The data assists the administration in determining what areas are sparsely staffed and what areas might be overstaffed. This data has assisted the administration to make hiring decisions particularly during the challenging economic times that started in 2008-2009.

The College lost staff throughout the organization due to the state budget crisis. The College offered a number of retirement incentives to employees in order to avoid layoffs. The fluctuations in staffing are monitored closely, but the offering of retirement incentives is by no means strategic. The College suffered a loss of 17.52 percent in full-time faculty since fall 2007.

The table below shows the impact of the budget crisis on full-time faculty. As full-time equivalent faculty decreased, the ratio of students per full-time faculty increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 35: Budget Impact on Full-Time Faculty Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Equivalent Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Equivalent Students per Full-time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-time Equivalent Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type of analysis is done for all employee groups and the data informs the staffing plan.

State regulations require districts to increase the number of full-time faculty over the prior year in proportion to the amount of growth in funded credit FTES and other factors. This number is known as the Faculty Obligation Number (FON). The District’s FON is 110.2. The District currently has 113 full-time faculty members. This number is 2.8 over the required FON; however, compared to colleges of similar size, the District has an artificially low FON and has developed a plan designed to rebuild full-time faculty to the 2007-2008 number, taking the decline in FTES into account.

In the meantime, each full-time faculty vacancy is reviewed annually by the Faculty Position Prioritization Committee. The president, in consultation with the vice presidents, reviews the recommendations of the Faculty Position Prioritization Committee and then determines the number of full-time faculty the College can hire each year.

Management positions are regularly reviewed in relation to the needs of the District. When vacancies arise management positions are carefully reviewed in relation to the staffing plan and current needs of the department prior to making a recommendation to rehire. The College weathered the budget crisis by leaving a number of key management positions vacant or filled by interims. Since spring 2011, the College has begun to rehire key management positions. The number of classified managers in fall 2012 is essentially the same as fall 2007, but the table below indicates the impact of the budget crisis on administrative positions. As the administrator headcount decreased, the ratio of students per administrator increased.
STANDARD III.A. HUMAN RESOURCES

TABLE 36: Budget Impact on Administrative Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Equivalent Administration</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-19.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Equivalent Students per Administrator</td>
<td>215.5</td>
<td>255.2</td>
<td>241.6</td>
<td>277.4</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>264.9</td>
<td>22.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>-0.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classified positions are evaluated on a year-to-year basis to determine where additional employees are needed to support student success, the instructional program, or to enhance the working and learning environment. Support staffing levels are also considered when evaluating changes to instructional programs and student services and are carefully reviewed in relation to the staffing plan. Efficiency and cost savings are routinely considered for management and classified staff proposals. The following table indicates that FTE classified staff has declined and FTES per classified staff have increased since fall 2007, but not at the same rate of change as for faculty and administrators.

TABLE 37: FTE Classified Staff and FTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE Classified Staff</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>190.2</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>172.7</td>
<td>171.7</td>
<td>-8.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES per Classified Staff</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>11.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTES</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>-0.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SELF-EVALUATION

The College maintains the number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility for the College required by the FON; however, because the College recognizes its reliance on full-time faculty in the context of student learning, the College has a plan to rebuild the faculty lost since 2007-2008 (III.A.41). The College has a staffing plan that is reviewed frequently when vacancies occur or when, as a result of PIOs, additional staffing is identified. Careful planning and justifications for each position are required and reviewed by the president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents.

It is evident that the number and organization of the College’s personnel work to support its program and services by the indicators of the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report. For the past two years the College has been above the statewide average and above the peer group average on all ARCC performance indicators, one of only two of the 112 community colleges to achieve that level of performance. The recently released Student Success Scorecard (Scorecard), using a different set of metrics than the ARCC report, still shows the College to excel in most of the performance indicators, including the important completion indicator. This measure of students
III.A.3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

III.A.3.a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College has a variety of written policies and procedures that specifically focus on fair and equitable treatment of all employees and fairness in employment practices. These policies and procedures are published on the District’s website, the HR website, and some are annually distributed via email.

The Board has a systematic process for the review of Board policies, and corresponding administrative procedures are developed by the president in collaboration with relevant constituent groups and posted on the District’s website. The College utilizes the California League for Community College (CCLC) service for guidance with updating and incorporating changes to laws and regulations into the Board policies and procedures. The CCLC provides sample Board policies and administrative procedures that are legally vetted and reviewed to include updates and changes to applicable Education Codes, Government Codes, Labor Codes, and Accreditation Standards.

Systematic review of policies and procedures is mandated by accreditation standards but is also an overall College practice. This type of consistent review assures compliance and responsiveness to changing needs of the College. Training assures that policies are consistently and equitably followed. Policies and procedures are made available in a variety of formats and locations to ensure all employees are familiar with the processes for requesting accommodations.

who complete a degree or certificate and/or transfer shows the College remains in the top 10 percent of community colleges statewide (III.A.42).

Classified job descriptions are reviewed when a new job is created or when a vacancy occurs. During fiscal year 2011-2012 Service Employees International Union (SEIU) reviewed and streamlined the entire maintenance series job descriptions to allow flexibility for District and department needs. After negotiations were completed nine job descriptions were condensed to three and were approved by the Board on July 11, 2012 (III.A.43).

Job descriptions were streamlined for the campus police job series in order to make the job descriptions more relevant and responsive to the current needs of the College. Opportunities for upward mobility and flexible staffing were created with the addition of a senior safety officer position. California School Employees Association (CSEA) job descriptions have been updated as a result of changing needs in various departments and the need for emerging technology to be integrated into work processes. Over the past three years several job descriptions for this unit have been rewritten, negotiated, and implemented. Some of the changes include combining job duties and reducing hours as a response to reduced workload or funding.

HR closely monitors and tracks each job vacancy and ensures that the proper approvals are acquired prior to recruiting for the position. The Request To Fill paperwork must be signed by the appropriate vice president and the president before the recruitment process can begin.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None
and/or filing a complaint. Clear expectations for respectful behavior are also widely published to create a common vision which is consistent with the mission and values statements, also posted College wide.

The College’s Mission Statement states that, “...student learning success is highly valued, supported, and continually assessed.” The Core Values state, “We promote diversity, inclusiveness, and openness to differing viewpoints. We value trust, respect, and integrity. We promote team work and open communication.” These values are supported in Board Policies 3410 (III.A.44), Nondiscrimination; Board Policy 3420 (III.A.11), Equal Employment Opportunity (III.A.45); Board Policy 3900 (III.A.46), Speech: Time, Place, and Manner; Board Policy 4030 (III.A.47), Academic Freedom; Board Policy 5300 (III.A.48), Student Equity; and Board Policy 7100 (III.A.49), Commitment to Diversity.

The associate vice president, human resources and training provides training to the HR staff on new personnel policies and procedures. Training is also provided to managers and the College community annually or more often to comply with mandatory regulations (III.A.50).

Several personnel related Board Policies and Administrative Procedures are sent out by email to employees and students on an annual basis as reminders of the importance of adherence to the College’s policies and procedures. Each year HR posts new hard copies of these Board Policies and Administrative Procedures outside the HR Office on the Fremont campus.

The College is a member of the Bay 10, the 10 local Bay Area community college districts encompassing 21 colleges. The Bay 10 participates in a joint training consortium with a legal firm specializing in community college legal matters. Each year the consortium, comprised of human resources department heads, plans trainings for the upcoming fiscal year (III.A.51). The attendees for these trainings consist largely of administrators and supervisors and can either be accessed as webinars or attended on-site at a selected college. The trainings focus on new laws, regulations, and changes to procedures to ensure that HR practitioners are prepared and educated to ensure fairness in employment procedures.

All managers and supervisors are required to be provided sexual harassment and discrimination training every two years. This training is provided in January every two years and goes beyond the mandated training by incorporating the mission, vision, and values of the College. All new employees are required to review the College’s sexual harassment policy and complaint procedures as part of their new hire orientation.

Board Policy 3420 and Administrative Procedure 3420 provide specific guidance for ensuring fairness in all employment procedures. Administrative Procedure 3420 requires that all screening committees include an individual trained to monitor conformance with EEO requirements. All HR staff members are trained EEO representatives. In addition most staff members in the Deans, Directors, and Administrative Staff (DDAS) group have received specific training and can serve as EEO representatives on screening committees (III.A.52).

Preparation to participate on a candidate selection committee includes EEO training, routinely made available to faculty and staff during Learning College Week and Classified Professional Development Day respectively. During the orientation process for all screening committees, HR staff provides training and guidelines to the committee members regarding the College’s EEO policy. Adherence is overseen by the associate vice president, human resources and training, who serves as the College’s EEO Officer. Additionally, recruitment procedures include sample questions regarding leadership, and faculty positions test applicants’ cultural
competencies and include scenario questions on how to handle conflict with other employees (III.A.53).

The College has developed extensive written policies and procedures to ensure fairness in all phases of the employment process. Screening committees have to undergo an official EEO training specific for screening committees. HR has also developed a standardized training as a refresher of the official EEO training and is required during the orientation of a newly formed screening committee.

Every job announcement and job application contains language indicative of the College’s commitment to non-discrimination. The College’s employment website illustrates the hiring process and provides clear information about the application, interview, and hiring processes. All searches must include a candidate’s commitment to diversity, and the candidate must demonstrate his/her ability to work in a diverse workplace.

SELF-EVALUATION
HR works closely with legal counsel, constituent groups, and the president to create and maintain all documents ensuring a fair and equitable workplace. Maintenance of procedures is evidenced in amendments made to Board Policy 3430 in the October 2009 and June 2012 updates.

The core of the College’s commitment to a fair and equitable workplace is outlined in Board Policy 3430 and Administrative Procedure 3430. The prohibition of harassment document defines harassment in all forms, states intolerance of harassment and retaliation, includes applicability to all aspects of the academic environment and employment conditions, and mandates institutional training with regard to anti-discrimination and other negative impacts to the academic and employment environment. The document further outlines the necessity for all said policies and procedures to be in writing and widely publicized.

These policies and procedures can be found on the College website, the HR website, the College catalog, and the class schedule.

The associate vice president, human resources and training works closely with the vice president, academic affairs and the vice president, student services when incidents of harassment occur. The response is coordinated and swift. All issues of harassment have been addressed timely and appropriately.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

III.A.3.b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
HR is responsible for the storage and maintenance of all employment related and personnel records. Specifically, the department is responsible for personnel files, medical records, workers’ compensation records, and other employment related documents. The associate vice president, human resources and training acts as the District’s custodian of employee records and is ultimately responsible for the security and confidentiality of all employment records.

All records are stored in locked file cabinets within the HR Office. The HR Office is kept locked during non-business hours. The department occupies a separate office space that is not shared by other departments and key access to the office is limited to the president and the chief of police. Other persons needing access to HR before or after hours must make arrangements with an HR staff member.
HR and payroll personnel are trained in the areas of file maintenance, storage, and the handling of confidential information. HR staff are classified as confidential employees as defined in state regulations. Confidential employees are trained to handle confidential and sensitive information as part of their responsibilities. Employees are provided with annual training in accordance with periodic changes and updates to federal, state, or local laws governing personnel files and record keeping (III.A.54).

The president approved procedures which are specific to the custody of personnel files (III.A.55). These procedures comply with state regulations which require that personnel records are private, accurate, complete, and permanent. The procedures make clear that every employee has the right to inspect his/her personnel records. The procedures further discuss the type and manner in which information is entered into an employee’s personnel record.

Employees who wish to review and/or inspect their personnel file can contact and schedule an appointment with an HR staff member. In addition, the employee can complete a request form available on the College website (III.A.56). Every effort is made to schedule a requested appointment within 24 hours of receipt of a request.

Provisions contained in the respective bargaining contracts limit access to employee files.

The use of color-coded personnel files by employee bargaining unit with specific secure design features, such as clasps and divided sections, make for easy unit recognition, prevention of loss, or damage to documents. Personnel files that have been removed for review by HR staff can be identified quickly and are not mixed in with regular files.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
Personnel files are kept confidential and are stored properly.

The HR Office receives an average of ten requests per year from employees requesting access to their file. All requests have been granted in a timely manner.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**III.A.4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.**

**III.A.4.a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
The Board has established policies that advocate, support, and ensure the fair treatment of the College’s diverse personnel. Board Policies include Unlawful Discrimination, Anti-harassment, Persons with disabilities, Equal employment opportunity, Drug-free workplace and campus, Violence in the workplace, and Gender equity. These policies are updated regularly and are available on the College’s website.

The College’s vision is very specific about diversity and its commitment to being inclusive.

The associate vice president, human resources and training is the EEO officer for the District and has the lead role in investigating complaints and providing training to employees who serve on hiring committees.

In addition to the various policies that define the appropriate treatment of employees and support all institutional constituencies, there is extensive language in all collective bargaining unit agreements that define employee rights.
Students can find the same statement as well as procedures for reporting discrimination in the Student Handbook, which is available to all students and can be found in the Student Center, on the College’s website, and throughout both campuses.

HR ensures all newly hired employees are aware that the College is an equal opportunity employer by including an EEO statement on both the faculty and classified application forms.

The associate vice president, human resources and training is the designated Title IX coordinator and shares this responsibility with the vice president, student services and the vice president, academic affairs. All of these administrators have participated in an intensive training program to better understand the responsibility of the role and the processes for investigation as well as appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity.

In fall 2010 the College sponsored an all-employee cultural sensitivity training by Lee Mun Wah (III.A.57). The training was attended by over 150 employees, including faculty, classified staff, and managers.

A District-trained EEO representative is present on all screening committees to ensure that all members of the committee understand and follow EEO guidelines mandated by law and District policy. HR presents a standard EEO training at the orientation meeting of all screening committees.

The College was awarded a grant that is focused on reducing stigma about mental health issues. The program, Step Up, has a goal to help students and employees feel more socially connected and provide opportunities to learn about how to take better care of each other (III.A.58).

The District also reaches out to specific student groups by bringing targeted services to them through the Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), the Student Services Area, and the Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC). One new and innovative way of reaching out to a specific population of the student body is through the Mobile Veterans’ Center which visits the Fremont campus throughout the semester to provide services to students who have served in the military. Individuals can obtain resources for post-traumatic stress disorder counseling, medical referrals, and assistance with claim forms. The aforementioned events and services bring a sense of community and pride to the College as various groups come together to celebrate diversity, community, student accomplishments, and staff involvement.

In addition to cultural events, the College organizes professional development days for all staff twice per year. The purpose of professional development day is to gather all faculty and staff before the spring and fall semesters to update them on any new laws, developments, programs, and services available to staff and students as well as to offer professional development trainings. These trainings are customized to fit the needs and interests of both faculty and classified staff.

The College has a Deaf Studies Division that provides academic courses and training opportunities to the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community. The Deaf student population fluctuates between 120 and 160 students each year. All faculty and staff in the Deaf Studies Division are fluent in American Sign Language, trained in the areas of Deaf Education and/or Rehabilitation Counseling, and are sensitive to the diverse cultural and educational background of the students.

In 2003 the College added domestic partnership benefits for the domestic partners of gay and lesbian staff and faculty.
SELF-EVALUATION
In the College wide survey administered in spring 2013, those expressing an opinion saw 92.3 percent of students, 91.9 percent of staff, and 85.6 percent of faculty answering Yes to the following question, “The College policies and practices demonstrate appropriate concern for issues of equity and diversity.”

Pursuant to state regulations, in November 2005 the Board adopted Board Policy 7100, Commitment to Diversity (III.A.49). Support is given to procedures and activities that promote cultural awareness and mutual respect in all aspects of College life. In addition to Board policy, the Board regularly passes resolutions which acknowledge various cultural and ethnic groups by means of celebrating history, national recognition, and accomplishments to promote College wide consciousness, understanding, and acceptance (III.A.59). In addition to Board support, the Faculty Senate also promotes diversity through faculty serving as advisors for various student clubs such as the Gay Straight Alliance, Korean Student Association, Muslim Student Association, and Women and Gender Empowerment (III.A.60).

The College is known worldwide for its Deaf and Hard of Hearing program and services and is the only college in the Bay Area and one of the few in the nation that provides specialized instructional programs, services, and co-curricular activities to Deaf and Hard of Hearing students. The College serves students, not only from the local community, but from all over the Bay Area and the western United States. Without the Ohlone Center for Deaf Studies, Deaf and Hard of Hearing college students would have no other comparable higher education options at a community college within several thousand miles.

The College has effective policies and procedures in place for any employee or student who feels they have been subject to harassment or discrimination. These policies and procedures are followed, enforced, and supported by HR, Board policy, and all applicable laws, providing assurance that diversity in any form at the College is welcomed and respected.

The Staff Development Committee, chaired by the associate vice president, human resources and training, promotes the learning college model which fosters an environment of shared ideas and continual learning. In 2009-2010 a list of outcomes for the Professional Development Committee was approved. Section 4 of the Professional Development Committee outcomes states “Management, faculty, and staff demonstrate cultural competence and develop sensitivity and skills in living, learning, and working in a diverse community.” This focus is evidenced by the Professional Development Committee providing support and evaluation of College-wide events, as well as a focused Classified Professional Development Day. This annual dedicated day of training and relationship building includes workshops such as “ASL for Everyday Use,” “Cultural Competency and Diversity,” “Crucial Conversations,” and “International Mentor Program” (III.A.61).

Throughout the year there are College wide events that promote diversity and, areas of special interest, and awareness that encourage and educate managers, faculty, and staff by means of guest speakers, brown bag presentations, department sponsored lectures, and World Forums. All activities, trainings, and forums are evaluated and the results are reviewed by the planning teams and HR for use in future needs assessment and planning (III.A.62).

The College demonstrates a commitment to equity and diversity. One of the College’s Core Values is “We promote diversity, inclusiveness, and openness to differing viewpoints.” This Core Value is put into practice with the inclusion of College Goal 6 in the College Strategic Plan which states, “Enhance College wide interaction with, and acceptance of, diverse peoples, cultures, arts,
and perspectives.” Commitment to this value and goal is evidenced throughout the College in its Board policies and resolutions, supported by discrimination and harassment policies, practiced in training, and celebrated in College wide events.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.A.4.b. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

HR maintains EEO records of all employees hired. Confidential EEO data is housed in HR for federal reporting purposes. Data is also gathered from all applicants through a voluntary EEO questionnaire (III.A.63). The information collected through the EEO Surveys is also useful in completing the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) report, which is a requirement of the California Community College Chancellor’s Office.

The College follows all applicable laws regarding the collection of demographic data for employees. Demographic information is collected via the Environmental Scan and new hire paperwork. Data collected is made available on the Institutional Research and Planning Office website for purposes of public viewing and data analysis.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The Institutional Research and Planning Office regularly assesses the College’s employment equity and diversity to determine its consistency with the College’s mission.

The College approximates the statewide average for distribution of staff by gender, but is above the statewide average for Asian staff and below the statewide average for Hispanic staff. White staff is below the statewide average, but in excess by 17 percent of the District White population; Asian staff is below the District by 16 percent and Hispanic staff are below the District by four percent. African-American staff is above the District population by four percent. Distribution of staff by age generally aligns with the statewide averages for each age group, with a slight tendency toward younger classified staff and managers.

The College is developing an Equal Employment Opportunity Plan that reflects the District’s commitment to equal employment opportunity. It is the District’s belief that taking active and vigorous steps to ensure equal employment opportunity and creating a working and academic environment, which is welcoming to all, will foster diversity, and promote excellence.

The College casts a wide net for vacancies to attract the most diverse applicant pool as possible. Initial applicant pools are reviewed for projected representation of historically unrepresented groups. Once the initial pool is approved, the pool is screened for minimum qualifications, resulting in a qualified applicant pool. The qualified applicant pool is reviewed so that no underrepresented group is adversely impacted. If the projected representation is not met, the application deadline may be extended so that additional recruitment efforts can be conducted. This action ensures that recruitment efforts provide a full and fair opportunity for participation of a wide diversity of potential applicants.

Every effort is made to ensure selection/screening committees include a diverse membership in order to bring a variety of perspectives to the assessment of applicant qualifications. To the extent possible, screening committees include members from historically underrepresented groups.

The College conducted comprehensive student, staff, and faculty surveys during spring 2013. The survey results
STANDARD III.A. HUMAN RESOURCES

indicate that, of those who had an opinion, 91.5 percent of students feel that the faculty and staff at the College are sufficiently diverse to meet the needs of students.

Over the past four years the College has increased training for screening committees on diversity and increased its advertising budget to include recruitment fairs when necessary.

The following table indicates the ethnicity of new hires for fiscal 2009 to 2012 by employee group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 38: Ethnicity of New Hires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.A.4.c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College’s vision, mission, and core values set the overall tone about the College’s commitment to a respectful and welcoming environment.

Board Policy 3430 lays out a comprehensive statement of the College’s commitment to providing an academic and work environment free of unlawful harassment. AP 3435 supports the Board’s commitment to maintaining an environment free of discrimination, by providing employees, students, or community members clear complaint procedures.

The Alleged Discrimination/Harassment Complaint form is available to all students, staff, and the general public on several webpages within the District. This form is embedded in Administrative Procedure 3435 and can be accessed from the Student Services Area and HR webpages (III.A.64). The form allows a complainant to address alleged discrimination based on race/ethnicity, religion/creed, color, national origin, ancestry, disability, gender, age, sexual harassment, sexual orientation, and/or marital status.

Students who wish to bring forth a complaint may go directly to the office of the vice president, student services; vice president, academic affairs; or an academic dean. Students may submit a complaint verbally or in writing using the Student Complaint Form provided on the website. All attempts are made to resolve complaints at the informal level. All complaints, inquiries, concerns, problems, and appeals are taken seriously and responded to through a collaborative process with related departments. Any complaints that involve a staff member and/or discrimination or harassment are forwarded to HR for investigation and/or resolution. Employees may address concerns with their supervisor or they may choose to register a formal or informal complaint with HR.

In fall 2012 the College established the Office of the Ombudsperson where students are able to discuss their complaints and concerns, receive advocacy, obtain referrals, and explore resolution options in a safe environment. When appropriate, the office initiates an informal intervention with the goal of facilitating a resolution that is acceptable to all parties involved. The ombudsperson acts as an independent, impartial resource. If a matter cannot be resolved through this office, a referral is made to the appropriate office for action (III.A.65).
STANDARD III.A. HUMAN RESOURCES

Staff, students, or community members have an opportunity to bring issues or suggestions directly to the president. A suggestion box is available for staff, students, or the general community to provide anonymous feedback, suggestions, or information directly to the president. The box is accessed by the assistant to the president and all information is reviewed by the president.

All new hires are required to read and acknowledge receipt and understanding of Board Policy 3430, Prohibition of Sexual Harassment and Complaint Procedure. This policy and related procedures are also referenced in the College catalog, class schedule, and on the student services website.

All supervisors are provided sexual harassment training every two years as required by California state law AB1825. The District’s training focuses on the maintenance of a respective work environment (III.A.66).

SELF-EVALUATION

Every two years the College conducts a comprehensive student, staff, and faculty survey. The survey results indicate that these groups feel that the College’s policies and practices demonstrate appropriate concern for issues of equity and diversity. The Spring 2013 Student Survey shows agreement with that statement by 92.3 percent of students who expressed an opinion; similarly the Spring 2013 Staff Survey shows 91.9 percent of staff agree with the statement, while the Spring 2013 Faculty Survey reflects agreement at an 85.6 percent rate for those who had an opinion.

Staff members have the support of their supervisors and HR to seek assistance in situations where they feel they are treated unfairly. HR has provided support to departments to assist with conflict resolution, mediation, and team building exercises. Since fiscal year 2010-2011 the College has hired consultants to work with several departments to resolve conflicts, conduct mediations, and to facilitate workshops to assist managers and staff with developing their own conflict resolution skills (III.A.67).

The College has demonstrated a commitment to the prevention of harassment. Annually a notification is sent to all employees that outlines a procedure for the investigation and resolution of complaints of harassment by or against any staff or faculty member or student within the College.

The College exemplifies the criteria within the standard and strives to go beyond minimum expectations. Student inquiries, concerns, problems, complaints, or appeals are rare. For the 2011-2012 academic year, a total of five student complaints and two employee complaints were addressed and successfully resolved by the College.

Efforts are made for continual communication and early conflict resolution via the Employee-Employer Relations Committee with both the CSEA and SEIU bargaining units, and the Certificated Employer-Employee Relations (CEER) committee with the UFO bargaining unit. These efforts provide a venue for open dialogue and collaborative problem solving with the goal of resolution outside of the negotiation process (III.A.68). Having this forum to resolve issues and misunderstandings allows for resolutions to issues that could otherwise become grievances. This process is working very well as over the past four years only one grievance was not resolved through this collaborative process. Even so, that grievance was eventually resolved and withdrawn.

HR institutionally and financially supports departments in team building, interdepartmental communication strategies, and manager-employee and employer-employee relations through the use of retreats, consultants, and mediators (III.A.69).
In June 2013 the District conducted a How to Deliver Exceptional Customer Service training that addressed issues of internal and external customer service and treating the public and colleagues with respect and superior service. A workbook was provided for individuals and departments to use for on-going study, discussion, and implementation of customer service best practices.

As the platform shifts in cyberspace, the College is vulnerable when access to electronic sources such as Facebook, My Space, and Twitter exist and allow staff, students, and community members to express themselves freely without consequences. Unfortunately, sometimes expressions can cross the line and become harassment or cyber bullying. In the president’s State of the College Address in January 2013, she spoke about focusing on developing and augmenting the College’s Codes of Conduct for all employees and students. She mentioned that the College values and standards for trust, respect, and integrity will continue to be emphasized. She further committed to ensuring that the College Council continue discussion throughout the semester, specifically how the College will address cyber bullying and hate speech, including the handling of such incidents, training for faculty and staff response, processes for supporting victims and any legal constraints that must be taken into account.

Work continues in this area. In February 2013 a workshop training titled, “Workplace Bullying: A Growing Concern” was conducted (III.A.70). In September 2013 HR republished and distributed the District’s Board Policy and Administrative Procedure regarding unlawful harassment and discrimination. The intent is to move from publishing these crucial policies and procedures twice per year instead of once. Personnel responsible for Title IX compliance include the vice president, academic affairs; associate vice president, human resources and training; and dean, kinesiology, athletics, and Newark campus. They attended a six-week course as a refresher on Title IX regulations and compliance regarding gender discrimination, sexual harassment, retaliation, and sexual assault.

The District created a response team to deal with issues of harassment, bullying, discrimination and hate speech. The response team is comprised of the vice president, academic affairs; vice president, student services; and associate vice president, human resources and training.

Review of the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures concerning Student Code of Conduct, Institutional Code of Conduct, Student Discipline and procedures started in spring 2013 and will continue until completion. The Athletics Department updated the Student Athlete Code of Conduct to expand on the types of on and off campus behavior that would lead to being dismissed from a team to include “harassment directed toward any person or group via verbal or through electronic means (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Rate My Professors.com)” (III.A.71).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.A.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.**

**III.A.5.a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

All full-time faculty members are required to participate in professional development activities for a minimum of 24
hours during each academic year (III.A.72). The College’s academic calendar devotes four six-hour days of the required 175 annual teaching days (185 annual teaching days for non-teaching faculty) to professional development known as Learning College Week, which is held the week prior to the start of each semester. Two of the days are considered mandatory flex days or fixed flex days. An Access database is used to monitor faculty and staff professional development participation.

Learning College Week is dedicated to a variety of professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. Faculty members are very involved in the planning of on-site learning opportunities and offer suggestions to the Faculty Professional Development Committee through surveys as well as direct input. An entire day during Learning College Week is named “Get It Done Day” in an effort to provide faculty with time and support to work on key initiatives like Student Learning Assessment and Outcomes and Program and Services Review.

Professional development for faculty is coordinated by a committee made up of faculty members and chaired by a full-time faculty member who is given release time. An academic dean is also assigned the responsibility for and oversight of faculty development. The purpose of the Faculty Professional Development Committee is to design and support professional development activities for full-time and adjunct faculty. The committee is charged with reviewing and approving requests for professional development funding; reviewing and approving individual flex credit applications; and designing and implementing professional development and training throughout the academic year and during Learning College Week.

Faculty can develop an Individual Professional Development Project and submit it to the Faculty Professional Development Committee for approval. Upon completion, the faculty member must turn in the completed project and a full Project Activity Report to the Faculty Professional Development Committee in order to obtain “flex” credit. Projects must demonstrate a connection to the College’s vision, mission, and values as well as improvement to the overall teaching and learning environment (III.A.73).

New faculty mentoring is also supported by the College through the Faculty Professional Development Committee. The purpose of the mentor program is to assist new faculty in becoming familiar with the College environment and to learn the policies, procedures, and standards of the College and the particular department.

Full-time faculty members are eligible to apply for sabbatical and academic leaves after six years of continuous employment (III.A.74). Sabbatical leaves are intended for the continued professional improvement of the employee that will benefit the College, the instructional program, and specifically, the College’s students. Each year, eligible faculty members submit sabbatical leave proposals that must provide detailed information about the project/learning experience and emphasize how the project connects with the College’s vision, mission, and values. Upon return from sabbatical, faculty members are required to submit a written report of the activities during the leave, including copies of materials developed and/or transcripts of coursework completed and substantive evidence of completion of all aspects of the sabbatical application purpose and plans. Faculty members may also present their work to the Board during a regular Board meeting.

Academic leave is used for the purpose of academic study or work experience related to the faculty member’s area of instruction. The objective of this leave is similar to that of sabbatical, but for a shorter period.
Conferences sponsored by educational organizations, institutions of higher learning, and government and industry concerning teaching and learning and educational research are supported by the College for faculty attendance. Requests for attendance are submitted through the academic dean and approved by the president. Funding for these types of conferences is available through professional development funds up to $400 per full-time faculty member and $250 per adjunct faculty member.

Reassigned time and/or travel expenses may be provided for individuals to visit outside institutions for the purpose of observing new teaching techniques, equipment, facilities, and programs. Applicants must demonstrate a clear relationship between the activity and instructional improvement.

Adjunct faculty can participate in any on-site professional development workshops. They are paid at their current pay rate for lab to attend up to three hours of workshops or flex activity per semester.

Professional development activities for management and classified staff are coordinated by the Staff Professional Development Committee made up of managers and classified staff from both CSEA and SEIU units and chaired by the associate vice president, human resources and training (III.A.75). The purpose of the Staff Professional Development Committee is to provide on and off-site professional development and trainings for staff. Individual professional development plans can be developed and funded by either the Staff Professional Development Committee, HR, or from the individual’s department funds.

SEIU members are able to participate in a professional growth and development program and a leave of absence for retraining and study. The professional growth and development program allows members to be reimbursed for tuition up to a maximum of four credits of approved coursework providing the unit member submits proof of course completion and attains a course grade of C or better. The College also reimburses textbooks up to $125.00 upon course completion. Employees are also granted release time to attend classes on campus (III.A.76).

SEIU members can further their education, upgrade their job skills, or retrain to keep up with technological or other changes by requesting a professional development leave of absence.

CSEA members have a similar professional growth and development program (III.A.77).

In 2008 the president launched the first Classified Professional Development Day, and this event has now been institutionalized. Each year staff members are surveyed and asked about their professional development needs. The results of the survey are used to plan a day of workshops, seminars, and events especially for classified staff.

In addition to individual departmental budgets, the president has a small budget provided through the College’s Foundation to fund professional development of employees who have demonstrated leadership for the College.

The College is also a member of the Bay Area Community College Districts Consortium, providing additional opportunities for employees to participate in a broad range of professional development trainings and workshops. As part of the Basic Skills Initiative, faculty and staff attend free conferences and trainings organized through the California Community Colleges Success Network (CCCSN).

The College provides funding for trustees to participate in individual training and workshops. This topic is discussed in depth under Standard IV.B.
Throughout the academic year the president hosts informal luncheons with faculty, classified staff, confidential staff, and managers. These unit specific luncheons provide an opportunity for employees and the president to learn about each other’s professional roles, personal and professional goals, and to share feedback and ask questions about the College.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
The College administers satisfaction surveys to faculty and staff every two years and includes a specific question about individual involvement in annual professional development. Of those who responded to the question in the spring 2013 survey, 91.7 percent of faculty and 68.1 percent of classified staff, confidential staff, and managers affirmed that they have been involved in professional development.

In 2009 the College expanded the job duties for HR to include training and hired an associate vice president of human resources and training. This change further enforced the College’s commitment to continuing a robust program for all employees.

Most full-time faculty far exceed the required 24 flex hours per faculty member, as indicated by the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Flex Hours</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of full-time faculty</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of full-time faculty who exceeded the required 24 “flex” hours</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College has funded sabbatical leaves consistently. The only year when sabbatical leaves were not granted was 2011-2012, when they were not funded due to budget constraints. The following table shows the number of full-time faculty granted sabbatical leave over the past several years:

**TABLE 40: Faculty Sabbaticals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College annually sets aside funds to support continual learning and professional development for faculty and staff even through difficult budget times. The following chart shows the funding over the past few years:

**TABLE 41: Professional Development Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications for funding are taken on a first-come, first-serve basis, and since 2009-2010 to present all applications for professional development funds have been funded.

Employees utilize an individual professional development plan to discuss with their supervisor during their performance evaluation. The individual professional development plan is subsequently submitted to HR for review and assistance with fulfilling the identified needs.

Goal 3 of the College Strategic Plan states, “Promote continuous, needs-based, learning and professional development for all district personnel” has several objectives all aimed to achieve this goal. Of the four objectives associated
with this goal, three have been accomplished (III.A.78).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**III.A.5.b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
Evaluations for on-campus professional development activities and events are completed at the end of each activity using paper evaluations, online Survey Monkey questionnaires, and/or small-group debriefs (III.A.79). All feedback data is discussed with the respective Professional Development Committees and shared with the president and vice presidents if necessary. Improvements to current offerings or new offerings of programs stem from feedback from participants. Evaluation forms collected at all College sponsored activities are stored and continually analyzed by the Professional Development Committees and HR for use in on-going needs assessment and planning.

A consistent need at the College is continuous development of technology skills. The College acquired a Learning Management System for employees that can be accessed from a web portal at work or home. A wide variety of courses ranging from strengthening technology skills to leadership development are available on the Learning Management System (III.A.80).

**SELF-EVALUATION**
Feedback has resulted in the College providing more online training available to all staff, including adjunct faculty, by the launching of a new Learning Management System, E-LEARN.

Managers identify training needs for their staff members during the performance review cycle. The associate vice president, human resources and training compiles this information and uses it when planning workshops for the annual Classified Professional Development Day.

In response to feedback from faculty in spring 2013, workshops during Learning College Week are planned to have more focused days as opposed to a variety of different workshops spread throughout the week.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**III.A.6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results if the evaluation is the basis for improvement.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
Institutional planning is conducted at both the long-term strategic level and the annual operational level (Administrative Procedure 3250) (III.A.81). One of the major plans of the College includes a Staffing Plan. The recent state budget crisis has led the District to review each vacant or new position. Each vice president must justify replacing all vacancies or new positions by considering the following:

- Does the position need to be refilled?
- If so, are the job duties as identified currently still needed?
- Does the job description and level need to change?
- Could the job be accomplished more efficiently if restructured?
What program improvement objectives (PIOs) have been identified by the program?

How will the replacement or new position fulfill the needs identified in the Program and Services Review?

Within the parameters of the Program and Services Review and ultimate budget planning processes, new classified positions are evaluated on a year-to-year basis to determine where additional resources are needed to support student success, including instructional programs and administrative areas. Similarly, administrator positions are added based on need.

As detailed in Section II.A of this report, there is a plan in place to replace full-time faculty that was developed in response to the significant loss of faculty between 2007-2008 and the present.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

A key indicator that human resources needs in program and service areas are met effectively is the overall success of the College. The College weathered the recent economic downturn without laying off employees.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
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STANDARD III.B: Physical Resources
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The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

III.B.1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College has a strong commitment to, and interest in, providing safe and secure facilities and equipment for all staff, students, and community members who visit the College. The College works consistently and routinely to ensure and evaluate the safety of its facilities. As a matter of policy and necessity, safety issues are given the highest priority. The College’s physical resources are an institutional responsibility and much of the implementation and monitoring of these resources fall within the Administrative Services Area under the direction of the vice president, administrative services (III.B.1).

The Facilities and Modernization Department manages the maintenance of all physical spaces across the College under the general direction of the director and the immediate direction of the facilities and grounds manager. The facilities and grounds manager supervises the personnel who work as electricians, plumbers, carpenters, mechanics, HVAC, and painters. All services are processed through an online requisition system and prioritized by precedence of urgency. A trip and fall hazard survey of the Fremont and Newark campuses was conducted in fall 2011 and spring 2012 (III.B.2). Identified hazards were repaired in summer and fall 2012 (III.B.3).

Safety at the Newark campus is assessed and addressed in the same manner as for the Fremont campus. In February 2012 Campus Police Services conducted a survey of the Fremont and Newark campuses to determine the number of lights that were in need of replacement or servicing. Facilities repaired, replaced, or serviced 554 lights on the Fremont campus and replaced, repaired, or serviced five lights on the Newark campus (III.B.4).

Upgrades of the fire suppression systems in Buildings 1-6, 8, and 9 on the Fremont campus, are in progress through the Measure G bond. These buildings have limited fire suppression capabilities. This project will provide fire department connections, fire hydrants, and other improvements. These new systems will be designed to meet current fire and life safety code regulations (III.B.5). As a new facility opened in January 2008, the Newark Center meets fire safety requirements.
The Measure A Bond passed in March 2002. This bond has addressed many College needs (III.B.6):

- Disabled access: Provided access ramps for Buildings 2, 4, and 6 on the Fremont campus; additional ADA access provided by replacing existing non-compliant doors and handles.
- Security/safety cameras: Installed 32 security cameras in parking lots and other high-traffic areas of the Fremont campus.
- Exterior lighting: Installed approximately 50 pole lights along walkways, down Olive Lane at the Fremont campus, and all pathways leading to parking areas.
- Classroom/Lab upgrade, Phase A: Installed media-enabled equipment, projectors, screens, podiums in 32 classrooms and labs.
- Gymnasium floor: Replaced tartan gym floor with new wooden floor; modified and upgraded bleachers.
- Locker Room upgrades: Removed and replaced all old broken lockers in men's and women's locker rooms, remodeled and upgraded restrooms, created two team rooms.
- Weatherproof buildings: Addressed urgent needs to repair damaged areas and remove mold.

Measure G building projects will begin to renovate or replace the original aging buildings on the Fremont campus; address Educational Master Plan (EMP) concepts to cluster similar academic uses to encourage collegial interaction and collaboration among faculty, staff, and students of similar areas of study; realign educational master planning needs to address future student and community needs; address structural, fire, and life safety and accessibility needs; replace deteriorating building systems with sustainable energy efficient systems; update technology; and implement the District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP).

The College uses its physical resources effectively. The space inventory report helps the College determine how efficiently it is utilizing current facilities in relation to academic programs (III.B.7). Space utilization is reviewed and discussed with stakeholders in the governance process (III.B.8).

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College provides a safe, clean, and positive environment with the physical resources that are sufficient to support instructional programs and services to both campuses and the College community. The Safety Committee and Campus Police Services monitor and regularly evaluate safety of the environment. The Facilities and Modernization Department is responsible for ongoing safety of buildings and grounds and overall maintenance of the facilities. Campus Police Services conducts safety inspections and documents and reports unsafe conditions to the Facilities and Modernization Department for repair or servicing. These requests are given the highest priority and typically repairs and modifications are made within 48 hours.

The College is a member of the Bay Area Community College District (BACCD) Joint Power Authority (JPA), a risk-sharing pool that carries property and liability coverage through the Statewide Association of Community Colleges. Annual inspections are conducted on property and liability, and reports are provided to the College with suggestions for improving safety and mitigating potential liability. Follow-up inspections certify that the upgrades, corrective measures, and repairs are accomplished (III.B.9). The College also contracts with a fire alarm company for regular inspections of all fire life safety equipment and fire suppression systems and with an elevator service company to ensure compliance (III.B.10).

Campus Police Services strives to improve safety throughout the College. A survey of classified staff and managers was conducted by the Institutional Research and Planning Office in 2013 (III.B.11). The results of the survey showed...
that 96.6 percent of those responding to the survey were satisfied with the responsiveness of Campus Police and that 90.7 percent of those that responded felt safe on campus. A similar survey of students was also done in March 2013 and shows that 90 percent of students answered a Strong Yes or Yes to the question of whether they felt safe on campus (III.B.12).

Despite the challenges of a large turnover in the Administrative Services departments at the College, the College has maintained its focus on safety and providing sufficient physical resources. Experienced administrators have been chosen for key positions and they recognize the importance of these efforts to assure the integrity and quality of programs.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.B.1.a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College uses the Strategic Goals and Objectives (III.B.6), the DFMP (III.B.13), EMP (III.B.14), the Technology Master Plan (III.B.15), and the Program Improvement Objectives (PIO) process (III.B.16) to ensure that facility and equipment needs for all programs and services are provided on an ongoing basis and that physical resources are appropriately allocated. These processes and reports ensure that program and service needs determine equipment, replacement of equipment, facilities, and maintenance needs.

The College has short and long-term goals for integrating its facilities that are guided by input generated from the president’s office, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, College Council, Facilities Committee, Sustainability Committee, Safety Committee, and, for the implementation of the recent bond funds, various user groups, focus groups, and architect and consultant selection committees involved in updating and improvement of the campuses. The College engages all user groups and stakeholders when planning building renovation or new building construction. Physical resource planning is integrated into the College’s planning and is evidenced by the active role of governance committees that work on facilities planning issues.

Voters approved a $150 million bond measure, Measure A (III.B.17) in March 2002. Major projects successfully completed as part of the Measure A bond are the Newark Center Site Project (III.B.18) and the Student Services Center Project, Fremont campus (III.B.19).

The Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology is a direct outgrowth of the EMP. In addition, it is consistent with the College’s value in sustainability. In August 2008 the Newark Center officially achieved LEED Platinum Certification by the U.S. Green Building Council for environmentally sustainable construction building operation. Academic programs and services located at the Newark Center are:

- Health Sciences (Registered Nursing, Respiratory Therapist, Physical Therapist Assistant)
- Biology and Biotechnology
- Environmental Studies
- Fitness and Wellness
- General Education
- Learning Resources Center
- One-Stop Career Center
- WorkAbility III Services
The Student Services Center was designed to consolidate student services departments into one facility—a one-stop shop—where students can get assistance with registration, financial aid, health care, and other student services. The Student Services Center is located on the south side of the Fremont campus (replacing the original Building 7) and constitutes approximately 45,000 gross square feet. Construction of the Student Services Center began in May 2007. The building was fully operational by fall 2009 and achieved LEED Gold Certification. The following Student Services programs and departments are located in the Student Services Center:

- Admissions and Records
- Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC)
- Campus Activities
- Counseling
- Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS)
- Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS)
- Financial Aid
- International Programs and Services
- Interpreting and Accommodation Services
- Placement Testing Center
- Student Health Center
- Student Services administration
- Transfer Center

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College maximizes, maintains, evaluates, and improves physical resources on the campuses to support degree and certificate programs and to provide quality College services. In November 2010 voters approved a $349 million bond measure. Measure G (III.B.20) will replace many of the aging original facilities on the Fremont campus as well as provide improvement to the remaining facilities. The reason for pursuing a bond measure is stated in objective 7 of goal 4 in the College Strategic Plan: “By 2015, upgrade the Fremont campus, including functionality, sustainability, safety, accessibility, and aesthetics.” The development of the College Strategic Plan had input from the College community and the community at large, as described in Standard I.B, and is closely aligned with the EMP (III.B.14) and the Technology Master Plan (III.B.15). Measure G is providing the means for achieving this critical objective.

To implement the upgrade of the Fremont campus, members of the College community developed the District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP) over several years, and the Board of Trustees (Board) approved the final plan in May 2012. The DFMP identifies the facilities projects approved by the voters and guides the use of Measure G funds.

In order to plan the projects, the College community has provided extensive input through various focus groups and user groups working with the team of architects (III.B.49). The buildings will be designed and constructed to serve the needs of the College community, and provided with up-to-date equipment to enhance teaching and learning. Accessibility on the steep hillside on the Fremont campus has always been a challenge. The College is committed to making major improvements to the pathways, travel patterns, lighting, and way finding. The College engages in constant and consistent cycles of planning, implementation, and evaluation to maintain safe, comfortable, and accessible classrooms, laboratories, student services facilities, and information technology hardware and software.

The College is implementing an improved work order system, the ONUMA System (III.B.21), which integrates seamlessly with FUSION. FUSION is the statewide system that community colleges use to report their space inventory, uses, and utilization. ONUMA is a new reporting system that is continually updated to graphically illustrate and inventory space, equipment, maintenance schedules, and replacements. The College plans to integrate ONUMA with a work order system to improve scheduled maintenance and repair processes. The FUSION/GIS/ONUMA System Interface
will provide improved information that assures effective utilization of physical resources.

The Measure G Bond will address many of the remaining improvements to physical support for quality programs and services. Funds have been allocated to a quick fix program, a series of projects to resolve immediate and emergency needs (III.B.22), and several completed projects have improved safety on the Fremont campus.

The College is also committed to environmental sustainability in the building program. The last two major projects obtained LEED platinum and LEED gold status. Measure G has set the goal even higher; the College is seeking a net zero energy designation for the entire College (III.B.23). The College has installed over two megawatt of photovoltaic power, and is studying a central plant that uses geothermal heating and cooling to advance this goal.

The College meets the standard

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
The College will implement the ONUMA and FUSION upgrades.

III.B.1.b. The institution assures that physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College prioritizes safety and has worked to improve access and security at all locations. Security improvements have included security cameras, upgraded lighting, and new electronic key access locks.

All renovated facilities are required to meet the standards required by the Office of the Division of the State Architect, California Department of General Services (DSA) for access compliance. DSA reviews fire, life, safety, and access compliance issues (including signage, ramps, path of travel, height of signs, specifications for drinking fountains, and elevators) for all new construction, modernization, and special maintenance.

The Measure A Bond, passed in March 2002, has improved and addressed many campus access, safety, and security needs (III.B.17).

Another important safety measure is the Ohlone Community College District Emergency Operations Preparedness and Response Plan (III.B.24), revised in July 2012, which guides the College in appropriate response to emergencies. The plan is reviewed by the president, vice presidents, and the Crisis Management Team, and updated annually. Building evacuation routes and assembly point maps are posted throughout College facilities (III.B.25). Members of the College administration, management, and those responsible for emergency response participate in drills and exercises on disaster preparedness. Personnel have attended training on the components of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS). The College also conducts an annual tabletop exercise where a disaster and/or emergency situation are simulated with administrators and managers handling the components of the disaster. This experience not only prepares the College in disaster response, but also qualifies the College for state and federal reimbursement in cases of disaster (III.B.26).

The Newark campus achieved LEED Platinum Certification by the U.S. Green Building Council for environmentally sustainable construction and building operation. The heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system at Newark uses an increased amount of outside air in its
ventilation while still maintaining efficiency by the use of enthalpy wheels, which flush the class and lab spaces with fresh air without sacrificing the interior climate to the outdoor temperature. The facility also provides a very large amount of natural light to the interior spaces. Research has proven that natural lighting helps people be more productive, happier, healthier, and calmer.

A Hazardous Material Business Plan (III.B.27) and a Chemical hygiene Plan (III.B.28) have been put in place. A vendor collects and removes all hazardous materials and chemicals in compliance with OSHA regulations. Another vendor collects and removes all bio-hazards and waste. Facilities personnel and Campus Police Services officers have received training on hazardous material spill response. Custodial staff, laboratory staff, and Campus Police also receive annual Blood Borne Pathogen training (III.B.29). Funds have been provided for an on-going training regimen that has been developed and implemented to ensure full compliance with OSHA regulations and worker safety. There is also an updated and active Injury and Illness Prevention Plan in place (III.B.30).

The District is designated smoke-free. The Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology has always been a completely smoke-free campus, including all parking lots. Until recently, the Fremont campus prohibited smoking in all areas except general use parking lots. In fall 2012 the College Council began discussing whether the entire District should be completely smoke-free. On October 8, 2012 the president of the Associated Students of Ohlone College reported the results of a student smoking survey to the College Council. The survey showed students in favor of a non-smoking initiative for both campuses. The members of College Council voted to make both campuses 100 percent smoke-free with an amendment to the Administrative Procedures. An ad-hoc committee was formed to develop a timeline to inform the College community (III.B.31). The entire District became smoke-free in fall 2013.

The Fremont and Newark campuses are patrolled by vehicle and on foot from 6:00 am to 12:00 pm Monday through Friday and from 7:00 am to 12:00 pm on Saturdays and Sundays. Campus Police Services hired an additional officer to ensure that there is an officer at the Newark campus during hours of operation in order to help maintain a safe environment for staff and students. Officers provide services such as investigating reports of crimes or suspicious circumstances, escorting students who have safety concerns or problems, securing facilities, and enforcing traffic and parking violations. Campus Police Services annually prepares and distributes updated security and crime statistics in the Annual Campus Security Report (III.B.32) pursuant to the Jeanne Clery Act and the Student Right-to-Know Act (III.B.33, III.B.34). This report is made available to all students and employees through the Campus Safety and Security website, and reported to the Department of Education annually in full compliance with the Clery Act (III.B.33).

Fire alarm monitoring is handled twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week by a vendor.

In 2009 the College implemented Alert-U (III.B.35). This is an emergency alert system that makes it possible for the College to quickly communicate with staff, students, and the community by text and e-mail. Students and staff sign up to receive College generated text messages or e-mails alerting them to an emergency or unusual occurrence at the College. The system has been tested several times and used twice since its introduction. The system is fully implemented for staff and faculty and for all currently enrolled students. The first test for students occurred in May 2009. Annual safety inspections are conducted to assess property and liability. Reports are provided to the College with suggestions for improvements and follow up inspections certify
that the upgrades, corrective measures, and repairs are accomplished (III.B.39).

The College’s Disabled Students Programs and Services Department (DSPS) includes an Adaptive Technology Center that promotes access and equity for all students with disabilities. Through the design of innovative learning environments, College staff can help ensure a student’s individual learning needs are addressed. The College provides access to College programs and services to individuals with disabilities to the fullest reasonable extent possible, as guaranteed by the Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (III.B.36).

On the Newark campus the College provides Assisted Listening Systems (ALS). Portable assisted listening devices for student use in classrooms can be checked out through DSPS.

SELF-EVALUATION
Campus safety continues to be an ongoing commitment. The Safety and Security Department is charged with College safety. The department regularly collects and analyzes crime statistics for all College locations and reports the statistics to the president, the vice presidents, associate vice presidents, and to the College community (III.B.32). This allows a fully informed discussion and evaluation of safety concerns of the College.

The College has had no citations for violations from OSHA since 2007. All areas noted for disposal and collection problems with hazardous materials and chemical waste have been mitigated.

The College has a Safety Committee that reports to the College Council. The Safety Committee is made up of individuals from various departments and is representative of the College. All members are encouraged to discuss safety concerns with any other student, staff member, or faculty member and bring those concerns to the Safety Committee for discussion and action.

The recent move to make the College smoke-free and the continual improvements to access and reducing environmental impact underscore a culture of providing safety, security, and an accessible and healthful environment. Even though the College meets this standard, this is an area where continual improvement is desirable.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

III.B.2. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

DESCRIPTION SUMMARY
The College uses various methods for planning and evaluating equipment and facilities. A review of the EMP and DFMP is used to help set project priorities. An annual update in FUSION of the Five-Year Construction Plan (III.B.37) provides focus for short-term needs. Facility planning and assessment are ongoing processes. The projects of Measure G support the EMP and the DFMP in addressing the practical needs of the College. The Five-Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan (III.B.38) is updated frequently as is the Space Inventory Report (III.B.7). Space utilization is reviewed in conjunction with class scheduling throughout each academic year.

The president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, director, and design team reviews facilities and
modernization in conjunction with the EMP and DFMP to develop a set of guiding principles to provide structure to the rest of the Measure G process. Focus groups are formed to provide input regarding departmental needs to the design team. The academic deans are heavily involved in this process. Meetings are held at least monthly to confirm and inform the president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents of progress and developments. Preliminary decisions are confirmed with the Facilities Committee and the College Council. The vice president, administrative services and the director, facilities and modernization, along with Measure G Bond managers and design professionals, develop the plans into working drawings. The working drawings are reviewed and approved by the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, the Facilities Committee, and the College Council at 50 percent and 100 percent of completion. The various committees and the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents are informed by the EMP, DFMP, classroom utilization studies, feasibility studies, total cost of ownership, life cycle costs and maintenance, and replacement costs. Finally, budget and schedule are confirmed before a project goes forward. The College repeats this process for various projects.

The CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module is used to review and develop Program and Services Reviews centered on student learning, student impacts, student achievements, program achievements, and program improvement objectives. Each department regularly completes a Program and Services Review (III.B.40). A facilities assessment portion may be added to Program and Services Review to become the basis for a continuous facilities assessment program.

Planning for the Measure G projects is both extensive and thorough with large amounts of data collection and facilities assessments. These assessments include a Campus Utility Infrastructure Assessment and Plan (III.B.41), a Central Plant Study (III.B.42), and an IT Server Room Study (III.B.43). The College Council and Safety Committee provide input and guidance to the College community regarding safety issues.

SELF-EVALUATION

Many achievements have been accomplished due to the passing of Measures A and G. The project completions and planned projects have made for safer campuses. Measure G funds are being utilized to improve physical spaces and modernize the Fremont campus. Although lack of funding has made maintenance and replacement of some building systems and equipment difficult, the quick fix portion of Measure G projects has improved efforts. The College is responsibly replacing and repairing systems within the context of the building replacement plans of Measure G.

Site improvements have been planned and completed to address deteriorating athletic fields, hillside accessibility, distant parking lots, lack of outdoor student spaces, poor way finding systems, landscaping, and campus image. A variety of safety and maintenance upgrades within the Building and Site Improvement Projects described above, including removal and replacement of unsafe walkways,
non-compliant elevators, and deteriorating site utility infrastructure, have been completed as part of the Measure G quick fix projects (III.B.22). The College continues to plan and refine the Measure G efforts and to produce Bond revisions to document this progress to the community and the Board, as well as the Citizens’ Oversight Committee (III.B.44).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
The College will develop a facilities assessment component as part of the Program and Services Review.

**III.B.2.a. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
Long-range capital plans at the College originate in discussion with faculty, staff, the community, and the College administration. The governance model is utilized and considerable effort is taken to get input and collaboration from the entire College community. Efforts are outlined and incrementally achieved through the College planning process (III.B.45). The College has a number of long-range capital projects based on its educational planning and which support its mission. Long-range capital planning is basic to the College’s Strategic Goals and EMP, DFMP, Five-Year Construction Plan, and Technology Master Plan.

The studies and evaluations directed by the College contain a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) component in the analysis that helps to define options available to the overall plan. TCO is a formula the College uses to evaluate choices based on total lifetime costs associated with a decision. It includes total cost of acquisition and operate costs, including maintenance and energy. It is based on the estimated total lifetime of the equipment of system or on a set period of years sometimes exceeding the lifetime of a particular component, and if so the cost also includes replacement costs. A comparison to existing systems or equipment not yet ready for replacement is also factored in.

Long-range capital plans have been successful due to the citizens of the District passing Measure A. Voters approved this $150 million bond measure in March 2002. Measure A allowed the opportunity for a much needed improvement to facilities, and the projects built are of the highest quality with long-term environmental sustainability as the cornerstone of design. The Ohlone College Newark Center for Health Sciences and Technology opened in January 2008 on an 80-plus-acre site in Newark.

Another bond measure was passed November 2010. Measure G (III.B.20) will replace many of the aging original facilities on the Fremont campus as well as provide improvement to the remaining facilities.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
Long-range capital plans stem from the College’s Strategic Plan, specifically Goal 4. The DFMP was based on this goal and the evaluation of the educational needs of the District as expressed in the EMP. The College has relied on the DFMP to plan and implement Measure G, developing a comprehensive program for the replacement and modernization of existing facilities. The continuous circular process of input, planning, decision, and verification using the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents; the design team along with the director, facilities and modernization; focus groups, user groups, the Facilities Committee, and the College Council assures that facilities decisions are high quality, effective, and informed. This effort determines the effectiveness of the College’s physical resources in support of programs and services.
The net zero energy goal the College has set for the construction of these new facilities will save millions of dollars in operational costs over the life of the facilities.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The Improvement Plan needs to include ongoing planning for Measure G. The College will develop a facilities assessment component as part of the Program and Services Review module. This facilities assessment module will help to inform a process to make ongoing decisions about facilities use. The College will take lessons learned from this process and integrate some of these elements into an ongoing process that can be used to evaluate all of its physical resources, change of use decisions, and reassignment decisions for future needs during and after the major construction processes.

**III.B.2.b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.**

The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College regularly evaluates buildings and systems, both informally and as a part of regular planning cycles. Use of program plans and related budget requests tie expansion and development to College goals. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning through the primary planning documents including the EMP, the College Strategic Plan, the DFMP, and the Technology Master Plan. Ongoing scheduling, planning, and cost estimating efforts are a part of the Bond and these efforts are led by the director, facilities and modernization, who utilizes industry experts to verify and solidify cost of ownership and long-term maintenance costs (III.B.42). The strategy for lowering the total cost of ownership for the College includes:

- New light fixtures with electronic ballasts, LED lighting, and fluorescent induction lighting requiring less energy to operate and a minimum rated lifetime of 50,000 hours.
- Motion sensors for lighting.
- More energy efficient HVAC units, including a Central Plant and geothermal heating and cooling system.
- An upgraded Energy Management System (EMS).
- Over 2,000,000 watts of solar photovoltaic electrical power produced by the College, helping to achieve energy independence and a Net Zero Energy Designation.
- Use of low maintenance surfaces and construction materials with high durability.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

A collaborative process is used for planning. Project planning includes collecting data that will aid in making decisions, meeting with stakeholders, holding department and user group meetings, and addressing equipment needs and other specific requirements to support the student learning process for the proposed facility. An architect has provided the College with site information and planning documents (III.B.46). User groups and focus groups have met numerous times to discuss specific requirements (III.B.47).

Another tool for ensuring that facilities decisions are based on institutional needs is the work order system. Maintenance work orders provide immediate information on the needs of departments and programs related to facilities and maintenance. The work orders also allow the director, facilities and modernization to amass evidence about patterns of need. The director, facilities and modernization has required that all proposed projects include a total cost of ownership component and a life cycle cost analysis to guide the College’s choices.

Capital equipment purchases, like all other budget requests,
are linked to College planning. In each plan, departments and programs must specify how their requests are linked to the College Strategic Plan, PIOs, or to a particular Program and Services Review recommendation. Once the program plans are completed, the academic deans evaluate and rank budget requests. These requests are then reviewed and approved through the established processes (III.B.48).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
### Standard III.B. Sources of Evidence

| III.B.1 | Administrative Services Organizational Chart |
| III.B.2 | Trip and Fall Hazard Survey |
| III.B.3 | Trip and Fall Hazards Repaired |
| III.B.4 | Light Repair on Fremont and Newark Campuses |
| III.B.5 | Measure G Fire suppression upgrades |
| III.B.6 | College Strategic Plan 2010-2015 |
| III.B.7 | Space Inventory Report |
| III.B.8 | College Council Meeting Minutes |
| III.B.9 | SWACC report |
| III.B.10 | Fire and Elevator Inspections |
| III.B.11 | 2013 Spring Staff Satisfaction Survey |
| III.B.12 | 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey |
| III.B.13 | District Facilities Master Plan |
| III.B.14 | Educational Master Plan |
| III.B.15 | Technology Master Plan |
| III.B.16 | Program Improvement Objectives Process |
| III.B.17 | Bond Measure A |
| III.B.18 | Newark Center Site Project |
| III.B.19 | Student Services Center Project |
| III.B.20 | Bond Measure G |
| III.B.21 | ONUMA |
| III.B.22 | Measure G Quick Fix List |
| III.B.23 | Net Zero Energy Designation |
| III.B.24 | Measure A Bond improvements |
| III.B.25 | Emergency Operations Preparedness and Response Plan |
| III.B.26 | Building Evacuation Routes |
| III.B.27 | Tabletop Exercise Training Notification |
| III.B.28 | Hazardous Materials Business Plan |
| III.B.29 | Chemical Hygiene Plan |
| III.B.30 | Proof of Blood Borne Pathogen Training Completion |
| III.B.31 | Injury & Illness Prevention Plan |
| III.B.32 | College Council Minutes, Smoke-Free Campus |
| III.B.33 | Annual Campus Security Reports: |
| III.B.34 | Jeanne Cleary Act |
| III.B.35 | Student Right to Know Act |
III.B.35 Alert-U
III.B.36 DSPS Adaptations to Student Needs
III.B.37 Five Year Construction Plan
III.B.38 Five Year Maintenance Plan
III.B.39 Work Order Resolution
III.B.40 Departmental Program and Services Reviews
III.B.41 Campus Utility Infrastructure Assessment and Plan
III.B.42 Central Plant Study
III.B.43 IT Server Room Study
III.B.44 Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Website
III.B.45 College Planning Process
III.B.46 Campus Site Survey
III.B.47 Minutes from appropriate meetings
III.B.49 Measure G User Groups
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STANDARD III.C:
Technology Resources
The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

III.C.1. The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

The Technology Committee, reporting to the College Council, works closely with the Information Technology Department (IT) to assure that technology resources and systems are designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, College wide communications, research, and operational systems. The Technology Committee and IT have an established Technology Master Plan that integrates with the College Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan (EMP), and District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP). The Technology Master Plan is continually assessed and updated as technology and needs change. IT completes regular Program and Services Reviews to assure the effectiveness of its functional areas, Application Services and Technical Services, in meeting the full spectrum of College technology needs.

III.C.1.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The mission of the Information Technology Department is to provide quality IT services and solutions to faculty, staff, and students by successfully aligning College and technology objectives. By doing so, the focus of technology decision making remains the continuous improvement of teaching and learning at the College. The College’s Information Technology Vision states that:

Technology is a service provided to faculty, students, and staff across every function at Ohlone. Technology is central to programs, courses, facilities, operations, and professional development, and it serves to advance the mission, vision, goals, and objectives of the College. Technology support services balance efficiency and cost-effectiveness with quality.

The IT Department manages the day-to-day operations supporting technology; implements and coordinates technology-related projects; and advises the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, and the College regarding policy, regulations, and administrative procedures in the following areas:
Standard III.C. Technology Resources

desktop and user support, system administration, network management, telecommunications, audio/visual services, enterprise system development and maintenance, academic lab and classroom support, and help desk call tracking.

IT services are predominantly divided into two functional groups: Applications Services and Technical Services. Applications Services focuses mainly on support for the Colleague® Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system and third party integrated computer systems such as TimeKeeper, Voyager, SARS, Blackboard, EMS Scheduling, and Onbase Document Imaging. Technical Services includes instructional and classroom technology support; desktop technology support for multiple platforms in offices and computer labs; and telecommunication and networking support, including wireless network and internet access across the College.

The District is in the process of reviewing the structure and charter of the Colleague Coordination Team (CCT). Historically this group coordinated the impacts of projects on other functional areas. The District is evaluating shifting this coordination to individual project teams. CCT projects are currently approved and prioritized by the CCT Chairs, a group comprised of the vice presidents and the director, application services. The director, applications services serves as project manager for the administrative ERP-related projects, reporting progress and status updates to the CCT Chairs on a monthly basis.

To help guide the work of the IT department, the Technology Committee meets monthly and is a standing committee of the College Council (III.C.1). This governance process ensures that IT activities are aligned with the College Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Core Values, and Strategic Goals and Objectives.

Self-Evaluation

The College’s IT Department makes decisions about technology services, facilities, hardware, and software with oversight by the Technology Committee, and reviews and prioritizes ERP-related projects with the CCT Chairs. IT Program and Services Reviews provide opportunities to review the needs and effectiveness of services, facilities, hardware, and software that provide service to faculty, students, and staff.

The Technology Committee has worked on establishing standards of technology purchases and implementations; has reviewed technology-related funding requested through the College’s Program Improvement Objective (PIO) process; has played a major role in developing the College’s Technology Master Plan; and has addressed concerns and offered guidance about the effectiveness of individual technology components as issues arise (III.C.2)

The College’s curricular commitments for Distance Education (DE) programs and courses are accommodated by the course management system (CMS) Blackboard. A detailed assessment of CMS options was executed as part of the initial decision to move to Blackboard (III.C.3). In addition, follow-up surveys have been done with faculty and students to ensure that the current implementation meets the DE learning needs. According to the Spring 2013 Faculty Survey, the College’s virtual instruction space was deemed sufficient by over 80 percent of those who responded and had an opinion (III.C.4).

The College has provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security. There are Service Level Agreements between IT and the College at large (III.C.5, III.C.6). The College maintains annual support agreements with Ellucian, the College’s ERP provider, and with Blackboard, the College’s course management system for DE. The College
has an offsite tape storage agreement to minimize the loss of data in the event of system failures. The ERP system, available only on the College’s secure intranet with firewall protection, displays the College’s confidentiality statement for every employee at every login attempt. The College runs daily file statistics and diagnostic reports on all ERP system files, carefully monitoring for dynamic levels, overflow, and potentially damaged files. The College ensures Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards (PCI DSS) compliance for credit card security and privacy by participating with certified third party vendors and financial institutions. For example, credit card information is not passed from credit card processing companies back to the College; only receipt and amount of payment are transferred to ensure privacy and security to the students. IT implemented several protocols in Colleague® to mask all social security numbers, limit accessibility to the full social security number on resolution screens, as well as making social security numbers inaccessible for queries and reports. Staff are trained and reminded to not send email containing social security numbers or to send files containing private data that are not encrypted.

The College wide faculty and staff surveys include a question regarding the quality and services provided by the IT Department. The spring 2013 surveys show that of those who responded, 78.8 percent of faculty and 87.0 percent of staff are satisfied with the quality and services provided by Information Technology, a significant improvement over the 53.5 percent satisfaction level in 2007, prior to the College’s administrative restructuring of the IT Department (III.C.5, III.C.7).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
Through the Professional Development Committee, the College has a Learning College Week each semester with planned workshops covering a range of topics. Predominantly attended by faculty, many of which are interested in incorporating technology into education, workshops on the use of technology have consistently been offered through the years. Surveys are conducted by the Professional Development Committee for attendees to give feedback on the actual workshops given as well as to provide input in planning future workshops. Evaluations and surveys show that the technology-related workshops are well-received, and there is regular demand for more offerings (III.C.8, III.C.9).

Classified Professional Development Day is held each spring for all classified staff and regularly includes technology workshops. In the past technology workshops related to Web UI, the web interface for Colleague®; Informer, the reporting tool for Colleague®; email etiquette; and Excel have been held.

In recent years, training topics have been expanded to address the needs and interests of all College employees. Topics have included instruction on the use of common computer software such as Word and Excel; specialized applications like the use of Colleague®; online resources such as Wikispaces and Voicethread; and specific hardware like the iPad (III.C.10).

In addition to scheduled training workshops that employees can attend, the College also promotes and implements individual training opportunities via online resources. In February 2012 the College purchased licenses for Learning Management Systems portals, which offer Lynda, SkillSoft Business, SkillSoft Desktop, and SkillSoft IT courses. The courses are designed to enhance job skills and enable all users to learn beginning to advanced techniques in navigating and using computer software. The courses are self-directed and can be accessed from anywhere with an internet connection. Managers can assign coursework to employees as part of a professional development plan. The courses also provide continuous development of IT professionals (III.C.10, III.C.11, III.C.12).

Application and software training requests to the IT Department include email etiquette and overview; document imaging (OnBase); Event Managing System (EMS) scheduling software; SARS-Trak and SARS-grid for student contact/counseling tracking; Colleague’s UI navigation and overview; Informer reporting; Excel; Word; mass email through Colleague®; and departmental-specific (Financial Aid, Human Resources, Admissions and Records, Payroll, Business Services) setup, maintenance, and workflows.

Outside of instructional programs such as the College's Computers, Networks, and Emerging Technology (CNET) and Computer Science Departments, the College does not specifically provide technology-related training for students. However, since technology is a ubiquitous part of the education process, both of the learning centers at the College provide technology-related support individually to students, as needed. In the Spring 2013 Student Survey, students were asked whether the assistance they received with technology for their classes was sufficient, and 81.5 percent of those who had an opinion felt that it was sufficient (III.C.13).

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

III.C.1.c. The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.
DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College’s technology infrastructure and equipment are systematically planned to support the needs of programs and services. The College provides management, maintenance, and operations of its technology infrastructure and equipment through the Technology Master Plan, Program and Services Review, and Program Improvement Objectives. The College provides appropriate system reliability and emergency backup of essential databases and applications.

The Technology Master Plan was created in 2007 to establish a clear information technology strategy to improve institutional effectiveness. The College cannot execute the College Strategic Plan, DFMP, and EMP without a Technology Master Plan to support implementation. The Technology Master Plan has been modified and updated in 2010, 2012, and 2013, in tandem with the College’s Program and Services Review cycle, to stay current, relevant, and effective. Beginning in 2013 the Technology Master Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees (Board). The plan includes technology planning, future trends analysis, and information technology strategies (III.C.14).

The Technology Master Plan includes operational foundations and principles to:
- choose and implement simplicity;
- balance between early or late technology adoption;
- maintain currency and relevancy of staff skills and knowledge;
- update technology systematically;
- solicit and respond to campus feedback;
- seek operational excellence.

The Technology Master Plan provided solid direction in the planning and campaign leading to the November 2010 passage of Measure G. In addition to numerous other benefits to the College, the funds from Measure G have given the College the opportunity to maintain technology standards in the classroom and across the College’s infrastructure. Initial expenditures for technology include $500,000 for a data center upgrade, $2.275 million for technology infrastructure and $1.56 million for instructional technology.

The College’s Program and Services Review process creates Program Improvement Objectives (PIOs), prioritizes objectives, allocates resources, implements action plans, and assesses improvements. In addition to the Technology Master Plan, the Program and Services Review process links departmental technology needs to the College Strategic Plan through the PIOs. This process directly connects instructional, administrative, and student needs to the budget process.

The planning for new facilities under Measure G represents a unique opportunity for the College to transform its use of technology as the College continues to support teaching and learning. All planning is accomplished through consultation with the College Council and user and focus groups, incorporating technology standards that were developed by the Technology Committee. Even during the multi-year transition period when old buildings will be torn down and new buildings built, the technology standards will be maintained within temporary space being used.

SELF-EVALUATION
Through the demonstrated work of the Technology Committee, the College engages in robust and systematic planning to acquire, maintain, upgrade, or replace technology infrastructure and equipment, both in meeting the teaching and learning needs of faculty and students and in meeting the overall administrative needs of the College.

The Technology Master Plan is assessed and updated regularly, with the most recent version developed and finalized by the Technology Committee in March 2013. This
work has incorporated the technical expertise of employees within IT, as well as the user-based perspectives of faculty and staff outside of IT, thereby meeting the overall needs and requirements of the College as a whole (III.C.15).

The Technology Committee has consistently emphasized the importance of keeping technology current, even going so far as to formalize processes and timelines for upgrading and/or replacing equipment (III.C.16). Historically, the biggest challenge in meeting these timelines has been budgetary. The College has generated considerable local funding to support technology implementations through the Measure G bond, allowing the deployment of several hundred computers to classrooms and labs. Many faculty computers that were outdated have been and continue to be replaced using Measure G funds. Additionally, the wireless network has been expanded on the Fremont campus. In the 2012-2013 academic year new multimedia carts were successfully piloted by faculty in classrooms without an integrated projector or computer. All of this work has been reviewed and guided through the efforts of the College’s Technology Committee (III.C.17, III.C.18).

In addition to the current technology use of Measure G funds, the College established a $10 million technology endowment concurrent to its initial $70 million sale of bonds. This endowment will provide funding for technology projects, purchases, and ongoing costs after a five year investment period, thereby permitting the College to maintain and support technology on both campuses over the long term (III.C.19, III.C.20, III.C.21)

The College provides appropriate system reliability and emergency backup by analyzing systems and transitioning to cloud-hosted environments, mirroring databases and applications at the data center on the Newark campus, migrating physical servers to virtual servers to reduce overall support costs and unplanned downtime, and utilizing third party vendors for offsite data storage in case of catastrophic events. During fall 2012 a failure in one of the College’s email servers resulted in very little data loss, due predominantly to the established backup procedures that the College has been following (III.C.22).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**III.C.1.d. The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
The College’s distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services. The IT Department’s areas of responsibilities include desktop/user support, system administration, network management, telecommunications, audio/visual services, enterprise system development, academic lab/classroom support, and help desk call tracking. Outside the IT Department’s scope, but part of the College’s overall technology responsibilities, include system analysis for Business Services and other Administrative Services areas, lab/classroom monitoring, and support for the College’s e-Campus (III.C.16).

**SELF-EVALUATION**
Decisions about use and distribution of technology resources are made through the Technology Committee, CCT Chairs, Program and Services Review, and IT management for department resource requests.

The College has provisions to assure a robust and secure technical infrastructure that provides maximum reliability for
students and faculty. These provisions include service level agreements from IT and the College at large; vendor-based agreements, such as Ellucian support and Blackboard support; offsite tape storage contracts and agreements; Colleague® confidentiality statement; IT policy regarding use of social security numbers; robust, current, and secure firewall protection; the College’s active participation and compliance with current credit card security and privacy standards; securing private data; and the ERP availability and exclusivity through the College’s secure intranet (III.C.23).

The College’s infrastructure is kept reasonably up-to-date through several policies and procedures, such as service level agreements, hardware vendor support agreements, and the Purchasing Department’s practices to ensure that all technology hardware comes with warranties. As a reminder of the importance of keeping equipment up-to-date, timelines for hardware replacement were developed through the Technology Committee (III.C.24).

Equipment and software applications that support distance programs and DE are assessed and reviewed by the Technology Committee, during Program and Services Review, and by IT management.

The College has focused attention on more effectively distributing technology, a challenge given limited funding availability. The Spring 2013 Faculty and Staff Surveys addressed the effectiveness of current hardware and software technology, both in the classroom and in the office. Of those who expressed an opinion, satisfaction ranged from 77.7 percent of faculty to 80.7 percent of staff regarding sufficiency of technology in the office/workspace. Faculty who responded also indicated a 68.5 percent satisfaction with technology in the classroom. Measure G funds have been allocated and used to improve the state of available technology at the College and will continue leveraging the Technology Endowment. As more technology hardware is upgraded through these funds, it is reasonable to expect that satisfaction numbers will correspondingly increase (III.C.4, III.C.7).

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

III.C.2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College ensures that technology decisions emanate from institutional needs and plans for improvement. Work begun since the last accreditation cycle with a Technology Master Plan has shown continual improvement each year, directly linking technology planning and institutional planning. The primary obstacles to short and long-term planning are state-wide budget volatility and an ever-changing technology environment.

SELF-EVALUATION
The Technology Master Plan is written and refined with participation from the Technology Committee and IT management, and incorporated into the IT Department Program and Services Review. The Technology Master Plan’s initiatives and projects are developed with the following guidelines and technology trends: digital telephone systems without Voice Over IP capabilities are, or will be, obsolete; data and physical security are lasting priorities; Wi-Fi access is both expected and necessary for today’s technology and the College’s learning environments; and virtualization (separating software from hardware) is driving IT efficiency (III.C.16).
The College’s Program and Services Review process provides the data that the College uses to base technology needs and decisions. The College determines that technology needs in program and service areas are met effectively through site surveys and employee annual evaluations.

Decisions about technology purchases are prioritized institutionally by means of Technology Committee discussions, annual budget managers’ meetings, College wide PIO process, and linking technology goals with the College Strategic Plan.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
### Standard III.C. Sources of Evidence

| III.C.1  | Technology Committee Meeting Minutes Website          |
| III.C.2  | Technology Master Plan                                 |
| III.C.3  | CMS assessment report, Spring 2010                    |
| III.C.4  | 2013 Spring Faculty Satisfaction Survey               |
| III.C.5  | Service Level Agreement                                |
| III.C.6  | Sample Service Level Agreement - Desktop Support      |
| III.C.7  | 2013 Spring Staff Satisfaction Survey                 |
| III.C.8  | Sample of Professional Development Evaluation Survey  |
| III.C.9  | Professional Development Planning Survey Results From Spring 2013 |
| III.C.10 | Learning College Week Agenda                          |
| III.C.11 | eCampus offerings, Applications jump page              |
| III.C.12 | SkillPort Link                                        |
| III.C.13 | 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey               |
| III.C.14 | Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda June 12, 2013       |
| III.C.15 | Various Iterations of the Technology Master Plan      |
| III.C.16 | Information Technology Program Review                 |
| III.C.17 | Technology Spending Plan                              |
| III.C.18 | Technology Committee Meeting Minutes from the September 2012 |
| III.C.19 | Measure G Series A and A-I Official Statement         |
| III.C.20 | Board of Trustees Meeting, Sept 14, 2011             |
| III.C.21 | Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Meeting, December 12, 2011 |
| III.C.22 | Technology Committee Minutes for October 16, 2012     |
| III.C.23 | Service Level Agreement Blackboard                    |
| III.C.24 | Appendix F of Technology Master Plan                  |
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STANDARD III.D.
Fiscal Resources
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Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning.

The College has prudently managed its fiscal resources during the turbulence of the past five years. During that time the College acted proactively to decrease expenditures in order to keep pace with declining State funding levels. These actions included reducing instructional course offerings; reducing workforce levels; offering early retirement incentives; implementing a stringent review process for the hiring of vacated positions; and other options. Due to these efforts the College has built its total General Fund Reserve levels to 22.9 percent, well above the required five percent.

The College’s 2013-2014 total General (Purpose) Fund Budget, adopted by the Board of Trustees (Board) on September 11, 2013, is $55.0 million. This budget represents a year-over-year increase of $2.5 million. The current budget reflects an unrestricted operating surplus of $343,582 after two years of deficit spending.

The College’s current revenues are able to support a limited amount of educational enhancements. The 2013-2014 Operating Budget includes $192,500 of new direct funding for Program Improvement Objectives (PIOs) and Institutional Improvement Objectives (IIOs) identified by the College as priorities for the current year. An additional $600,000 of improvements was included in the budget that will impact student learning, including faculty sabbaticals and previously-eliminated administrative positions.

Given its history of prudent fiscal management, a substantial reserve level, and the mitigation of deficit spending, the College’s resources are sufficient to ensure financial solvency.

III.D.1. The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.

III.D.1.a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.
DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The College’s resource allocation/budget process is described in the 2010-2015 Educational Master Plan (EMP) and includes a cyclical review of the College’s strategic direction and the linking of its foundational principles, mission, core values, and goals to its financial planning process (III.D.1).

The review of strategy includes assessment, comprised of an Environmental Scan (College community needs and College outcomes in meeting those needs, both expressed in a data-oriented document); accreditation planning agendas; results of Program and Service Reviews; and a thorough evaluation of the status of current College goals and objectives. The next step in the cycle is a reaffirmation of College values and a review of the College Mission Statement. With the benefit of assessment, the College is ready to analyze the degree to which it is fulfilling its mission and meeting community needs. A visioning process follows that provides an opportunity for meaningful input from College stakeholders and the community to help determine the College’s future. Following this work, the College determines what current goals should continue and drafts new goals to be achieved in the next cycle. Goals are expressed in more specific objectives and include timeframes. Over the life of the College Strategic Plan, programs that are designed to achieve the goals are implemented and their program results are assessed.

Through governance, the College identifies goals for achievement during each budget cycle; devises and implements strategies to meet these goals and finally, using data, assesses the performance. The College’s Program and Services Review identifies PIOs based on data, for example Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) data, as part of an integrated effort to strengthen the institution and meet its objectives as well as its accreditation standards. Program and Services Review is an ongoing process involving all departments, including instructional disciplines, student services, instructional services, administrative services, and the departments reporting to the president. The Program and Services Review and annual updates to PIOs form a bridge from Program and Services Review to budget planning (III.D.2).

The College Planning Matrix shows how strategic goals, standing committees, and the accreditation standards connect and interrelate (III.D.3). Accreditation covers mission and planning in Standard I; the primary purpose of the College, educating students, in Standard II; resources in Standard III; and leadership and governance in Standard IV, all interrelated areas within the College. The College has strategic goals that pertain to each one. Evaluating programs and services through Program and Services Review assures quality and continuous improvement and is an accreditation requirement. Program and Services Review methodology requires linkages to be established between PIOs and achievement of specific College-level goals and objectives.

Governance structures align with financial planning efforts by supporting the strategic goals and the objectives, providing the methodology, the how of getting things done through resource allocation—fiscal, physical, human, and technological. The roles of College Council and the Faculty Senate are central. College Council oversees institutional planning and other standing committees that assure the integrity of facilities, professional development, and the budget. Faculty Senate has responsibility for academic programs.

Evidence-based decision making is a growing part of the College culture. The goals in the College Strategic Plan 2010-2015 have clearly defined objectives to guide their achievement. Objectives make the goals operational.
following the recommended strategies set forth in the College Strategic Plan; objectives delineate measurable outcomes, timelines, action plans and responsibilities. Each semester the president/superintendent (president), in consultation with the College Council assesses progress on identified objectives. The president reports to the College community the status of institutional objectives in her State of the College address before the start of each semester.

The Board, president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, and governance groups participate in ongoing discussions about fiscal planning that clearly demonstrate and support its links to institutional planning. Each year the president presents a budget to the Board, prepared in accordance with state regulations and the California Community College Budget and Accounting Manual. The schedule for presentation and review of budget proposals complies with the state law and regulations and provides adequate time for study by the Board and for review by appropriate governance committees (III.D.4).

Budget development must meet the following criteria:
- The annual budget supports the College’s master and educational plans
- Assumptions upon which the budget is based are presented to the Board for review
- A schedule is provided to the Board by January of each year that includes dates for presentation of the tentative budget, required public hearing, Board study session(s) and approval of the final budget. At the public hearing, interested persons may appear and address the Board regarding the proposed budget or any item in the proposed budget.
- Unrestricted General Fund reserves shall be no less than five percent of the General Fund expenditures.
- Changes in the assumptions upon which the budget was based shall be reported to the Board in a timely manner.
- Budget projections address long-term goals and commitments.

Prior to both the Tentative Budget Approval each June and the Final Budget Approval by the Board each September, the president and vice president, administrative services review the budget with the Budget Committee and College Council for feedback and discussion (III.D.5, III.D.6). Recommendations are developed with respect to the IIOs and PIOs that are receiving specific resource allocations with the proposed budget (III.D.7).

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. College planning is conducted at both the long-term strategic level and the short-term annual operational level. The major plans of the College include the EMP (III.D.1), College Strategic Plan (III.D.9), District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP) (III.D.10), Technology Master Plan (III.D.11), Measure A and Measure G plans (III.D.12, III.D.13), Staffing Plan (III.D.14), and the College’s annual budget (III.D.15). Financial planning is an integral part of all these plans and in performing fiscal planning a long-term, broad-based approach is taken.

Annual planning is the means by which the College achieves its strategic goals. Annually, coinciding with budget deadlines, the College engages in a process to revisit its Mission Statement and determine a list of priority improvements it needs to undertake in order to achieve the College Objectives. This process engages all programs and services through the annual submission of PIOs. The PIOs are accompanied by action plans, an estimation of resource needs, assessment methods, and metrics.

The College establishes priorities amongst competing resource needs so that it strategically allocates funding to best meet its goals and objectives. As part of a
STANDARD III.D. FISCAL RESOURCES

comprehensive assessment of the College’s planning processes, the Process Assessment Committee (PAC) has streamlined the PIO prioritization process. The PIO process has been further strengthened to work seamlessly with the budget planning process by involving budget managers at the program or department level and by streamlining the allocation of resources for PIOs. PIO action plans are done on an annual basis.

Individual departments categorize each PIO into one of three general areas for planning purposes: institution-wide, cross division/department, and departmental. PIOs requiring additional resources are discussed at annual budget manager meetings with the vice president, administrative services to ascertain their alignment with College mission and goals and to quantify the anticipated outcomes of the resource investment on student learning. This information is used by the president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents to then prioritize PIOs and, by the Budget Committee and College Council to then make funding recommendations. From this list of PIOs, the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents prioritize a list of IIOs. Those IIOs that have the broadest and most significant impact on the College merit additional focus.

The president, College Council, and the Budget Committee use a categorized, prioritized, College wide master list of PIOs and IIOs for financial planning purposes (III.D.16). These are shared broadly through all major committees and with the Board during the budget adoption process.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

III.D.1.b. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College’s comprehensive, systematic, and integrated system of planning is supported by an accounting system comprised of several funds designed to enhance planning and control. The funds have been set up to comply with the California Community Colleges’ Budget and Accounting Manual (BAM) Fund Definitions and to follow the hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

Revenue and expenditure assumptions are the foundation of fund budgets and are informed by the extensive analysis of historical data, the prioritization of College goals and objectives, including PIOs and IIOs, and on informed projections of future events based on the most current economic information from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO), the Legislative Analyst’s Office, and others.

The process begins with the release of the governor’s annual budget proposal in January, then integrates changes based on the governor’s revised budget proposal in May and the adopted budget in June of each year.

Using the state budget information, the vice president, administrative services—in consultation with the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, College Council, and Budget Committee—develops budget assumptions that are clearly enumerated and form a basis for revenue and expenditure estimates. This methodology enables the College to quickly react and make necessary adjustments if an assumption later proves to be flawed or inaccurate.

Key revenue assumptions include projected enrollment data, the faculty obligation number (FON), cost of living
adjustments (COLA), growth/restoration factors, deficit factors applied to state apportionment, and property tax revenues. The College also projects any new funding sources such as grants, partnerships, or other viable opportunities to enhance revenues. Expenditure assumptions include a detailed analysis and projection of personnel costs including salaries; step and column costs; compliance cost increases; and health and welfare costs.

The budget is developed, monitored, and managed in accordance with state regulations and the BAM (III.D.17). The College updates the Board quarterly with respect to ongoing and anticipated fiscal commitments through governance committees. Budget managers have access to monthly reports that indicate levels of available resources.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
The College’s planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements. The 2012-2013 budget provides an excellent example of the rigorous process the College uses to establish its budget assumptions to reflect a pragmatic assessment of current and exigent conditions.

California’s 2012-2013 budget was predicated on California voters approving Proposition 30, Governor Brown’s tax initiative to fund Kindergarten-14 education. This was a risky proposition. Not only did voters need to approve Proposition 30 by a majority, but this proposition also needed to pass by a greater majority than competing initiatives in order for the College to receive revenues at current levels.

The College constructed three alternative budgets based on three distinct outcomes. Scenario A projected revenues based on the approval of Proposition 30 and resulted in year-over-year “flat” funding. Scenario B projected severe funding cuts as a result of a Proposition 30 defeat; revenue reductions resulted in 560 fewer full-time equivalent students (FTES) funded by the state, translating into approximately 213 fewer classes and turning away an estimated 1,556 students. Scenario C projected additional fiscal impacts related to local property tax and Redevelopment Agency (RDA) revenue fluctuations, given the level of volatility and uncertainty at the time (III.D.18).

While the College hoped for the best, it planned for the worst and adopted Scenario B as its (baseline) budget. Spring and summer 2013 class schedules were adjusted accordingly (III.D.19).

Since the College carefully planned its reduction in services related to Scenario A versus Scenario B and Scenario C, it was able to adapt quickly and restore classes readily and appropriately when Proposition 30 was successful at the polls (III.D.20, III.D.21).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**III.D.1.c. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
To ensure adequate and consistent short-term funding of the College’s operations when budget assumptions prove to be inaccurate, it is necessary to establish and maintain savings or reserves. In accordance with state regulations, the College maintains a contingency reserve of five percent of its expenditures. In addition to this required reserve, the
College has established a two percent ($1 million) Rainy Day Fund as well as additional reserves for capital improvements, office equipment, and Supplemental Employee Retirement Plan (SERP) liabilities. In all, the College’s total reserves in its General Fund at year end 2012-2013 are approximately 23 percent of its annual expenditures (III.D.22, III.D.23).

The District’s most significant liabilities are its General Obligation Bonds, related to Proposition 39 bonds Measure A and Measure G, and its SERP liability. Additionally, the District is responsible for post-employment health care benefits which have been and continue to be earned by employees who retire with 10 or more years of service. As a result of Governmental Accounting Standards Board 45 (GASB 45), the College is required to treat this obligation in a similar manner as its pension benefits. This obligation resulted in an unfunded obligation for Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) that had been earned up to the date of GASB 45 adoption in 2004. As of March 31, 2013, the unfunded obligation was estimated at $2,113,121.

The District carefully identifies and plans for its long-term liabilities while maintaining its fund reserves to ensure adequate resources in case of unanticipated shortfalls. The process for establishing fiscal planning priorities is detailed in Section 7 of the EMP, which also provides direction for Facilities, Information Technology, and staffing in support of student learning.

The District’s bonds are in compliance with all indentures and began maturing on August 1, 2012, and continue for the next 25 years (III.D.24). The vast majority of bonds issued are current interest bonds, the least costly funding instrument. The bonds are accounted for in Fund 20 and the tax collection and debt service is managed by Alameda County with input from the District.

Both pension plans have been funded at 100 percent of the required contribution level and the OPEB liability, while funded at 13 percent of its actuarial obligation, has been funded at the GASB recommended Annual Required Contribution (ARC). The ARC represents a level of funding that if paid on an ongoing basis, is projected to cover normal cost each year, and amortize any unfunded liabilities over a period not to exceed thirty years.

In addition to its aforementioned long-term liabilities, the District makes decisions that have financial consequences that extend beyond the current budget year. Multi-year labor contracts; structures and their related maintenance; multi-year grants; and educational programs detailed in the College catalog can all create obligations that require resources in the future. The District’s decision-making methodology detailed in the EMP seeks to identify the entirety of these obligations when decisions are made.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College plans for and has successfully discharged all of its past financial obligations. The College maintains reserves in excess of its required reserve and has funded its OPEB Annual Required Contribution and pension plans fully. Effective 2013-2014 the College will partially fund its OPEB liability with surpluses/fund balances in sub-funds 13 and 14. The balances are such that this strategy, which provides relief to the District’s General Fund, will result in the mitigation of the College’s structural deficit. In addition, the District has established a SERP reserve of $1.5 million, a sum that covers the actuarial value of the SERP that will be retired in 2016.

Furthermore, by carefully planning its long-term obligations, the College refinanced a portion of its Measure A, Series A, general obligation bonds, in 2010 resulting in savings of nearly $3.5 million to taxpayers. The College refinanced
another $94 million of Measure A, Series B, general obligation bonds in September 2012 for additional savings to taxpayers of $8.3 million for an aggregate total of $11.8 million of savings (III.D.25, III.D.26).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.D.1.d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets. (See Recommendation #4 and response).**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The planning process is detailed in Standard II.B.2 and Section 7 of the EMP, Institutional Planning Cycles (III.D.8) and encompasses both strategic planning and annual budget planning. To maintain focus on its foundational principles, the College implemented a cyclical process for assessing its strategic planning described in Standard I.B.6.

All College programs and services engage in self-evaluation and improvement through Program and Services Reviews. As part of the Program and Services Review process, the College engages in a process to determine a prioritized list of program improvements that it would like to undertake to achieve specific College goals and objectives. This process engages all College programs and departments by asking that they submit PIOs, which are the tactical products of their Program and Services Reviews (III.D.27). These PIO’s are accompanied by action plans and resource needs.

In February and March of each year the budget managers in each program/service area meet with the vice president, administrative services to review their current year budget, their subsequent year PIO’s, and anticipated additional resource needs in order to develop the subsequent year budget (III.D.28). The vice president, administrative services tracks these PIO’s and their anticipated outcomes according to how effectively they contribute to College goals and objectives. The list is then used for determining resource funding allocation with input from the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, Budget Committee, and College Council (III.D.29). Since the list includes all programs and services, the result is an annual representation of efforts at program improvements that serve as the impetus for financial planning (III.D.30).

The president, in her semi-annual State of the College address to the College community, routinely devotes a large portion of her speech to an assessment of the College’s goals. The president generally begins with an overview of the State of California’s budget and how it relates to the College’s budget plan. This is connected to current progress on meeting strategic goals and plans to make improvements at the College, given financial constraints. The speech, as well as supporting data and other relevant information, is made available to the general public on the president’s website.

Other stakeholders are informed more frequently. The Budget Committee, a standing committee of College Council, receives monthly updates on the budget, offering a venue for a College wide dialogue and linkage with the planning processes and financial allocation (III.D.5). The committee regularly provides information and recommendations to the College Council, and the minutes are posted to the College website. The Board meets monthly and is kept abreast of the planning process and is regularly updated on the status of budget and goals for the coming year. On a quarterly basis the Board is updated on budget versus actual financial results (III.D.20, III.D.21, III.D.22, III.D.23,
In addition, community budget forums are held on an as needed basis (III.D.31).

**SELF-EVALUATION**
The College clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget. The budget planning process is clearly delineated in Section 7 of the District’s EMP and District processes support those guidelines while offering constituencies the opportunity to participate and contribute to the development of College plans and budgets.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

**III.D.2.** To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

**III.D.2.a.** Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
The annual budget is developed with input from each department and program through budget manager meetings (III.D.28) based on College goals and objectives. Each department/program budget has a designated budget manager. Additional resource requests are presented and discussed with the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents; the Budget Committee, and at College Council meetings (III.D.27). Following adoption, the budget is available online for all departments/programs. Subsequently, financial reports are also accessible online and information is real time.

Budget and financial transactions are initiated and reviewed at the department/program level and then monitored/approved by Administrative Services. If personnel changes are involved, Human Resources is also involved.

Funds are allocated in a manner that will realistically achieve the College’s stated goals for student learning. Some examples are:

- Resource allocations support PIOs.
- Slightly over fifty percent of apportionment is spent on classroom instruction (III.D.32).
- The College consistently employs more full-time faculty than required by its FON to keep the educational quality high (III.D.33).

The president and vice president, administrative services conduct budget forums once a semester or more frequently if needed. Information from the CCCCC is included on the president’s web page. The Budget Committee, College Council, and the Board also receive regular reports on the status and changing priorities of the budget (III.D.5, III.D.6, III.D.20, III.D.21).

In addition to daily and monthly review of financial transactions, quarterly budget reports are prepared and analyzed to ensure accuracy and credibility. These reports summarize year-to-date budget/financial information using the Colleague® financial software system and are presented to the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, Budget Committee, College Council, and the Board.

A byproduct of the annual independent financial audit is a document that details issues identified by certified public accountants that could enhance financial controls. Any audit
findings and/or recommendations are communicated to appropriate College leadership and constituents through the Audit Committee of the Board, Budget Committee, College Council, and the Board. Action plans are developed and implemented expeditiously in response (III.D.33a, III.D.33b, III.D.33c, III.D.33d, III.D.33e, III.D.33f).

SELF-EVALUATION
Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

The College has consistently received unmodified “clean” opinions from its independent auditors on its financial statements, evidence of a high degree of accuracy and credibility with respect to financial documents. From the previous Accreditation Self Study in 2008 through 2012-2013 the College has not received any qualified or adverse audit opinions with respect to financial statements accuracy and/or program compliance.

The College regularly monitors and updates its budget(s) based on the most current information and shares and discusses this information publicly with all appropriate governance groups.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

III.D.2.b. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College’s financial statements are annually audited by an external independent audit firm as required (III.D.35).

Auditors consider all District funds, all auxiliary organization’s funds, and also conduct performance audits for the College’s two general obligation bonds, Measure A and Measure G (III.D.36). External auditors conduct fiscal and compliance audits as required.

The audit reports are presented to the Audit Committee of the Board, the Budget Committee, College Council, and the Board for review and approval. Measure A and Measure G audits are also presented to the Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee for review and acceptance as required by law (III.D.37).

The College has consistently received unmodified opinions from its external auditors with respect to accuracy of financial statements and level of internal controls (III.D.33). When audit findings and/or recommendations have been identified, a corrective action plan has been developed immediately in collaboration with the appropriate department and implemented in a timely manner. The auditor’s report on the status of these findings and recommendations are noted in the audit for the subsequent year. These results are reported publicly to all the appropriate governance groups.

SELF-EVALUATION
The College has consistently earned an unmodified opinion from external auditors for its financial reporting and internal controls.

The external audit for 2011-2012 contained a finding related to membership attendance of the Educational Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) Advisory Committee. A corrective action plan, as described on page 72 of the audit, has been implemented (III.D.36). Two recommendations, which did not rise to the level of findings, were noted by auditors with respect to fiscal operations and internal controls of the College’s Foundation (III.D.35). Corrective
action was immediately taken by the District to strengthen internal controls. These actions were communicated to all appropriate College governance groups (III.D.38). No audit recommendations or findings have exceeded a year and there have been no repeat findings.

The most recent College audit is available on the Business Services web site (III.D.36).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.D.2.c. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution in a timely manner.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Financial information is provided to the College community via meetings, forums, written reports, and online modes. Information on District revenues and program expenditures, actuals versus budget, is regularly provided to budget managers during Deans, Directors, and Administrative Staff (DDAS) meetings and at Administrative Services team meetings. Other financial information—such as changes in the budget, personnel, payroll, and purchasing data—is also provided consistently during these meetings (III.D.39).

On a monthly basis the Budget Committee, College Council, and Board receive fiscal information and updates that may include revenue tracking; expenditure tracking; current financial trends and observations; State budget outlook; and/or strategies to balance the budget (III.D.5, III.D.6, III.D.20, III.D.21).

Real-time online financial information can be accessed by all budget managers through both the WebAdvisor and Colleague® pathways.

Forums are held periodically to provide up-to-date information on significant changes in the funding outlook from federal and state agencies. Quarterly financial reports and the tentative and final budgets are reviewed by the Budget Committee and College Council for feedback and input prior to being shared with the Board for approval. Quarterly finance reports for general obligation bonds Measure A and Measure G are presented to the Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee which reviews and accepts them as required by statute (III.D.37).

The Master Agreement between the District and the Foundation delineates the role of the Foundation at the College, supported by Administrative Procedure 3300. The Foundation is required to conduct an annual independent audit.

All key financial documents, including annual audit results, are posted on the College’s website.

The vice president, administrative services, and director, business services, attend professional seminars held by the CCCCO and professional organizations. Information is regularly shared with the College community. When questions arise regarding financial matters the three primary sources of contact are the vice president, administrative services; director, business services; and lead accounting coordinator.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the College in a timely manner through the utilization of numerous delivery methods from real-time online access; monthly reports to the Budget Committee, College Council, and Board; and quarterly reports to the Board and community.

The College meets the standard.
ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
To increase productivity and ease-of-use the College is exploring the implementation of a budget development module in Colleague® for all budget managers.

III.D.2.d. All financial resources, including short-and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College has historically not utilized any short-term debt instruments such as Certificates of Participation (COPs) or Tax Revenue Anticipatory Notes (TRANs).

The use of bond funds for construction, modernization, and renovation efforts is dictated by Measure A and Measure G ballot language, approved by District voters, and reviewed and accepted quarterly, as required by law, by the Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee (III.D.37). Further, the College’s recently adopted DFMP, developed collaboratively with the College community, provides high level direction to staff with respect to the use of these funds (III.D.10). The College employs a construction management firm to assist in planning, monitoring, and reporting of all bond expenditures and activity.

All financial transactions involving the Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC) require ASOC Board approval, and are reviewed by the College’s vice president, student services for appropriateness. Transactions are also reviewed by the College’s financial team and external auditors for accuracy and reasonableness (III.D.40).

Financial expenditures of the College Foundation are monitored by the College’s finance team, reviewed by the Finance Committee of the Foundation, the Executive Committee of Foundation, and the Foundation’s Board of Directors. The College, in collaboration with the Foundation director, has provided training to the Foundation Board of Directors with respect to College goals and priorities (III.D.41). The president; vice president, administrative services; director, business, services; and Foundation director meet regularly, quarterly at a minimum, to ensure that all Foundation fund raising efforts are consistent with stated College goals and priorities and to review Foundation expenditures (III.D.42).

In past years the College bookstore was an auxiliary organization and cafeteria services were provided by the College. Now, both operations are contracted to outside agencies. Follett Corporation operates the bookstore and Fresh & Natural operates the cafeteria. Annual revenues from each, as negotiated, are used to support the General Fund, thereby supporting the College’s educational goals and objectives.

Revenue received by the College from these organizations in support of the General Fund:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 42: Revenue from Bookstore &amp; Cafeteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant management is decentralized at the College. Grant managers, as program area experts, are responsible for ensuring that grant funds are expended as intended. The College’s Finance Team supports grant managers by monitoring expenditures, generating reports, assisting with state and federal audits, and offering guidance as required. External auditors conduct annual audits of special funded state programs including EOPS, Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), and CalWORKs for accuracy.
of financial records and compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations (III.D.43). Grants such as the Human Services Workforce Development Grant conduct their own audits of related College programs to insure compliance with intent.

SELF-EVALUATION
Processes, safeguards, and internal controls are all in place to ensure that all financial resources of the College including auxiliary activities, long-term debt instruments, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.

The College has consistently received unmodified opinions from its external auditors in relation to compliance with all applicable state and federal grant requirements.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Complete an Administrative Procedure, in support of Board Policy 3280, with respect to Grant Management that allows for a refined process and enhanced involvement of the finance team in all College grant programs.

III.D.2.e. The institution’s internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

DESCRIPtIVE SUMMARY
According to the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations (COSO) internal control is a process, affected by an entity’s board of directors, management, and other personnel, designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of objective in the effectiveness and efficiency of operations, reliability of financial reporting, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

External auditors, by the nature of their work, validate the efficacy of many of the District’s internal controls. In addition to audits of state apportionment and student enrollment reporting, the annual audit includes audits of compliance standards for special funded state programs including EOPS, DSPS, and CalWORKs. Grants such as the Human Services Workforce Development Grant also have their own audits conducted by the outside sponsoring agency.

All bond transactions are not only reviewed by the College, but by construction managers. In addition, all bond expenditures are reviewed quarterly and publicly by the Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee. The College administration is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal controls over financial reporting.

SELF-EVALUATION
The College’s internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness and the results of this assessment are used for improvement. College administration develops policies, protocols, and practices to ensure such compliance. Annual external audits gauge the efficacy of the District’s internal controls while performing the work of the audit. Deficiencies discovered during the audit process are addressed in a timely and transparent fashion.

In addition, as part of the Business Services Program and Services Review, the efficiency and effectiveness of financial services being provided are assessed. Each area of Business Services describes how activities support the College mission, vision, and associated values. Servicing activity benchmarks are developed, and PIOs are established with an eye on improving internal controls (III.D.44).

Internal controls at the College consistently provide checks and balances for all financial transactions.
In the annual audit for 2011-2012, on page 64, the auditors found no instances of non-compliance as required under the Government Auditing Standards and no deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting considered material weaknesses (III.D.45).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.D.3. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability.**

**III.D.3.a. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and develops contingency plans to mitigate financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College maintains fund balances well in excess of the five percent minimum required by education code. These substantial fund balances ensure adequate cash levels exceeding five percent of expenditures. Cash flow projections each year confirm no need to borrow funds, either internally or externally. The latest cash flow projection for 2013-2014 is on the Budget Committee website (III.D.46).

Were they needed, additional funds to meet operating expenses are available in other eligible funds (such as Fund 25, 41) as deemed appropriate by the Board and on a short-term loan basis. At the end of 2012-2013 there was a total of $2.1 million of alternate liquidity available in these funds (III.D.47).

A two percent Rainy Day Fund ($1 million) is set aside in addition to the five percent Required Reserve. Total available General Fund Reserves for the past three years are noted below (III.D.48, III.D.49).

| TABLE 43: General Fund Reserves |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| GENERAL FUND                  | 2010-2011       | 2011-2012       | 2012-2013       |
| Total Reserves ($)            | 12,114,191      | 11,704,827      | 10,574,900      |
| Total Expenditures ($)        | 47,188,011      | 45,842,504      | 46,109,374      |
| Reserve Level (%)             | 25.7            | 25.5            | 22.9            |

The 2012-2013 total General Fund Reserves were at 22.9 percent of total expenditures (III.D.50).

Strategies for proactively managing risk include a conservative budgeting model; a very prudent, conservative investment policy (III.D.50); participation in shared risk pools including Joint Powers Authority (JPA) for property and Workers’ Compensation and CALPERS for employee health insurance; and an Employee Wellness Program. Reserve levels are set by the respective boards based on best practices.

The frequency of unforeseen occurrence—over which the College may exercise some control is minimized through the Program and Services Review process. Future needs for resources are identified, prioritized, and funded during the annual budget development cycle. Externally imposed unforeseen circumstances are dealt with during the regular and periodic fiscal reviews with the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, and Board.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain fiscal stability. The General Fund Reserves have consistently exceeded the required five percent and there is accessible alternate liquidity in other College funds.

Significant risk management strategies are in place to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen circumstances. This
is clearly demonstrated by the response to the most recent budget crisis. Prior to the passage of Proposition 30 in November 2012, the College faced the risk of a reduction in fiscal year 2012-2013 revenues of approximately $2.3 million due to a projected state imposed workload reduction of 457 FTES and another $1.1 million due to an anticipated deficit in state funding. As a contingency to mitigate the anticipated loss in revenues, the College conservatively predicated its fiscal year 2012-2013 College budget on Proposition 30 not passing at the ballot.

Contingency measures included reducing the number of classes by 140, resulting, in part, in a $581,000 reduction for adjunct faculty salaries. Categorical program budgets were reduced between 32 percent and 64 percent. A College wide salary freeze and hiring frost were continued for the fourth straight year. Reductions in the General Fund Ending Fund Balance were forecast to balance the budget (III.D.51, III.D.52). With the passage of Proposition 30 most of these reductions were restored (III.D.53, III.D.54).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.D.3.b. The institution practices effective oversight of finances including management of Financial Aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College practices effective oversight and management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets in five broad ways, including:

1. Board Policies and Administrative Procedures;
2. External audits by independent auditors and program (grantor) auditors;
3. Budget development and monitoring with budget managers;
4. Real-time information to all budget and grant managers;
5. Regular meetings between Business Services and auxiliary organizations.

Stringent and prudent Board Policies provide for effective fiscal management and accountability. Board Policy 6320, for example, establishes criteria for District investments as follows (III.D.55):
- The preservation of principal shall be of primary importance;
- The investment program must remain sufficiently flexible to meet all operating requirements;
- Transactions should be avoided that might impair public confidence.

The related Administrative Procedure 6320 provides for additional specifications, responsibility, and accountability for managing College investments. (III.D.56)

An independent auditing firm audited the College on its internal controls of financial transactions and accuracy of financial reporting. For 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, pages 62 and 64 respectively, the auditors reported, “We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses.” The College has consistently received unmodified opinions from independent auditors and no material weaknesses have been identified as a result of external audits.

Further, the District’s financial aid program has been regularly reviewed by both the United States Department of Education and the United States Department of Veteran’s Affairs. Over the past five years there have been no
supplementary special audits required. The District has been found to be compliant.

During the 2012-2013 academic year the College’s Design It, Build It, Ship It grant was audited. This grant is a workforce training grant funded by the federal government’s Trade Assistance Community College Training Initiative. No adverse findings or material weaknesses were noted in the audit (III.D.57, III.D.58).

Fiscal oversight is also enhanced through regular meetings with budget and grant managers. Current expenses are compared to the current budget and revisions are made as appropriate. Regular meetings between Business Services and auxiliary organizations, such as the Ohlone Foundation, facilitate effective fiscal oversight of these entities.

All College departments have access to real-time budget and financial information online. Managers responsible for grants, financial aid, and other categorical or auxiliary programs (such as ASOC and Foundation) are required to keep expenditures within the amounts appropriated. When a new grant is being requested, information is collected on the funding and compliance requirements. The obligations of the College with regard to grants and contracts are defined and monitoring/reporting requirements are documented and calendared (see Grant Management Information document in (III.D.59).

SELF-EVALUATION
The College has a history of compliance and sound financial management and oversight practices as evidenced by independent external audits, audits conducted by external auditing firms, and grantors. The College has consistently received unmodified opinions in fiscal, compliance, and performance audits.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

III.D.3.c. The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Future liabilities and financial obligations of the College are identified and noted in the annual audit. Provisions and resources are made committed to retire future obligations.

With regards to OPEB liability, the College is compliant with GASB 43/45. As part of the annual budget cycle, and with information from actuarial studies and under guidance from the Retirement Board of Authority, the College quantifies OPEB liability and plans accordingly. Annually, the College funds the ARC, comprised of the normal cost and both the initial and residual unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) amortization costs, required to meet its obligations under GASB 43 and 45. Further, the College has established a GASB 43 Trust Fund to address future OPEB benefits/liability (III.D.60).

As a means of funding unpaid accrued vacation and compensatory time, one-fourth of the total outstanding balance of all employees’ compensated absences is accrued at year end in the District’s General Fund (III.D.61). The College limits the accrual of unused vacation time for its classified staff, delineated in bargaining agreements, and its management staff, set in individual contracts. Compensatory time is permitted only in select departments. Leave balances are posted monthly for managers and supervisors to review. Employees whose balances approach the maximum accrual level work with their supervisors.
and Human Resources to develop and implement a plan to reduce their leave balances.

The College has no other employee-related future obligations.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
The College plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations including Other Post-employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. As part of the annual budget cycle, the College quantifies its exposure and allocates appropriate resources to mitigate.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

III.D.3.d. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
In accordance with the requirements of Statements 43 and 45 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) the College contracts for bi-annual actuarial studies to be completed in order to determine and recognize its OPEB liability.

As of February 1, 2013 the calculated UAAL for the District’s OPEB was $4,062,293 (III.D.62). Annually, the College funds the ARC, comprised of the normal cost and both the initial and residual unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL) amortization costs, required to meet its obligations under GASB 43 and 45. The College has established a GASB 43 Trust Fund for future OPEB benefits/ liability. Further, the College has established the Retirement Board of Authority (RBOA) to oversee this trust fund. The RBOA meets quarterly.

**SELF-EVALUATION**
The actuarial plan to determine OPEB liability is prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards and GASB guidance. The District’s first actuarial study was conducted in 2007, prior to the release of GASB Statements 43 and 45. Subsequent studies have been commissioned in 2009, 2011, and 2013, bi-annually as required by GASB 43/45.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**
None

III.D.3.e. On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**
As part of the annual budget development process, the College assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of locally incurred debt. The budget development process includes participation from all appropriate governance groups including the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, Budget Committee, College Council, and, finally, approval by the Board. (III.D.64)

Currently, there are two types of local debt: supplemental employee retirement program (SERP) debt and general obligation (GO) bond debt.

The College has participated in two five-year SERPs; the first SERP was offered to employees in 2009 and the second was offered in 2011. Payment schedules were negotiated with a third party administrator. As of fiscal year 2013-2014
there is one remaining payment left for the former and two remaining payments for the latter, for total debt of approximately $1.3 million. Repayment of this debt is funded by the General Purpose Fund, Fund 10. Balances equal to these subsequent-years’ SERP payments are designated (by Board approval) and set aside in the General Fund Ending Fund Balance annually with no adverse impact to the College’s financial stability (III.D.63).

The College has two active Proposition 39 General Obligation bonds. Measure A for $150 million was approved by voters in March 2002 and will be closed out in fiscal year 2013-2014. Measure G for $349 million was approved by voters in November 2010.

General Obligation Bond debt service is managed collaboratively by the College, its financial advisors, and the County Assessor’s Office through the levy of local property taxes as approved by voters in support of general obligation bonds Measure A and Measure G. Repayment schedules are established when bonds are sold. As respective tax proceeds are collected, they are deposited into a dedicated Debt Service Fund to assure timely and appropriate retirement of the obligation (III.D.64). Because general obligation bond debt repayment is supported by District taxpayers through ad valorem taxes, repayment schedules pose no adverse impact to the College’s financial stability.

There are no other long-term leases or other debt instruments.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

During the budget development process, which begins in January and concludes with a final budget in September each year, resources are set aside to accommodate the payment/service of any local debt. Designated reserves in the General Fund and balances in the Debt Service Fund(s) serve to mitigate SERP obligations and GO Bond obligations respectively.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.D.3.f. Institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Financial Aid Office and Business Services Department work collaboratively to ensure that the College is in compliance with all federal requirements with respect to student loans. The financial aid report, FATR, identifies all student awards. The Business Services Team posts the FATP (Financial Aid Transmittal Posting) to the College’s financial system. The Financial Aid staff then submits this report to the Department of Education. Both of these transactions are processed six or seven times per year.

Accounts Receivable uses this same report to reconcile students’ balances against awards. A senior accountant runs the vouchers and check processing, which produces a check register that indicates the remaining balances to be disbursed to students. Two days before disbursement, the Business Services Department accesses the federal website (www.g5.gov) and requests funding which is subsequently wired to the bank. The day before the student receives the award, the check register and the funds are sent to an outside vendor, which distributes the funds to the students via a debit card, check, or direct deposit (III.D.65).

The current federal guideline for student loan default rate is 25 percent. The College’s default rates for the past three years are:
TABLE 44: Student Loan Default Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DEFAULT RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SELF-EVALUATION

The College has consistently been in compliance with all federal guidelines. The College’s default rates have been consistently lower than federal guidelines.

The official report can be found online at http://www.nslds.ed.gov/nslds_SA/defaultmanagement/search_cohort_2yr.cfm.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

None

III.D.3.g. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Contractual agreements with external entities for services exist to directly support the mission and goals, as well as for services that directly support the effective operations. Contracts with external entities provide services at the lowest possible cost, or are very cost effective at a minimum, thereby increasing the level of available resources to apply towards its primary educational goals. All applicable contracting regulatory codes are followed including Public Contract Code; Education Code; Business and Professions Codes; federal and state Labor Codes; and Government Code. All technology purchases are subject to the Accessible Technology Initiative, Section 504 and Section 508 (III.D.66).

Board Policy and purchasing procedures necessitate a process open to public scrutiny when it comes to obligating District resources (III.D.67). The Board approves all contracts at one of its monthly meetings in open session. Any contract/agreement can be pulled from the consent agenda for discussion. In addition to considering price, other factors such as specific skills, experience, and references may be used when awarding contracts.

Administrative Procedure 6345, Bids and Contracts, and California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act (CUPCCAA) specify procedures related to the Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act. Based in Education Code, Labor Code, and Public Contract Code, this procedure allows the District more flexibility in awarding contracts on small construction jobs (III.D.68). These and other special purpose construction related contracts are reviewed by an outside construction management firm in addition to College administrators.

Desgnated administrators and budget managers are responsible for contractors utilized in their areas and for following all program guidelines. The vice president, administrative services; director, business services; and director, purchasing, contracts, and auxiliary services review and monitor performance of all contracts with external entities to assure compliance with terms and conditions and satisfactory performance. Contracts routinely contain clauses that allow for termination of the contractual relationship for cause or convenience. Local, state, and federal compliance requirements are closely monitored.

SELF-EVALUATION

Contracting practices and agreements support College mission, goals, and priorities and are in compliance with
Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. College policies ensure the integrity of such agreements. Purchasing practices are reviewed as part of the annual audit and Program and Services Review process. This review includes statistical testing of expenditures for contracts. There have been no exceptions cited for contractual agreements with external agencies.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**III.D.3.h. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and the results of the evaluation are used to improve internal control structures.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College utilizes external audits, independent audits, and internal business processes analyses to assess the efficacy of its financial management practices. After each annual external audit financial management systems and processes are reviewed to identify any areas for improvement. In addition to certifying year-end financial statements, the audit may contain findings and/or recommendations for improving operations and internal controls. For example, the 2011-2012 annual audit of the Ohlone Foundation identified two areas in which fiscal internal controls could be improved. Although these recommendations did not rise to the level of audit findings, they were presented as recommendations from the external auditing firm (III.D.35). The College immediately addressed these recommendations and implemented changes to strengthen internal controls (III.D.69).

As part of the Program and Services Review process, each department in Business Services conducts an assessment of services and processes. These assessments are shared District wide and offer the opportunity for review and comment. Departments within Business Services that develop and review Program and Services Reviews include Budget, Accounting, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, and Payroll.

Due to persistent funding cuts and the loss of three positions, Business Services has had to rely increasingly on technology to enhance and provide services. A few examples of the use of the ERP system are opening an employee tab so budget managers can view budget in a much easier manner; enabling employees to view their remittance advices and W-2 forms online; online purchasing to relieve the paper log jam and orders are filled more quickly. Contracting with outside vendors in conjunction with the Colleague system has provided students credit card accessibility to payment plans, vending machines, bookstore, cafeteria, parking machines, transcripts, and P-Counter print options (III.D.44).

Administrators and other staff regularly attend meetings and seminars of statewide professional organizations, such as the CCCCO, to obtain the most current information about areas of operation and best practices with respect to internal controls and fiscal management.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College systematically and regularly evaluates its financial management practices and the results of the evaluation are used to improve internal control structures. Audit findings and/or recommendations are reviewed by the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, the Audit Committee of the Board, and the Budget Committee, and improvement plans are developed in a timely fashion. The annual independent auditors have consistently stated that the financial statements fairly and accurately, in all material respects, reflect the financial position of the
STANDARD III.D. FISCAL RESOURCES

College, reflecting adequate internal controls.

The Program and Services Review process is undertaken by all teams in the Business Services Department and provides opportunities for the identification and improvement of any real or perceived gaps in systems and/or financial management processes.

Further, financial management has greatly improved through the expanded use of technology as noted.

The College’s finance team stays current on best practices in financial management by attending workshops, seminars and meetings of statewide organizations such as the CCCCO and the Association of Chief Business Officials.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

None

III.D.4. Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement of the institution.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning as noted in detail in Standard III.D.1.a. Financial resource planning is integral to the EMP, College Strategic Plan, Program and Services Review planning, DFMP, Technology Master Plan, Measure A and Measure G, and Capital Planning.

The College assesses the use of its financial resources on an annual basis. The primary tool for achieving this analysis is the Annual Assessment of Goals and Objectives Assessment Document Tool (III.D.70). This tool is a living document that tracks the efficacy of College resource application in relation to the College Strategic Plan. Each goal and its supporting objectives are assessed for progress and efficacy. Sources of evidence are cited to support the analysis.

In addition, managers assess the effective use of financial resources in their areas during the Program and Services Review process and the review of PIOs. These evaluations are shared with the vice president, administrative services during annual budget development meetings and then shared with the president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents for review and discussion.

SELF-EVALUATION

Budgets are developed, evaluated, and monitored to ensure effective use of financial resources. At the departmental and program level, budgets and expenditures are monitored consistently to ensure operational effectiveness.

The College has begun the work of enhancing its Program and Services Review Process to make it more robust. As part of that process the College now more formally considers ways to leverage resources across functional and program areas; to gauge program performance efficiencies and efficacies; and, to ensure that future resource allocation decisions are tied to past performance and results.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The College aims to exceed this standard by developing appropriate metrics to assess the efficiencies and efficacies of resource allocations and program performance. Assessing resource and program efficiencies and efficacies will further inform resource planning and serve as a basis for continued institutional improvement.
Standard III.D. Sources of Evidence

III.D.1 Educational Master Plan
III.D.2 Program and Services Review Process
III.D.3 College Planning Matrix
III.D.4 Budget Development Timeline
III.D.5 Budget Committees Meeting Agendas
III.D.6 College Council Meeting Agendas
III.D.7 II0/PIO Matrix
III.D.8 Annual Assessment of Goals and Objectives
III.D.9 2013-2014 Final Budget
III.D.10 District Facilities Master Plan
III.D.11 Technology Master Plan
III.D.12 Measure A
III.D.13 Measure G
III.D.14 Staffing Plan
III.D.15 Annual Budget
III.D.16 College Strategic Plan Annual Assessments of Goals and Objectives Assessment Documentation Tool
III.D.17 College Strategic Plan 2010-2015
III.D.18 Board of Trustees Presentation
III.D.19 College 2012-2013 Final Budget
III.D.20 2012-2013 Quarter 2 Financial Report (memo)
III.D.21 2012-2013 Quarter 2 Financial Report
III.D.22 2012-2013 Quarter 4 Financial Report (memo)
III.D.23 2012-2013 Quarter 4 Financial Report
III.D.24 Note 7 Financial Statements
III.D.25 Official Statement 1
III.D.26 Official Statement 2
III.D.27 PIO planning process
III.D.28 Budget Manager Meeting Agendas
III.D.29 Budget Committee Agendas
III.D.30 Program Improvement Objectives Spreadsheet
III.D.31 Budget Forum Agenda
III.D.32 Report 311
III.D.33 FON Report
III.D.34a Audit report Evidence 1
### STANDARD III.D. FISCAL RESOURCES

| III.D.34b | Audit report Evidence 2 |
| III.D.34c | Audit report Evidence 3 |
| III.D.34d | Audit report Evidence 4 |
| III.D.34e | Audit report Evidence 5 |
| III.D.34f | Audit report Evidence 6 |
| III.D.35 | CA Ed Code Section 84040.5 / Administrative Procedure 6400 Audits/Periodic Reports |
| III.D.36 | 2012-2013 Audit Report |
| III.D.37 | Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Website |
| III.D.38 | Foundation Finance Committee Meeting Minutes |
| III.D.39 | DDAS Meeting Schedule |
| III.D.40 | ASOC Board minutes |
| III.D.41 | Foundation Board Presentation |
| III.D.42 | Foundation Fundraising Meetings |
| III.D.43 | 2011-2012 Program Compliance Audit |
| III.D.44 | Business Services Department Program Reviews |
| III.D.45 | 2011-2012 Annual Audit |
| III.D.46 | Cash Flow Project for 2013-2014 |
| III.D.47 | 2011-2012 Year End Actuals |
| III.D.48 | 2012-2013 Q3 Financial Report (memo) |
| III.D.49 | 2012-2013 Quarter 3 Financial Report |
| III.D.50 | Board Policy 6320, Investment |
| III.D.51 | 2012-2013 Tentative Budget Memo |
| III.D.52 | 2012-2013 Tentative Budget to Board |
| III.D.55 | Board Policy 6320, Investment |
| III.D.57 | “Design It, Build It, Ship It” grant (memo) |
| III.D.58 | “Design It, Build It, Ship It” grant |
| III.D.60 | OPEB Liability (Trust Fund) |
| III.D.61 | Compensated Absences |
| III.D.62 | Actuarial Study |
| III.D.63 | 2013-2014 Final Budget |
| III.D.64 | Budget Process |
| III.D.65 | Higher One |
| III.D.66 | Accessible Technology Initiative |
| III.D.67 | Board Policy |
| III.D.68 | Administrative Procedure 6345, |
| III.D.69 | Auditor’s Recommendations addressed |
| III.D.70 | Annual Assessment of Goals & Objectives Tool |
The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

- **STANDARD IV.A.**
  Decision-Making Roles and Processes

- **STANDARD IV.B. STANDARD IV.A. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE**
  Board and Administrative Organization
Standard IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes
IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College prides itself on sustaining a culture focused on continually improving its processes in order to better serve the needs of its students, its staff, and the College as a whole. In all of its efforts, the College is committed to broad participation by all segments of the College (students, staff, faculty, and administrators) in the discussions of student learning programs and services that lead to the making of decisions in these areas. The College responds to changes in regulation and requirements imposed by legislation, receiving transfer institutions, and accreditors. The College also acknowledges the expertise of faculty in the areas of curriculum and grading and the final decision-making authority of the Board of Trustees (Board). The College recognizes, however, that in spite of its well-intentioned efforts, not all processes work optimally and that there is always room for improvement.

The College always refers back to its Mission Statement, Core Values, and Goals when making decisions (IV.A.1). The Program and Services Review process, which is inextricably linked to planning and decision making, requires all departments to connect activities and program objectives to the College’s Goals. The College seeks to inform activities and program objectives in each Program and Services Review with data pertinent to the specific department.

The primary committee related to discussion and decision making is the College Council, which comprises representatives from all College constituencies. As stated in its by-laws, the purpose of the College Council is “to ensure that appropriate members of the District participate in developing recommended policies for Board of Trustee’s action [and]…to ensure that appropriate members of the District participate in developing recommended Administrative Procedures for the College president/superintendent’s (president) action” (IV.A.2). In addition, there are numerous avenues for participation in the development, evaluation, and improvement of the College through College Council committees, College work groups, and task-specific ad hoc committees. College Council committees are the primary recommendatory committees to College Council, and include Facilities, Budget, Technology, International Education, Safety, and Sustainability. The College Council and the Budget, Technology,
and Facilities committees include membership from all College constituencies. Meetings for the College Council and College Council committees are open, and anyone in the College community is invited to attend and provide input during the meetings.

The Faculty Senate is the primary faculty governance organization. The purview of the Faculty Senate is defined in regulations, and the College relies primarily on the advice and judgment of the Faculty Senate in the areas of curriculum and grading policies (IV.A.3). For more information, see section IV.A.2.a.

The Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC) serves to represent the students’ voice, provide support activities, and serve as the liaison to the College administration. Operating under a constitution and working budget supported by the Board, ASOC appoints student representatives to all College committees, including a representative to the Board.

ASOC receives its funding through the collection of student activity fees and has supported a variety of social, academic, outreach, and recreational events. Through the structure of the Inter-Club Council, students can join a broad spectrum of available clubs and organizations or start a new club. A current listing of clubs and activities is available on the ASOC website (IV.A.4).

ASOC took an active role in providing significant support and input into a variety of College wide issues over the last three years. Of special note were the efforts to support the Bond campaign and Proposition 30, and creating student opinion surveys and soliciting student input on at least three major College decisions affecting students, including the implementation of a College debit card, the option of printing a class schedule, and the implementation of state mandated registration priorities.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College fosters an environment that encourages participation in decision-making, initiative in innovating, and a commitment to institutional excellence, and therefore meets the requirements of the standard.

Since the time of the College’s last self-evaluation, a greater openness has been established in the work of College decision-making bodies. The College Council emerged out of the former President’s Cabinet, and all of the recommendatory committees—the College Council and Budget, Technology, and Facilities Committees—are now fully open meetings, with meeting announcements sent to all College staff. When College Council was established in fall 2003 the primary recommendatory body was the President’s Cabinet, and the Council served more as a vehicle to disseminate information. This practice has now changed, and the College Council is the primary venue for interaction, discussion, and questions. Membership for committees is carefully developed to ensure participation by faculty, students, and staff, and managers support the participation of staff by providing time away from duties to attend committee meetings.

The College Council continues to evolve in effectively involving the broader College community. From 2008-2012 College Council minutes show that the topic of constituent-group feedback was addressed 20 times. In fall 2012 the faculty co-chair began emailing all College personnel a brief summary of what was discussed at the last College Council meeting in advance of the formal minutes. She also established a standing agenda item, “Heard it through the Grapevine,” which allows for clarification of rumors circulating at the College. Furthermore, the faculty co-chair is very committed to following the Council By-Laws, allowing all voices to be heard. New ideas are put out as information items and then disseminated to constituency groups before
coming back to the College Council to be acted upon.

Results from the College surveys conducted during spring 2013 show that a majority of faculty and staff respondents (140 faculty, split almost evenly between full-time and adjunct, and 125 staff, including 32 managers) believe that College Council is an open forum for discussions related to planning and decision making (of those responding with an opinion, 88.1 percent and 85.7 percent, respectively) \((\text{IV.A.5, IV.A.6, IV.A.7})\). However, the percentage of faculty and staff who expressed no opinion about the role of the College Council (25.7 percent and 19.7 percent, respectively) also shows that further communication needs to occur. Students were not asked about the College Council specifically, but when asked about the effectiveness of student government in representing student interests, a majority indicated that they didn’t have an opinion (52.4 percent). Of those who did express an opinion, 73.9 percent indicated that they felt the student government was representing student interests effectively.

While the College Council and the Faculty Senate and their subcommittees afford opportunities for discussion and participation in decision making, perceptions regarding the effectiveness of this participation vary depending on the issue. A part of this comes from the challenge of getting input from the right groups when it is needed. Leaders and administrators balance the fine line between providing information in a timely fashion and providing too much information such that all emails are ignored. It is a relatively easy thing for leaders to send out information. It is much more difficult to get people to read the information that is sent. The president has also worked with the College Council to improve the feedback loop on issues—sending out clear information and data to constituents and gathering their input and responses.

One recent issue highlights the need for developing more effective communication. A decision was made not to have a printed class schedule available to all students for the spring 2013 semester. This decision was made by the College administration in light of the uncertainties presented by the state budget and the outcome of a state election related to the budget. This issue was discussed at an academic deans’ meeting early on, and a subsequent discussion with the counseling department was held to get input on a limited print run primarily for internal use. When the decision to have a limited printed class schedule and its contents was shared with the College Council as an informational item, some individuals were surprised that a decision had already been made. Many individuals also believed the decision was only for spring 2013 and were further surprised by a limited version of the printed class schedule for summer/fall 2013. The College administration thought this fact had already been clearly communicated, especially given the ongoing analysis by a College Council ad hoc committee assessing the need for a printed class schedule in future semesters.

While this issue illustrates where the College still needs to make progress, especially in the area of effective communication, there are many examples of where effective participation can be demonstrated.

One such example is the establishment of a no-smoking policy for the Fremont campus. As documented in the College Council minutes \((\text{IV.A.8, IV.A.9, IV.A.10, IV.A.11, IV.A.12, IV.A.13})\), this issue was presented to the College Council for discussion by the president and representatives of the Student Health Center and the ASOC. Time was then given for College constituencies to discuss the issue and survey constituents. The College Council finally made a recommendatory vote regarding the procedure for further action by the president.
A second example has been the encouragement of College wide involvement on construction projects as the result of the passage of a local bond measure, Measure G. The passage of this $349 million bond in November 2010 necessitated revising and combining existing campus plans into a unified District wide plan called the District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP). Once again, College Council minutes document the entire participatory process involved in the revision, from the hiring of the bond management company and discussions in the Facilities Committee and College Council, to the sending of the final document to the Board for approval. While neither particularly exciting nor flashy, the evolution of the present DFMP from its beginnings as two separate documents covering two separate campuses into a single, driving blueprint for the future of the District as a whole is a notable accomplishment. Many individual entities inside and outside the College coordinated on the development, refinement, and implementation of this roadmap, including:

- President, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents
- Bond Implementation Group
- Facilities Committee (reporting to College Council)
- Bond program management firm
- Architects
- Board of Trustees (Board)

This example shows that the College knows not only how to “think big” in terms of funding and vision, but also to act collegially by involving many areas of the College community in a careful and transparent process.

The following is a timeline documented by College Council minutes for the development of the DFMP:

- The Newark Center Educational Master Plan (EMP) was approved in December 2003 (IV.A.14).
- An updated Facilities Master Plan (FMP) for the Fremont campus was approved in April 2010 (IV.A.15).
- In November 2010 District residents approved a $349 million bond for repair, renovation, and replacement of College facilities.
- A bond program management firm was hired (IV.A.17, IV.A.18). This appointment was one of the first applications of Measure G funds.
- It was determined the College needed to update the FMP (2010) referenced in the bond measure with a “bridge” document until a District wide Facilities Master Plan encompassing both the Fremont and Newark campuses could be prepared in order to service the entire District and properly implement Measure G bond funds.
- Architects were hired as consultants to begin transition of 2010 Fremont FMP and 2003 Newark EMP into an all-encompassing, District wide Facilities Master Plan (DFMP).
- Drafts were presented to College Council and Facilities Committee meetings in spring 2011 (IV.A.19, IV.A.20).
- The document was finished in July 2011. After approval by the Board, implementation of Measure G funds was able to move forward.
- Further discussion ensued in College Council and Facilities Committee meetings (IV.A.21)
- Bond Oversight Committee was put in place (IV.A.22).
- Facilities Committee report to College Council (IV.A.23).
- Board Workshop on DFMP on February 29, 2012 (IV.A.24).
- The final version of the DFMP was published May 9, 2012 (IV.A.27).

A final example is the role that Program and Services Review is playing in forming the basis for decision-making across the College and the broad participation required in the review.

Business Services does Program and Services Review for different areas of the department on a rotating basis. Each
of these areas is reviewed by the director and the staff who are involved in the functions. Data is collected and compiled going back to 2000 when Colleague® was first implemented. Program Improvement Objectives (PIOs) are developed based on the data compiled. The review of Accounts Receivable showed that with the additions of payment plans, deregistration for non-payment, a letter campaign on outstanding balances, work with an outside collection agency, and the Chancellor’s Office Tax Offset Program, there was a need for additional staffing in this area.

Each department within Student Services writes its own Program and Services Review with faculty and staff. The dean, director, or supervisor reviews the final draft of the Program and Services Review and then submits it to the vice president, student services for approval. The vice president, student services reads each Program and Services Review and has a one-on-one meeting with the dean, director, or supervisor to discuss any changes, additions, or recommendations needed for the Program and Services Review. If any changes are necessary, the dean, director, or supervisor makes those changes and submits the Program and Services Review again to the vice president, student services for final approval. PIO’s are developed by the department as a whole, with input from all the staff and faculty in that department. The PIO is a product of the Program and Services Review and is submitted at the same time as the Program and Services Review and drives budget requests. A similar process is in place for all academic disciplines and other areas of the College (see Standard II.A.2.f for example).

Program and Services Reviews are readily accessible to the public on the College website through the CurricUNET® Program Review module (IV.A.28). These Program and Services Reviews are updated every three years, with Program Improvement Objectives (PIO) updated annually. For instructional areas, the executive dean, research, planning, and academic affairs provides each area with an annual data dashboard related to student success for use in revising Program Reviews and PIOs. The data dashboard includes retention, persistence, and goal attainment in the aggregate and broken out by demographic characteristics. These dashboards are also available on the College website. The College website also provides reports related to student success generated from College data by the California Community College’s Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Continue to review methods of communicating information to ascertain which modalities are most effective for different purposes. In the case of committee meetings, review how to develop and maintain a central up-to-date listing of meeting dates, times, and locations.

**IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Board Policy 2510 outlines the broad rules for constituent groups (IV.A.3). This policy, in turn, is detailed for application in Administrative Procedure 2510 (IV.A.29). Written procedures delineating the participatory roles of students, staff, faculty, and administrators in decision making can be found in the Planning and Decision-Making Handbook (IV.A.30) and Administrative Procedure 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making. Information regarding College committees, the essential structure through which decisions are discussed and recommended, is provided in these
documents. They are available on the president’s office website. Essential planning documents such as the EMP (IV.A.31), the Technology Master Plan (IV.A.32), the DFMP (IV.A.27), and the Strategic Plan for Career Technical Education and Economic Development (IV.A.33) can also be found on the president’s website.

SELF-EVALUATION
Board Policies and Administrative Procedures related to participation in decision-making processes are all available on the College website. During the fall 2013 semester Administrative Procedure 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making (IV.A.29); Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning and Program Review (IV.A.34); and a Planning and Decision-Making handbook (IV.A.30) were endorsed by Faculty Senate and College Council and approved by the College president.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.A.2.a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Faculty members have the most clearly defined roles related to institutional governance. These roles are spelled out in Board Policies 2510 and 4020, Administrative Procedure 2510, and stem from regulation (IV.A.35, IV.A.29).

Faculty members have a substantive, if not primary, role in institutional policies related to academic and professional areas of the College, as required by regulation. The Board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Faculty Senate with regards to grading policies and curriculum, including the establishment of prerequisites and the placing of courses within disciplines. The Board reaches mutual agreement with the Faculty Senate on issues related to degree and certificate requirements; educational program development; standards or policies regarding student preparation and success; District governance structures related to faculty roles; policies for faculty development activities; processes for program review; and processes for institutional planning and budget development. This substantive role is reflected in the Spring 2013 Faculty Survey, where over 92 percent of faculty expressed the belief that the Faculty Senate is representing faculty well in issues related to participatory governance. The primary recommendatory subcommittees of the Faculty Senate include Curriculum; Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOAC); Faculty Professional Development; and the Faculty Position Prioritization Committee. Working subcommittees include Equivalency, Transfer, Basic Skills, Sabbatical Leave, Student Conduct/Academic Appeals, and Student Awards. The membership of some of these committees includes administrators and staff in addition to faculty. The work of these subcommittees goes up through the Faculty Senate, and for issues that are not covered by state regulation (see above), the decisions of the Faculty Senate feed into the discussion and recommendations by the College Council through the input of Faculty Senate representatives on College Council (see Section IV.A.1). The role of staff and students is also based on regulation and detailed in Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2510. While not as specific a role as that accorded to faculty, staff and students have the right and are encouraged to participate effectively in development of College policies.
Administrators have a substantive role in the development of policies as well. They are represented on the College Council with three voting members, one each for Academic Affairs, Student Services, Administrative Services, and from the areas reporting to the president. They serve on a rotating basis. However, they are not singled out as a group for specific roles in any Board Policies, but Administrative Procedure 2510 outlines their involvement (IV.A.29).

SELF-EVALUATION
The results of the spring 2013 surveys of faculty, staff, and students reflects the difference in regulatory authority. While faculty express strong satisfaction with their involvement in planning and decision-making processes (83.6 percent of those who expressed an opinion on the Spring 2013 Faculty Survey) (IV.A.7), staff expressed satisfaction but at a lower level (72.8 percent of respondents on the Spring 2013 Staff Survey) (IV.A.6). Students were not asked about this topic.

While Board Policies provide an overview of the roles of faculty, students, and staff in the development of College policies, many individuals remain unclear about the extent of their involvement in the College’s planning and decision-making processes. To provide clarity the College developed Administrative Procedure 2510, Participating in Local Decision Making, (IV.A.29) and the Planning and Decision-Making Handbook (IV.A.30). The documents were endorsed by the College Council and approved by the president in December 2013. They will be instrumental in clarifying mechanisms for input within the College’s governance planning and decision making.

The College meets this standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.A.2.b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Board Policies 2510 and 4020 and Administrative Procedure 2510 make clear the primary role that faculty play in the recommendations about student learning programs and services, especially in the development of curriculum, grading policies, and the development of student learning programs and services. In the area of curriculum and grading policies, the Board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Faculty Senate. In the areas of program development and policies regarding student preparation and success, the Board consults with the Faculty Senate and decisions are made through mutual agreement.

Implementation of student services to support policies regarding student preparation and success involves faculty from the involved areas, and the Faculty Senate is kept apprised of implementation in order to provide feedback.

The Curriculum Committee exists as a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. It, in turn, has two subcommittees focusing on General Education (GE) and Distance Education (DE). The Curriculum Committee is comprised of 10 faculty members with proportional representation from each academic division. The General Education subcommittee focuses on approval of curriculum to meet local general education requirements. The DE subcommittee focuses on review of courses with a distance education component. Academic administrators serve as ex-officio members on all of these committees.

More information can be found in section IV.A.2.a.
SELF-EVALUATION
The College’s processes with respect to curriculum and program development function well. A typical curriculum approval illustrates the effectiveness of the process. When a department wants to make a curriculum change (for example, create a new program) the program is processed through the College’s curriculum management system, CurricUNET®.

CurricUNET® channels the program application through the various levels of approval, including the academic dean. Once all levels of approval are completed, the application is reviewed in an open meeting of the Curriculum Committee. Faculty and the academic dean generally attend the meeting to answer any remaining questions from the Curriculum Committee. Barring additional issues that need to be addressed, the Curriculum Committee approves the program. The vice president, academic affairs and the president then bring the actions of the Curriculum Committee to the Board with a recommendation for final approval.

In general, the Board approves actions of the Curriculum Committee as a part of the consent agenda. However, the Board often takes items such as new program approvals off of the consent agenda in order to afford trustees the opportunity to find out more about the goals of the new program before approving. While this has not happened at the College, there is a provision should the Board not approve an action of the Curriculum Committee. In such a case, the action is referred back to the Curriculum Committee with an explanation and, if pertinent, a request for specific actions before the item is returned to the Board.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The various committees of the College provide numerous opportunities for discussion and input of potential decisions that affect the good of the College. The committees under the aegis of the College Council include representation from all College constituencies. A student trustee is an advisory voting member of the Board, and the Board agenda always includes standing items for reports from faculty and students.

SELF-EVALUATION
There is little doubt among the students, faculty, staff, administrators, and the Board that all are working for the good of the College. This is not to say, however, that all constituents are always in agreement on all issues. In general, the openness of meetings provides the opportunity for all members of the College community to participate in discussions related to College policies. The description of the development of the District no-smoking policy in section IV.A.1 illustrates this.

As discussed under Standard IV.A.1, effective communication lies very much at the heart of the ability to work in a coordinated fashion for the good of the College as a whole. Sometimes there are multiple sources of communication, and this can result in confusion. This is especially the case for students. For example, there are numerous Facebook pages related to the College and its activities. There is no coordination among these pages, so the information is not always consistent across pages.
The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The College will examine how social media is being used throughout the College and, using established planning processes, determine how best to coordinate the use of social media for effective College communication, especially with students.

**IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College has always approached its reporting to external agencies with integrity and honesty. These external agencies include the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO), outside financial auditors, the Board of Registered Nursing, several accrediting groups related to health sciences, and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The College maintains an accreditation documents page on the College website that documents all relevant Accreditation Reports and Substantive Change Proposals to ACCJC.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The College complies with all of the Accrediting Commission standards. This is evidenced by the consistent response the College receives for its work. Financial audits are consistently unmodified; the Board of Registered Nursing consistently reaffirms the programs accreditation. Even though the College was put on warning by the ACCJC after the last accreditation visit, principally for Board related issues, an immediate response took the College off warning at the earliest opportunity, within a year.

The College complies with all the accreditation standards. This is evidenced not only by the lack of recommendations but the praise the College receives for its work. Recent financial audits were unmodified. The Board of Registered Nursing site visit resulted in reaffirmation. (IV.A.37). Even though the College was put on warning by the ACCJC after the last accreditation visit, principally for Board related issues, an immediate response took the College off warning at the earliest opportunity, within a year.

The accreditation page on the College website documents all relevant Accreditation Reports and Substantive Change Proposals to ACCJC. A review of the website demonstrates the College has met all ACCJC deadlines and maintains an historical record for public view.

A recent situation provides an example of the College’s integrity in its dealings with the CCCCCO. In fall 2011, the College discovered an unusual spike in full-time equivalent students (FTES) for a half dozen of its 1500 sections. Further research identified an incorrect entry of contact hours for high-enrolled sections, and it was also discovered that similar contact hour errors were present on small numbers of sections dating back to fall 2007. The incorrect entries resulted in an over-reporting of FTES and an inaccurate award of apportionment. Despite the fact that the College had consistently passed its audits without the errors being discovered, the College immediately responded by voluntarily self-reporting the discovery to the CCCCCO during fall 2011 and self-auditing all sections from fall 2007 forward to ensure no similar errors remained. The appropriate “Minor and Inadvertent Error” report was submitted to the CCCCCO at the end of spring 2012.
College also initiated additional audits to ensure accuracy of contact hour reporting. Over the last year, the College has continued to work directly with the CCCCO to resolve any incorrect awards of apportionment.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

In addition to taking advantage of the self-evaluation process of accreditation to evaluate how well current decision-making processes are working, the leadership is always open to re-evaluating existing processes to improve effectiveness and has created the Process Assessment Committee (PAC) to evaluate processes on an annual basis (IV.A.38). The leadership is also ready to acknowledge when processes do not work and to engage constituencies in discussions for improvement.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Several examples illustrate the College leadership’s openness to evaluation and improvement of its processes. Three years ago, in an effort to improve the transparency of its planning and budget processes and better connect planning to budgeting, the leadership implemented a system for budget requests tied to PIOs. After one year, leaders acknowledged that the process did not meet the goals behind making the change. PAC evaluated the process and made recommendations for changes through College Council. The changes were implemented during 2012-2013.

Another example involves the College’s decision five years ago to capitalize on the College’s familiarity with the CurricUNET® Course and Program Approval module by implementing the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module. As the process for Program and Services Review has been refined over the first four years, it has become very apparent that the CurricUNET® Program and Services Review module is overly cumbersome for the College’s needs. PAC re-evaluated what is needed from the Program and Services Review module, and the College will work with the developers to refine the program to better suit the needs of the College. In the meantime, a simplified process has been implemented.

The evaluation of the effectiveness and integrity of planning and decision-making processes also hinges on whether or not promises to the College community are upheld. The College is also strong in this regard.

One example is the process for hiring full-time faculty. The past five years have been hard on all California community colleges. As a result, the College offered two Supplemental Employee Retirement Plan (SERPs) which resulted in a reduction in the number of full-time faculty. Several years ago, the president made a commitment to not lose further ground and to provide a balanced environment in which to make decisions about hiring priorities. Both of these promises have been upheld, which provides a solid foundation for the work of the Faculty Position Prioritization Committee. Furthermore, the committee reviews the criteria it uses each year in an effort to best tie in the criteria used for prioritization with the mission and needs of the College and its students.
Finally, data is an increasingly important part of informed decision making. One dean managed both Admissions and Records and Institutional Research and Planning for one year. Given the demands of Admissions and Records alone, it is not surprising that research requests were not fulfilled in a timely manner. In spring 2013, the College restored the dean to Institutional Research full-time. Subsequently, the dean’s responsibilities were expanded to support Academic Affairs, and additional support of institutional research is planned.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
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In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college Districts/systems clearly defined the organizational roles of the District/system and the colleges.

IV.B.1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the College or the District/system.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The College has a Board of Trustees (Board) responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the College (IV.B.1). The Board has established and adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the College (IV.B.2). The Board consists of seven members who represent the cities of Fremont and Newark as well as a portion of Union City (IV.B.1). Each December a chair and vice-chair are chosen (IV.B.3).

SELF-EVALUATION
Board meetings may qualify as business, workshops, or special depending on the actions taken or subjects addressed. The Board meets regularly, at least once per month, plus workshops as needed (IV.B.4). Board policies to meet the requirements of the standard effectively are published online in the Board Policy and Procedures Manual.

Chapter 4 of the manual contains policies for Academic Affairs. Board Policies 4020, Program and Curriculum Development, and 4025, Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and GE, directly support this standard (IV.B.5). Board Policy 4020 explicitly requires that programs and curricula be “of high quality, relevant to the community and student needs, and evaluated regularly to ensure quality and currency” (IV.B.6). The president/superintendent (president) is required to create procedures to support that directive that include involvement by the Faculty Senate in all processes; regular program and course review; training opportunities for individuals involved in curriculum development; and use of job market data for vocational/occupational programs (IV.B.7).
Board Policy 4025 states that an associate degree is symbolic of a student’s successful acquisition of specific capabilities and insights through a pattern of learning experiences. General education provides degree awardees with basic principles, concepts, and methodologies unique to or shared across various disciplines. Coherence and integration among separate requirements are sought in addition to the examination of proposed solutions to societal problems (IV.B.5).

Additionally, Chapter 4 sets policies for the academic calendar, auditing rules, graduation requirements, and rules for course repetitions, multiple enrollments, and grading. It also establishes policies for key academic support functions and processes including library services, articulation, credit by examination, and academic renewal. The Board governs academic freedom, academic probation, disqualification and readmission, and the rules for field trips and excursions as specified in Chapter 4 (IV.B.8).

Chapter 6 of the Board Policy and Regulation Manual speaks to the financial stability of the College. Chapter 6 delegates authority to the president over the general business procedures of the College, and requires compliance with applicable laws and procedures (IV.B.9).

Policy proscribes the method, timings, and rules for budget preparation, budget management, and fiscal management. The budget is required to support the College’s master and educational plans with relevant assumptions presented to the Board for review in a timely manner. Iterations of the budget, from tentative to final, are reviewed by the Board starting in March and approved after a public hearing. By policy, unrestricted general reserves may not fall below five percent of the general fund (IV.B.10).

Policy dictates that revenues in excess of those accounted for in the budget must be added to the College’s reserves for contingencies by a two-thirds vote. The Board must also approve transfers between expenditure classifications by majority vote (IV.B.11). The Board requires the president to manage fiscal affairs using principles that include that:

- Adequate internal controls exist.
- Fiscal objectives, procedures, and constraints are communicated to the Board and employees.
- Adjustments to the budget are made in a timely manner, when necessary.
- The management information system provides timely, accurate, and reliable fiscal information.
- Responsibility and accountability for fiscal management are clearly delineated (IV.B.12).

With the aforementioned policies in place, the College has achieved academic excellence and fiscal stability as evidenced by the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report and the maintenance of reserves beyond the five percent reserve without layoffs.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.B.1.a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Per Board Policy 2010 (IV.B.13), Board Membership, the Board is an independent policy-making body elected by qualified voters of the District in accordance with Board Policy 2100 (IV.B.14). In June 2012 the Board approved Resolution #56/11-12 which authorized the election of
trustees by area (IV.B.15). A student member serves on the Board and is chosen by enrolled students for a one year term at a regularly scheduled election in April so as to fill the seat by May. The student trustee provides an advisory vote.

To promote independence, members of the Board are sworn into office, may not be active employees of the College, and may not hold an incompatible office.

SELF-EVALUATION
The College now meets the standard. In the past individual trustees would act independently. At times members would attend conferences and business meetings and speak counter to decisions of the Board as a whole or revisit previous decisions with which they disagreed. This activity has changed since the 2008 accreditation through several factors. An extensive Board Member Guide (IV.B.16) was developed and implemented in October 2008 and updated in 2012. In March 2008 through the fall 2009 workshops were conducted for the Board in response to recommendations. The electoral process has changed the complexion of the Board and installed new members who have benefited from the Trustee Orientation and continued professional development. With few exceptions Board action is unanimous.

The Board advocates for the College through participation on the California Community College Trustees (CCCT) and the Alameda County School Boards Association (ACSBA).

Members of the Board have, in the past, reported attempts by outside entities to influence Board action. Each member must determine what constitutes “undue” influence in the light of requests or lobbying by constituents and the matters under consideration.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.B.1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Per Board Policy 2200, Board Duties and Responsibilities, the Board represents the public interest, as defined by Education Code Section 70902, by establishing policies defining the College Mission Statement and standards of operation (IV.B.1). This mission states:

The mission of Ohlone College is to serve the community by offering instruction for basic skills, career entry, university transfer, economic development, and personal enrichment for all who can benefit from our instruction in an environment where student learning success is highly valued, supported, and continually assessed.

The Board is also responsible for monitoring institutional performance and educational quality as well as ensuring that fiscal resources exist to meet the defined standards of operation. At monthly meetings the Board receives budget updates, including updates for Bond measures A and G, to ensure that fiscal resources exist. The Board reviews and accepts quarterly financial reports as well as related budget changes. Audit reports for both bond measures and the College as a whole are reviewed as well.

The Board has adopted policies for the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services that encompass Chapter 4, Academic Affairs (IV.B.8) and Chapter 5, Student Services (IV.B.17) of the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Manual (IV.B.18).

SELF-EVALUATION
The Board has acted to establish and regularly review policies to ensure the quality, integrity, improvement, and
support of educational programs at the College.

These policies are comprehensive and broadly delegate the administration of the College by managerial division. Chapters in the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Manual (IV.B.18), and Board Policy Chapter 5 (IV.B.17) are dedicated to the Board, the General Institution, Academic Affairs, Student Services, Business and Fiscal Affairs, and Human Resources. Most policies are based on predefined templates from sources which provide a foundation of best practices and are legally vetted.

Chapter 4 (IV.B.8) of the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Manual governs Academic Affairs and speaks to the "quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning." Board Policy 4020 states

_The programs and curricula of the District shall be of high quality, relevant to community and student needs, and evaluated regularly to ensure quality and currency. To that end, the President shall establish procedures for the development and review of all curricular offerings, including their establishment, modification or discontinuance. (IV.B.6)_

Chapter 5 (IV.B.17) of the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Manual establishes Student Services. Services and programs provided to students under these policies include counseling, a transfer center, financial aid, disabled student services and programs, the Extended Opportunities Programs and Services, health services, and athletics programs.

Chapter 6 (IV.B.9) of the Board Policy and Procedure Manual provides for the financial support of the academic and student support programs. Policies require sound budget preparation, management, and audits. Prudent fiscal management, investments and effective handling of purchases, contracts, property disposal, construction and auxiliary income sources are required.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**IV.B.1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Per Education Code Section 70902, the Board is granted ultimate authority for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity in that it:

…may initiate and carry on any program, activity, or may otherwise act in any manner that is not in conflict with or inconsistent with, or preempted by, any law and that is not in conflict with the purposes for which community college districts are established (IV.B.19)

Pursuant to this authority the Board has adopted policies for educational quality that range from the academic calendar, the development of programs and curriculum, to grading and standards of scholarship, and academic freedom. These policies are contained in Chapter 4 (IV.B.8) of the Board Policy and Procedures Manual. The Board is updated on pending legal matters in closed session before each regular Board meeting. Actions taken in closed session must be reported out in open session.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The Board has taken responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity through the policies it has enacted. It maintains oversight of these areas via its regular and special meetings and workshops.

Each regular meeting is preceded by a closed session where the Board is briefed on any pending or potential litigation. The Board also seeks and receives counsel from attorneys...
on legal matters if needed. The Board was briefed on the process and options for developing of surplus property by an attorney contracted by the District who developed a Request For Proposals (RFP) on behalf of the College. An attorney specializing in bond development provided guidance and wrote the ballot language for the Measure G bond (IV.B.20).

Policy proscribes the method, timings, and rules for budget preparation, budget management, and fiscal management. Iterations of the budget, from tentative to final, are reviewed by the Board starting in March and approved after a public hearing. The consent agenda of each business meeting includes approval of payroll warrants (payroll comprises nearly 85 percent of the College budget), a review of purchase orders, a ratification of contracts, and authorization to dispose of surplus property (IV.B.9, IV.B.10).

Board Policy states that “programs and curricula of the District shall be of high quality, relevant to community and student needs, and evaluated regularly to ensure quality and currency” (IV.B.21). The president is tasked with creating the procedures necessary to meet that requirement and is answerable to the Board for their success. The Board is regularly updated on the progress toward this goal via their adoption of the ARCC report or similar reports (IV.B.22), which measure and compare California community colleges’ performance in a number of key factors. The Board is also presented with the results of the College’s Environmental Scan (IV.B.23) which serves to align the academic program with the needs of the community.

The Board receives presentations detailing academic programs at the College. Division, department, and sabbatical reports were made from 2009 to 2010. In 2013, presentations on Program and Service Reviews and Student Learning Outcomes began (IV.B.24).

The president provides regular written updates to the Board on topics requiring Board action, topics that will potentially require Board action, and topics for information only (IV.B.25).

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**IV.B.1.d The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Board Policies and Procedures Manual is published on the College website (IV.B.18). Each chapter is printable in PDF format. Individual policies are listed online under their respective chapters. Hard copies of the manual are available in the president’s office either in total or by chapter. In April 2013 the regulations were removed from the public website as part of a realignment of administrative procedures with Board policies. These regulations are out of date and are being replaced by Administrative Procedures in connection with the ongoing Board policy review.

**SELFC-EVALUATION**

The governing policies and administrative procedures are publicly available both in the president’s office and on the College website. The online version of the Board Policy and Procedure Manual has a detailed table of contents broken out by subject and chapter.

Board Policy 2010 specifies the Board’s size and membership requirements. Board Policy 2200 describes the Board’s duties and responsibilities. Board structure is addressed by Board Policy 2100 (term length, staggered terms, eligibility,
STANDARD IV.B. BOARD AND ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

election area, and compensation) (IV.B.14); Board Policy 2210 (Board officers, officers’ terms and responsibilities) (IV.B.3); and Board Policy 2220 (creation of Board committees and active committees). Board administrative procedures are defined in Board Policies 2305 to 2750 (IV.B.26).

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.B.1.e The governing board acts in a matter consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
Time is devoted at Board meetings towards reviewing and amending policies so that all policies are reviewed every four years. Off-cycle changes or additions can be made provided they are introduced one regular meeting prior the meeting at which action is recommended (IV.B.27).

SELF-EVALUATION
With the exceptions mentioned in this standard (Standard IV.B.1.j), the Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. All agendas and related documents are posted on the College website the Friday prior to a regular Wednesday meeting. Posted agendas are strictly followed, as evidenced by meeting minutes and by video archives of Board meetings (IV.A.28).

The Board’s overall adherence to policies and bylaws is due, in part, to the Board Member Guide. This document provides ample direction regarding this standard. The Board Member Guide specifies that trustees are responsible for “acting only in the best interest of the entire community and adhering to District Policies and Procedures” (p. 11-12).

In addition, the guide specifies that one of the duties of the Board president is to “assure Board compliance with policies on Board education, self-evaluation and President’s evaluation” (p. 8).

As noted above, Board policies are regularly reviewed, as evidenced by meeting agendas. Policies are developed in consultation with the appropriate governance bodies, primarily the College Council and the Faculty Senate. This is also outlined in the Board Member Guide. As it states, one of the purposes of the College Council is “to ensure that appropriate members of the District participate in developing recommended policies for Board of Trustee’s action” (p. 23). Historically, the Board has generally recognized the recommendations of the Faculty Senate in policies related to academic and professional matters. This was recognized during a Faculty Senate discussion of the “10+1”, in which a faculty member noted “Ohlone has a long and positive history in dealing with the Board on academic matters where faculty should have a strong, if not the strongest, voice” (IV.B.29).

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.B.1.f The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
The Board has a program for Board development centered on the Ohlone College Board Member Guide. The Guide serves as a reference on topics including Board polices on structure and organization; policies and practices related to Board meetings; communication protocols; campus visits;
Board planning and evaluation; the president; accreditation; the College Foundation; governance; groups on campus; graduation; and resources available for trustees (IV.B.16). In addition, the Board assigns a trustee to mentor each new Board member. The mentor advises the new trustee and responds to questions.

The president provides a multi-session orientation that, in addition to the topics in the guide, includes but is not limited to the role of the trustee, monitoring results, avoiding micromanaging, accreditation recommendations, communicating with the CEO, and responding at the policy level (IV.B.30).

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Each year trustees are provided opportunities to attend training on a variety of topics including facilities planning, strategic planning, the Brown Act, the Student Success Act, and the Foundation.

Periodically, trainers are brought to the College to provide Board education on accreditation and trusteeship, and specific topics related to issues of current relevance, such as frontage property development and bond measures. Each year, as part of the Board evaluation retreat, good practices for governing boards and individual trustees are reviewed by a professional facilitator and discussed in depth in the context of the previous year and goal setting for the coming year.

The College has both a program for ongoing Board development as well as a new member orientation. The Board’s ad hoc committee rated both programs as “effective.” The Board Member Guide, developed in October 2008 and revised in October 2012, covers the following topics:

- About the Board of Trustees
- Meetings of the Board
- Communication Protocol
- Campus Visits
- Board Planning and Evaluation
- College President
- Accreditation
- Foundation
- Collegial Governance
- Groups on Campus
- Graduation
- Trustee Resources

The Ohlone College Trustee Orientation applies to elected, appointed, and student trustees to facilitate a smooth transition. The orientation prescribes the following process:

1. Several sessions are held to welcome the new trustee and provide a general overview.
2. The trustee meets with the following College administrators
   a. Human Resources to activate on-boarding with respect to health insurance and the monthly stipend.
   b. The vice presidents, academic affairs, student services, and administrative services, as well as the director of the foundation.

The trustee is also directed to resources that include:

1. The annual Community College League of California (CCLC) “Effective Trustee Workshop”
2. Online resources
   a. CCLC Trustee Handbook
   b. Ohlone College Board Member Guide
   c. Ohlone College Board Policies and Procedures
   d. Brown Act
   e. Ohlone College Strategic Plan
   f. Educational Master Plan
   g. District Facilities Master Plan
   h. Technology Master Plan
This orientation is usually done over the first few months in office. Additional resources are available at the new trustee’s request (IV.B.30).

Board Policy 2100 states that:

“The term of office of each trustee shall be four years, commencing on the first meeting in December following the election. Elections shall be held every two years, in even numbered years. Terms of trustees are staggered so that, as nearly as practical, one half of the trustees shall be elected at each trustee election” (IV.B.14).

The Board follows this policy.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Increase the funding opportunities for Board development, including greater support for conference attendance and training webinars.

**IV.B.1.g The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Board Policy 2745 (IV.B.31) defines the Board self-evaluation processes. In May a committee of the Board is appointed to determine the instrument of process to be used in coming year’s self-evaluation. Any instrument must contain criteria for Board operations as listed in the Board Policy and Procedures Manual. Board annual priorities are assessed and additional criteria from recognized practitioners are included in the instrument. All members of the Board are asked to complete the evaluation instrument and submit it to an external compiler.

The evaluations are summarized, presented, and discussed at special meetings for that purpose. These results are used to identify accomplishments in the past year and priorities for the following year.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

The evaluation instrument was revised in 2009 when the Board was restructured to eliminate extended Board members. In 2011 the instrument was refined to focus on the Accreditation Standards and to include assessment of annual Board goals (later renamed "priorities"). The process has remained the same since 2008 when a facilitator was first employed.

In 2013 the Board performed a mid-term assessment to refine goals. Changes in the structure of goals have resulted in easier assessment of their accomplishment.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**IV.B.1.h The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Board’s code of ethics is defined in Board Policy 2710, Conflicts of Interest (IV.B.32), and Board Policy 2715, Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice (IV.B.33). The Board is required to maintain high standards of ethical conduct by:

1. Acting only in the best interest of the entire community and adhering to District Policies and Procedures.
2. Protecting the interests of students in every decision and assuring the opportunity for high-quality education for every student.
3. Using the powers of the office honestly and constructively, communicating and promoting the needs of the community to the College, and the needs of the College to the community.

4. Maintaining an atmosphere in which controversial issues will be debated openly and fairly, protecting the dignity of individuals. Respecting others; acting with civility.

5. Exercising authority only as a Board and conducting their relationships with college staff, students, local citizenry, and the media on that basis.

6. Ensuring public input into Board deliberations; adhering to the law and spirit of the open meeting laws and procedures.

7. Maintaining confidentiality of closed sessions.

8. Preventing conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest and informing the entire Board or the Board President when a matter under consideration might involve such a conflict, as stated in the District’s Conflict of Interest Code.

9. Using appropriate channels of communication, authority and responsibility.

10. Devoting adequate time to Board work.

11. Being informed about the District, educational issues, and responsibilities to trusteeship.

12. Promoting a healthy working relationship with the President through supportive, open, and honest communication and regular evaluation.

The Board’s Conflict of Interest policy is aligned with government code. The policy prohibits members acting on contracts for which they have a financial interest unless the interest is “remote,” as defined by government code. Remote interests must be disclosed at a meeting of the Board and recorded into the official minutes. Trustees with remote interests must not vote, debate, or attempt to influence other trustees with respect to the contract. Employment that is inconsistent, incompatible, or in conflict with a trustee’s duties is also considered a conflict of interest.

Currently, steps to deal with violations of the policy are defined under Administrative Procedure 2710. Board officers and the president have authorization to consult with legal counsel when they become aware of actual or perceived violations of the Code of Ethics or conflicts of interest. Violations of the law may be referred by College legal counsel to the relevant authorities. In the event of a potential violation, the Board president may appoint an ad hoc committee to examine the matter and identify further action. All sanctions are considered by the full Board (IV.B.32). Should a Board chair or Board vice chair be implicated in code violations, they are to be replaced by another Board member to pursue the appropriate process.

Economic interest filings are handled under Administrative Procedure 2715. (IV.B.33)

**SELF-EVALUATION**

During 2011 there were issues affecting two trustees (X and Y).

Trustee X was thought to be residing outside the District. Following Administrative Procedure 2715, the matter was referred to counsel. Counsel’s opinion was that the College need not take action. The College accepted counsel’s opinion and no action was taken. However, subsequent reports in the press brought an inquiry by the district attorney. Charges against the trustee were filed and the case moved through the justice system. The trustee resigned from the Board in November 2011. In December 2011 he plead no contest to one count of election fraud and was ordered to repay the College $60,000 in salary and benefits.

In April 2011 another residency issue occurred (Trustee Y). The Board followed procedure and the Board chair
convened an ad hoc committee to examine the matter. The ad hoc committee met and examined the issue, but was unable to agree on a recommendation to the Board. Legal counsel was used throughout this process. The matter was tabled (IV.B.34, IV.B.35) and according to parliamentary procedure the issue died. In 2013 another trustee was elected Board chair, and in the interest of resolving the issue restarted the process through a referral of the matter to counsel. In 2013, the newly elected Board chair requested the College obtain a legal opinion on the residency issue. In accordance with Board Procedure outside counsel was consulted and no violations were found.

In both instances the procedure was followed. When there was any question related to the residency of a trustee, the matter was re-examined per the published procedure. However, improvements to the processes can be made.

- The process for dealing with violations should reside as a “policy” rather than an “administrative procedure.” Administrative Procedures are created by the president and use of such to reprimand trustees, who employ the president, compromises the process. This procedure, Administrative Procedure 2715, began as the second of a two-part policy.
- The process for dealing with violations needs to address changes in Board leadership during an active review by an ad hoc committee.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

The Board should move the steps to deal with violations of these policies from administrative procedure to Board policy.

**IV.B.1.i The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The president is required to keep the Board informed of “approved accrediting organizations and the status of accreditations” (IV.B.36). The Board is informed about the accreditation process through business meetings, workshops, and written updates (IV.B.37). The Board has received monthly updates on this self-evaluation and approved it prior to its submission.

The Board Member Guide explains the details of Accreditation Standard IV as well as the Board’s role in accreditation. Specifically:

- The Board must be fully informed of all accreditation actions, reports, visits, and progress on accreditation recommendations as they pertain to the College. All reports created in response to Commission actions must be approved or ratified by the Board (IV.B.36). The Board self-evaluation instrument is based on Accreditation Standard IV.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Following the Commission sanction received in July 2008, the Board approved two follow-up reports which were in due October 2008 and April 2009. Accreditation updates were presented as information-only items in 12 of the 13 meetings between July 2008 and July 2009 inclusive. At the business meeting in March 2009 the Board received the update on the follow-up report to the 2008 accreditation site visit (IV.B.38).

The Board is regularly involved in the accreditation process. In February 2011 the Board approved a substantive change proposal that added courses with at least 50 percent distance education content. The Board also heard a first reading of the Accreditation Mid-Term Report at that meeting (IV.B.39) and approved it subsequently. Additionally, the Board has approved two progress reports.
(IV.B.38, IV.B.40). The Board is provided access to annual reports to the ACCJC as information, as well.

In February 2013 an ad hoc committee was formed to assess the Board’s performance in meeting accreditation standards. This committee met on three occasions in 2013 on March 21, April 9, and September 9 (IV.B.41). A May 2013 workshop allowed the accreditation self-study teams to review their progress and initial findings with the Board (IV.B.32). Throughout 2013 a monthly presentation to the Board provided progress reports on the accreditation self-study. The Board approved the self-evaluation report in December 2013.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**IV.B.1.j** The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often called the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often called the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Board Policy 2431 specifies that the Board will establish a fair and open search process to fill presidential vacancies (IV.B.2). Board Policy 2430 delegates the executive responsibility for reasonably interpreting and administering Board policies to the president. This includes the authority to delegate these authorities while remaining directly responsible to the Board (IV.B.42).

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Prior to 2008 the College used an “extended board” format which included vice presidents and leaders from the Faculty Senate, bargaining units, Associated Students of Ohlone College (ASOC), and College Council. While this format promoted inclusion, it invited a free flowing discourse that ultimately led to micromanagement and circumvention of the president as operational items were discussed at length.

In 2008 the College restructured the meeting format to include only the trustees and the President on the dais. Vice presidents and associate vice presidents now sit to the side of the dais and are available only to answer questions directed through the president or to make presentations on agenda items. There are regular updates from the Faculty Senate and the ASOC presidents. Comments are welcome from the public, including union leadership, in person or via letter. These comments are received by the Board, but are not launching points for further discussion.

The end result of these changes has been a dramatic reduction in meeting times. Conversations between the Board and the broader administration now pass through the president, supporting her authority to delegate per Board policy.

Public elections have also changed the nature of the Board and reduced the micromanaging. Only two of seven current trustees were on the Board prior to 2008. New members have benefited from the Ohlone College Trustee Orientation and the Ohlone College Board Member Guide.

The Board Member Guide works to avoid micromanagement and support delegation to the president through protocols for communication with the president, media, and College personnel and groups, as well as visits to campus. Communication is to be directed through the president as the sole employee of the Board. As a matter of protocol, trustees visiting a campus or meeting with College groups...
should notify the president and when appropriate the visit or meeting should be coordinated through the president’s office. The difference between the roles of trustees and the president is an ongoing theme throughout the Board Member Guide (IV.B.16).

The president is held accountable to the Board through an annual evaluation held in closed session. The evaluation examines the president’s success toward meeting his/her annual goals and other factors. The Board uses a template from a professional trustee organization. In addition to success at meeting annual goals, the president is evaluated on institutional leadership, use of resources, relations with the Board, external relations, and personal qualities.

If there is an area for improvement it is that the Board can, at times, wordsmith documents presented to the Board during meetings leading to request for changes in processes like the selection of architects or disposal of surplus property. This is done as a precursor to approving or ratifying a document, but because it impacts College operations, it borders on micromanagement.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Expand guidelines in the Board Member Guide and professional development for trustees to avoid micromanagement, and to address and caution against wordsmithing documents that lead to requests for procedural changes outside of workshops devoted to their development.

**IV.B.2** The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

**IV.B.2.a** The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purpose, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Board Policy 3100 delegates the responsibility of organizing the College to the president. This delegation includes creating lines of authority and fixing general duties (IV.B.43). The president has also established processes for filling and determining the need to fill staff and faculty vacancies. All administrator and staff hiring requests are reviewed by the president, vice presidents, and associate vice presidents prior to authorization. Faculty hires are initiated via program review and recommended to the president by the Faculty Position Prioritization Committee (IV.B.53).

**SELF-EVALUATION**

In July 2011 the president announced the use of a “Band Aid” year to mitigate losses in revenue. During this time, several administrators were asked to take on additional duties.

- The Director, International Programs and Services added Dean, Counseling;
- The Dean, Research and Planning added Director, Admissions and Records;
- Payroll began reporting to the Information Technology Department;
- Purchasing began reporting to Business Services (IV.B.44, IV.B.45, IV.B.46).

In addition to cost saving, the president has reorganized the College to better align the talents of staff to the needs of the College. Faculty, administrators, and staff have been encouraged to apply for openings and have been selected with some regularity.
The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None

**IV.B.2.b** The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals and priorities;
- Ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
- Ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and
- Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College Council has been the centerpiece to the collegial process, providing participation in governance since its creation in 2003. This body meets the requirements in statute for input into the College decision making and Board Policy and consists of student, faculty, staff, and administration representatives. Vice presidents and associate vice presidents serve as ex-officio members. All meetings are open to the college community (IV.B.47).

The president is a former institutional research officer as well as having worked for the ACCJC. Data is incorporated in the program review process and presented to the College Council. The executive dean, research, planning, and academic affairs is accessible to the president as a direct report. The Research and Planning Office is located in close proximity to the president’s office.

A detailed description of the planning process is discussed in I.B and III.D.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

In March 2009 the College came together to provide input on the College's strategic goals and objectives to formulate the College Strategic Plan. A planning session was held in Epler Gymnasium. The results were vetted by College Council before being taken to the Board by the president. The planning cycle is slated to begin again fall 2014.

Annual planning includes both internal and external data collected and analyzed by the Institutional Research and Planning Office (IV.B.48). Data is available on the office website and is divided among:

- The Environmental Scan
- Ohlone Data Source, and
- Data Analysis

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Assess and improve the use of technology to capture, analyze, and archive course assessments and program reviews.

**IV.B.2.c** The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The president maintains a set of Administrative Procedures designed to implement Board Policies and external requirements in the context of the College mission and policies. Most often each Administrative Procedure links to a corresponding Board Policy in order to provide consistency. Statutes, regulations, and accreditation standards are referenced in each Board policy.
SELF-EVALUATION
The Board has in place all legally required policies and keeps them updated as requirements change.

Administrative Procedures in Chapter 3 (IV.B.49) cover the general institution. Compliance with external requirements is demonstrated by, but not limited to:
Administrative Procedure 3410, Nondiscrimination
Administrative Procedure 3420, Equal Opportunity Employment
Administrative Procedure 3430, Prohibition of Harassment

Administrative Procedures in Chapter 6 (IV.B.50) cover business and fiscal affairs. Compliance with external requirements is demonstrated by, but not limited to:
Administrative Procedure 6400, Audits/Periodic Reports
Administrative Procedure 6540, Insurance
Administrative Procedure 6950, Drug and Alcohol Testing

Administrative Procedures in Chapter 7 (IV.B.51) cover human resources. Compliance with external requirements is demonstrated by, but not limited to:
Administrative Procedure 7216, Academic Employees: Grievance Procedure for Contract Decisions
Administrative Procedure 7346, Employees Call to Military Duty
Administrative Procedure 7365, Discipline and Dismissal – Classified Employees
Administrative Procedure 7700, Whistleblower Protection

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.B.2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

DESCRPTIVE SUMMARY
The president maintains an Administrative Services Area, headed by a vice president, administrative services, who serves as Chief Business Officer. This area is responsible for controlling budget and expenditures. Administrative Procedure 6100 states:

The Vice President of Administrative Services is delegated authority from the President to supervise budget preparation and management; oversee fiscal management of the District; and contract for, purchase, sell, lease real and personal property, in accordance with Board policy and law. Responsibility for the development of internal policies and procedures consistent with the provision of this procedure remains with the Vice President of Administrative Services. This delegated authority is subject to the condition that certain of these transactions be submitted to the President for review and approval from time to time as determined by the President.

When transactions do not exceed the dollar limits established in the Public Contracts Code, the Education Code or other laws pertaining to the taking of competitive bids, the Director of Purchasing, Contracts and Auxiliary Services may contract for goods, services, equipment and rental of facilities so long as the transactions comply with law and any limitations or requirements set forth therein. Furthermore, the Director of Purchasing, Contracts and Auxiliary Services may amend the terms and conditions of any contractual arrangement so long as the total expenditure of funds and period of contract do not exceed the limitations set forth in applicable law or regulation.

Pursuant to Administrative Procedure 6100, Administrative Services maintains and implements financial controls over budget, accounts payable, accounts receivable, and payroll.
These controls are audited annually, the results of which are reported to the Board and submitted to the California Community College Chancellor’s Office by December 31 and ACCJC as required (IV.B.52).

Budget and expenditure decisions are also linked through the Program and Services Review process via annual budget manager meetings. In these meetings current expenditures are reviewed and the costs of Program and Improvement Objectives (PIOs) derived through the Program and Services Review process are discussed. The College community provides input through the College Council’s Budget Committee.

SELF-EVALUATION
The president effectively controls the budget and expenditures, and consistently follows a fiscally conservation direction. Her team approach to budget management includes regular consultation with the Budget Committee, a subcommittee of the College Council; the College Council; and the vice presidents and associate vice presidents.

Review of fund balances and audit reports for the College indicate that the College has remained fiscally sound. Audit reports for the Foundation and for Measures A and G reinforce these findings.

Information on College audits can be found in Standard III.D.2.b.

The College meets the standard.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
None

IV.B.2.e The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY
At the start of each semester the president presents the State of the College speech. The speech is open to the public and provides a general update on recent activities, strategic goals, and the opportunities and challenges posed in the near future. The president also makes regular presentations to local community groups. Topics have included regular updates on the College performance and statuses on the College’s Measure G Bond program. Community groups range from chambers of commerce to fraternal organizations and subject-specific bodies such as the League of Women Voters. The College also televises each Board business meeting. The agendas contain “good news” items presented by the president as well as academic, fiscal, and bond presentations made under her delegation.

The president also meets regularly with several groups and committees within the College. She co-chairs semi-monthly meetings of the College Council, which is comprised of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. She also attends monthly Budget Committee meetings, a subcommittee of the College Council. In addition, the president has regular meetings with the vice presidents and associate vice presidents, and with the College Leaders group, which includes the vice presidents and associate vice presidents; and Faculty Senate, College Council, ASOC, and union leaders. The president held a series of budget forums during the years of the budget crisis (2009-2012). All members of the College community were welcome to attend these forums. At the forums, she provided budget updates, as well as allowed time for questions. The forums are video-recorded and archived on the website. In recent years, the president has attended the all-faculty meeting during Learning College Week. At these meetings, she has been
open to address any concern, question, or issue raised by faculty. She periodically attends academic deans’ meetings, Faculty Senate meetings, ASOC meetings, and union leader meetings.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

Through her regular participation in the above committees, groups, and organizations, the president keeps the College and the community informed of local, regional, and state issues concerning the College. Her frequent interactions with various community groups have done well to promote the College and its services, and have served to strengthen positive connections between the College and the surrounding community. This is evidenced by strong community support for the College, in particular the recent passage of Measure G.

The president regularly meets with and shares information with a variety of College committees and groups, as mentioned above. She has established a variety of avenues through which members of the College community may provide input, ask questions, and/or express concerns. Finally, she provides the College community with regular information about the budget, both through budget forums and budget updates.

The College meets the standard.

**ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

None
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| IV.B.38 | Board of Trustees Meeting from March 11, 2009 |
| IV.B.39 | Board of Trustees Meeting from February 9, 2011 |
| IV.B.40 | Board of Trustees Meeting from October 8, 2008 |
| IV.B.41 | Ad Hoc Members and Meeting dates |
| IV.B.42 | Board Policy 2430, Delegation of Authority to President/Superintendent |
| IV.B.43 | Board Policy 3100, Organizational Structure |
| IV.B.44 | College Council Meeting Minutes from July 11, 2011 |
| IV.B.45 | President State of the College – August 24, 2012 |
| IV.B.46 | President State of the College – August 25, 2013 |
| IV.B.47 | College Council Website |
| IV.B.48 | Research and Planning Website |
| IV.B.49 | Administrative Procedures Chapter 3, General Institution |
| IV.B.50 | Administrative Procedures Chapter 6, Business and Fiscal Affairs |
| IV.B.51 | Administrative Procedures Chapter 7, Human Resources |
| IV.B.52 | Administrative Procedure Chapter 6, Business and Fiscal Affairs |
| IV.B.53 | Faculty Position Prioritization Committee |
APPENDIX A

Sources of Evidence

Standard I

Standard II

Standard III

Standard IV
Standard I.A. Sources of Evidence

I.A.1 Faculty Assessment Presentations to SLOAC
I.A.2 Math SLO Presentation
I.A.3 Full-Time Equivalent Students by Credit Type
I.A.4 College Council Retreat Agenda from August 22, 2012
I.A.5 Courses Priorities Framework
I.A.6 Spring 2013 Student Satisfaction Survey
I.A.7 SLOAC Meeting Minutes Website
I.A.8 Specific SLOAC Meeting Minutes
I.A.9 SLO Presentation from faculty during Board of Trustee Meeting
I.A.10 2012 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) report
I.A.11 2013 Student Success Scorecard
I.A.12 College Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives 2010-2015
I.A.13 Spring 2013 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
I.A.14 Spring 2013 Staff Satisfaction Survey
I.A.15 Spring 2011 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
I.A.16 District Ethnic Comparison
I.A.17 Footnote about student success
I.A.18 Board Meeting Minutes from June 10, 2009
I.A.19 Ohlone College Website (About Ohlone)
I.A.20 CurricUNET Program Review Module
I.A.21 College Council Meeting Minutes from May 4, 2009
I.A.22 Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning
Standard I.B. Sources of Evidence

I.B.1  Planning and Decision-Making Handbook
I.B.2  College Strategic Plan 2010-2015
I.B.3  Mission, Vision, Core Values
I.B.4  College Council Website
I.B.5  Planning and Program Review at Ohlone: A Continual Process
I.B.6  Program Review Guidelines
I.B.7  Exemplary Program and Services Review site
I.B.8  Educational Master Plan Website
I.B.9  District Facilities Master Plan Website
I.B.10 Technology Plan Website
I.B.11 Faculty Senate Website
I.B.12 SLOAC Website
I.B.13 Definition/description of a Learning College
I.B.14 Curriculum Committee Website
I.B.15 General Education Committee Website
I.B.16 Process Assessment Committee Website
I.B.17 Faculty Position Prioritization Committee Website
I.B.18 Bond Oversight Committee Website
I.B.19 Foundation Website
I.B.20 Sample questions and notes from discussions with stakeholder groups during the Strategic Planning process
I.B.21 Footnote about Satisfaction Surveys
I.B.22 The academic deans’ meeting agenda and attendees
I.B.23 Research & Planning Website
I.B.24 SLOAC Website – agendas and minutes
I.B.25 Annual Assessment of Goals and Objectives, Assessment Documentation Tool
I.B.26 Benchmarking Website
I.B.27 President’s State of the College Website
I.B.28 Board of Trustees Website
I.B.29 2012 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges Report (ARCC)
I.B.30 Environmental Scan
I.B.31 CurricUNET Program Review Module
I.B.32 Academic Procedure 3250,
I.B.33 Educational Master Plan
I.B.34 District Facilities Master Plan
I.B.35 Technology Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.B.37</th>
<th>Budget Committee Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.B.38</td>
<td>Planning and Program Review at Ohlone: An Integrated System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.39</td>
<td>Linking Program Improvement Objectives to Planning and Resource Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.40</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.41</td>
<td>Strategic Plan Development and Assessment Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.42</td>
<td>Glossary of Planning Terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.43</td>
<td>Board of Trustees June Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.44</td>
<td>Annual Planning Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.45</td>
<td>Budget planning documents/site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.46</td>
<td>Budget Manager Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.47</td>
<td>2013 Student Success Scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.48</td>
<td>Student Success Webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.49</td>
<td>College Council Membership Webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.50</td>
<td>Advisory Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.51</td>
<td>Bond Oversight Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.52</td>
<td>Foundation Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.53</td>
<td>EMSI Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.54</td>
<td>Spring 2013 Faculty Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.55</td>
<td>Spring 2013 Staff Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.56</td>
<td>Spring 2013 Student Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.57</td>
<td>Budget Committee Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.58</td>
<td>Faculty, staff, and Student Satisfaction Survey Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.59</td>
<td>Staffing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.60</td>
<td>Educational Master Plan Mid-Cycle Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.61</td>
<td>Template for Assessing the Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.62</td>
<td>Revised PIO process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Standard II.A. Sources of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II.A.x</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.A.1</td>
<td>Mission, Vision, and Core Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.2</td>
<td>Education Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.3</td>
<td>Program and Services Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.4</td>
<td>College Catalog Curriculum Guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.5</td>
<td>College Catalog Certificates of Achievement and Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.6</td>
<td>Environment Scan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.7</td>
<td>2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.8</td>
<td>2013 Spring Staff Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.10</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.11</td>
<td>CurricUNET® Course and Program Approval module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.12</td>
<td>College Catalog General Education Philosophy and Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.13</td>
<td>Effective Contact Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.14</td>
<td>Distance Education Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.15</td>
<td>SLOA Committee Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.16</td>
<td>SLOA Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.17</td>
<td>Placement Testing Center Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.18</td>
<td>Master Course List for SLO Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.19</td>
<td>SLO Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.20</td>
<td>Strategic Plan Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.21</td>
<td>2013 Student Success Scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.22</td>
<td>Course Priority Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.23</td>
<td>2013 Spring Faculty Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.24</td>
<td>SLOA Committee - Faculty SLO Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.25</td>
<td>Faculty Development Attendance Records/workshop summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.26</td>
<td>CurricUNET® Program Review module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.27</td>
<td>College Catalog SLO Degree and Certificate Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.28</td>
<td>Budget Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.29</td>
<td>Sample Department Meeting Minutes – English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.30</td>
<td>SLO Assessment Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.31</td>
<td>SLOA Committee Two-year Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.32</td>
<td>Rational for Master Course List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.33</td>
<td>Annual Program Improve Objective (PIO) Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.34</td>
<td>Get it Done Day Spring 2013 Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.35</td>
<td>Process Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard II.A: Instructional Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.A.36</td>
<td>Planning Cycle Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.37</td>
<td>Assessing the PIO Process PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.38</td>
<td>Athletic Program Assessment iTunes video project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.39</td>
<td>GE Course Enrollment Analysis by GE Plan A Areas – Target Courses for GE Assessment (2012, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.40</td>
<td>GE Subcommittee website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.41</td>
<td>Faculty Assessment of Course SLO Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.42</td>
<td>Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes from CTE program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.43</td>
<td>Community Education Course Request Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.44</td>
<td>Community Education Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.45</td>
<td>Contract Education Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.46</td>
<td>English Language Institute Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.47</td>
<td>Study Abroad Process Document – Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.48</td>
<td>Consortium Courses in College Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.49</td>
<td>Contract Ed BSM Workshop outline example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.50</td>
<td>HERO Grant Course Outline example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.51</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.52</td>
<td>College Catalog – Advisory Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.53</td>
<td>Board Agenda Approving Advisory Committees (2013-2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.54</td>
<td>Professional Development Committee Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.55</td>
<td>Institutional Research and Planning Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.56</td>
<td>Program Improvement Objective Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.57</td>
<td>Program Review Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.58</td>
<td>Nursing Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.59</td>
<td>CNET newly revised courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.60</td>
<td>MultiMedia Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.61</td>
<td>SLO Presentation to Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.62</td>
<td>2012 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.63</td>
<td>Learning College Week Faculty Survey (feedback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.64</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee Minutes from May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.65</td>
<td>SLOAC meeting minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.66</td>
<td>College Strategic Plan 2010-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.67</td>
<td>District Facilities Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.68</td>
<td>Technology Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.69</td>
<td>Measure G Project List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.70</td>
<td>Technology Committee Charter/Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.71</td>
<td>Distance Education Substantive Change Proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STANDARD II.A. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

| II.A.72 | College Catalog |
| II.A.73 | Class Schedule |
| II.A.74 | GE Plan A and Area Definitions |
| II.A.75 | WASC Retreat on Assessment in Practice Project |
| II.A.76 | Guidelines for Getting Courses Approved for GE Plan A |
| II.A.77 | English 101A Reading and Written Composition – English Learning Center |
| II.A.78 | WebAdvisor Website |
| II.A.79 | Library Instruction – Library Website |
| II.A.80 | GE Committee goals |
| II.A.81 | World Forums |
| II.A.82 | ASOC |
| II.A.83 | Student Activities/Clubs |
| II.A.84 | Administrative Procedure 4102, Occupational/Vocational Technical Programs |
| II.A.85 | Career Technical Education Core Indicators |
| II.A.86 | College Catalog – Course Descriptions |
| II.A.87 | Archive College Catalog |
| II.A.88 | Transfer Center Website |
| II.A.89 | Transfer Center Events Calendar Website |
| II.A.90 | ASSIST.org Website |
| II.A.91 | Faculty Handbook- Syllabus, Grading, Curriculum sections |
| II.A.92 | Administrative Procedure 4021, Program Discontinuance |
| II.A.93 | Ohlone Website |
| II.A.94 | Administrative Procedures, Chapter 4 |
| II.A.95 | Board Meeting Minutes March 2010, approval of Board Policy 4030, Academic Freedom |
| II.A.96 | Administrative Procedure 4030 |
| II.A.97 | College Catalog – Student Conduct and Discipline |
| II.A.98 | Student Handbook |
| II.A.99 | Academic Dishonesty Update 2010 |
| II.A.100 | Faculty Senate, May 2010 Agenda regarding Academic Dishonesty |
| II.A.101 | Learning College Week, August 2010 Faculty Senate |
| II.A.102 | Academic Dishonesty |
| II.A.103 | College Council Meeting Minutes |
Standard II.B. Sources of Evidence

II.B.1 Student Services Program Reviews
II.B.2 Student Services Curriculum
II.B.3 Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning and Program Review
II.B.4 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey
II.B.5 College Catalog
II.B.6 Class Schedule
II.B.7 Student Handbook
II.B.8 Student Services Policies/Procedures
II.B.9 College Council Meeting Minutes about Class Schedule
II.B.10 Accommodations and Services program Review
II.B.11 Guide To Student
II.B.12 Student Activities
II.B.13 Personal Development
II.B.14 DSPS
II.B.15 Smith Center
II.B.16 Personal Counseling Program Review 2011-2012
II.B.17 Faculty Senate Membership
II.B.18 College Council Membership
II.B.19 Curriculum Committee Membership
II.B.20 Student Success Act, 2012
II.B.21 EOPS Program Review
II.B.22 DSPS Program Review
II.B.23 Puente Program Review
II.B.24 Professional Development Activities and Committee Assignments for Counseling
II.B.25 Curriculum for New Counselor Training/List of Training Sessions
II.B.26 Student Survey Website
II.B.27 Community College Counseling, Student Educational Plans, And Educational Outcomes: A Quantitative Analysis
II.B.28 Personal Development Statistics, 2010
II.B.29 Orientation Data: Retention, Success, and Persistence Rates for Freshman Connection Students
II.B.31 AB540 Website
II.B.32 Crisis Intervention Policy & Procedure, 2013
II.B.33 International Program/Services Strategic Plan
II.B.34 Puente Events
II.B.35 Deaf Studies Events
II.B.36 International Program and Services
### STANDARD II.B. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

| II.B.37 | Dia de los Muertos |
| II.B.38 | Indigenous Peoples Day |
| II.B.39 | Intercultural/International Studies GE Requirement |
| II.B.40 | Environmental Scan |
| II.B.41 | 2012 Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) |
| II.B.42 | Accuplacer English Validation Study 2010-11 |
| II.B.43 | Accuplacer Math Validation Study 2010-11 |
| II.B.44 | Placement Testing Trends 2008FA to 2012FA |
| II.B.45 | Evidence that cultural and linguistic biases are minimized |
| II.B.46 | Student Health Center Survey |
| II.B.47 | XEMGT (Enrollment) report |
| II.B.48 | Step Up Program |
**Standard II.C. Sources of Evidence**

| II.C.1     | Ohlone College Library website                  |
| II.C.2     | CurricUNET                                      |
| II.C.3     | LRC Program and Services Review                |
| II.C.4     | 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey        |
| II.C.5     | 2013 Spring Faculty Satisfaction Survey        |
| II.C.6     | 2013 Spring Staff Satisfaction Survey          |
| II.C.7     | Reference Desk Subject Logs                    |
| II.C.8     | 2012 Fall Faculty & Staff Survey Conducted by the Library |
| II.C.9     | College Catalog, GE descriptions for Information Competency requirement |
| II.C.10    | Ohlone Library YouTube channel                |
| II.C.11    | Library Science Courses Syllabi               |
| II.C.12    | Library Science Course Outlines               |
| II.C.13    | Datamart enrollment, success and retention data |
| II.C.14    | 2012 Fall Student Survey Conducted by the Library |
| II.C.15    | Instructional Evaluation Instruments          |
| II.C.16    | Measure G Survey                               |
| II.C.17    | Tutorial Needs Survey of Lab Managers, 2012    |
| II.C.18    | Contracts on File in the Library               |
| II.C.19    | LRC Program and Services Review               |
Standard III.A Sources of Evidence

III.A.1 Request to Fill
III.A.2 BOG Minimum Qualifications
III.A.3 Procedures for Equivalency Committee
III.A.4 College Catalog
III.A.5 Administrator Degrees Matrix
III.A.6 Board Policy 7120, Recruitment and Hiring
III.A.7 List of Ad Agencies
III.A.8 CCC Registry
III.A.9 Examples of Job Descriptions
III.A.10 Hiring Guidelines
III.A.11 Administrative Procedure 3420, Equal Opportunity Employment
III.A.12 Hiring committee training presentation and copy of presentation provided by LCW
III.A.13 Document with Equivalency Process
III.A.14 Application Screening Device
III.A.15 Interview Questions and Committee Scoring Form
III.A.16 Faculty Position Prioritizing Committee
III.A.17 General Guidelines and Confidentiality
III.A.18 Ideal Candidate Statements
III.A.19 Job Announcement Showing Requirements
III.A.20 Description of Faculty Mentor Program
III.A.21 Performance Evaluation process for CSE and SEIU Employees
III.A.22 Performance Evaluation Processes for Managers/Contract Employees
III.A.23 Training Slides for Performance Evaluations
III.A.24 Evaluation Process for Full Time Faculty
III.A.25 Evaluation Process for Managers
III.A.26 College Survey data
III.A.27 Faculty Self Evaluations
III.A.28 Available Upon Request
III.A.29 Board Policy 2715, Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice
III.A.30 Board Policy 1200, District Mission, Vision and Values
III.A.31 Administrative Procedure 3050, Institutional Code of Ethics
III.A.32 UFO Bargaining Agreement
III.A.33 Ohlone College Faculty Ethics Statement
III.A.34 Administrative Procedure 3550, Drug Free Environment
III.A.35 Board Policy 3820, Gift Acceptance Policy
III.A.36 Administrative Procedure 7370, Political Activity
III.A.37 Administrative Procedure 7700, Whistleblower Protection
III.A.38 Law Enforcement Code of Ethics
III.A.39 Deaf Code of Professional Conduct
III.A.40 Staffing Plan
III.A.41 Plan to Rebuild Faculty
III.A.42 Ohlone Top 10
III.A.43 Board Agendas
III.A.44 Board Policy 3410, Nondiscrimination
III.A.45 EEP Statement
III.A.46 Board Policy 3900, Speech: Time, Place, and Manner
III.A.47 Board Policy 4030, Academic Freedom
III.A.48 Board Policy 5300, Student Equity
III.A.49 Board Policy 7100, Commitment to Diversity
III.A.50 Managers Training Matrix
III.A.51 LCW Training plan
III.A.52 EEO Training material and list of managers who are trained
III.A.53 Sample diversity questions and scenario questions
III.A.54 Training material and signed documents
III.A.55 Administrative Procedure 7145, Personnel Files
III.A.56 Form and link
III.A.57 Lee Mun Wah Training
III.A.58 Step Up Program Information
III.A.59 List of recent cultural events
III.A.60 List of faculty serving as advisors on various ethnic groups
III.A.61 Agendas for classified professional development days
III.A.62 List of recent trainings
III.A.63 Sample of EEO stats
III.A.64 Administrative Procedure 3435, Procedures for Handling Complaints of Unlawful Discrimination
III.A.65 Information – Office of the Ombudsman
III.A.66 Training material for training of sexual harassment
III.A.67 List of consultants helping the departments
III.A.68 Excerpt showing description of CEER
III.A.69 List of Expenditures Showing Professional Development Fund
III.A.70 Training material "workplace bullying" a growing concern
III.A.71 Athletic Code of Conduct
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III.A.72</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty Participation for Three Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.A.73</td>
<td>Sample of Individual Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.74</td>
<td>Contract language regarding sabbatical leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.75</td>
<td>Link to professional development committee page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.76</td>
<td>SEIU contract showing professional growth section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.77</td>
<td>CSEA contract section showing professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.78</td>
<td>Link to strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.79</td>
<td>Survey Monkey Data for Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.80</td>
<td>Information and link to E-LEARN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.A.81</td>
<td>Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning and Program Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard III.B. Sources of Evidence

III.B.1 Administrative Services Organizational Chart
III.B.2 Trip and Fall Hazard Survey
III.B.3 Trip and Fall Hazards Repaired
III.B.4 Light Repair on Fremont and Newark Campuses
III.B.5 Measure G Fire suppression upgrades
III.B.6 College Strategic Plan 2010-2015
III.B.7 Space Inventory Report
III.B.8 College Council Meeting Minutes
III.B.9 SWACC report
III.B.10 Fire and Elevator Inspections
III.B.11 2013 Spring Staff Satisfaction Survey
III.B.12 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey
III.B.13 District Facilities Master Plan
III.B.14 Educational Master Plan
III.B.15 Technology Master Plan
III.B.16 Program Improvement Objectives Process
III.B.17 Bond Measure A
III.B.18 Newark Center Site Project
III.B.19 Student Services Center Project
III.B.20 Bond Measure G
III.B.21 ONUMA
III.B.22 Measure G Quick Fix List
III.B.23 Net Zero Energy Designation
III.B.24 Measure A Bond improvements
III.B.25 Emergency Operations Preparedness and Response Plan
III.B.26 Building Evacuation Routes
III.B.27 Tabletop Exercise Training Notification
III.B.28 Hazardous Materials Business Plan
III.B.29 Chemical Hygiene Plan
III.B.30 Proof of Blood Borne Pathogen Training Completion
III.B.31 Injury & Illness Prevention Plan
III.B.32 College Council Minutes, Smoke-Free Campus
III.B.33 Annual Campus Security Reports:
III.B.34 Jeanne Cleary Act
III.B.34 Student Right to Know Act
STANDARD III.B. PHYSICAL RESOURCES

III.B.35  Alert-U
III.B.36  DSPS Adaptations to Student Needs
III.B.37  Five Year Construction Plan
III.B.38  Five Year Maintenance Plan
III.B.39  Work Order Resolution
III.B.40  Departmental Program and Services Reviews
III.B.41  Campus Utility Infrastructure Assessment and Plan
III.B.42  Central Plant Study
III.B.43  IT Server Room Study
III.B.44  Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Website
III.B.45  College Planning Process
III.B.46  Campus Site Survey
III.B.47  Minutes from appropriate meetings
III.B.49  Measure G User Groups
Standard III.C. Sources of Evidence

III.C.1 Technology Committee Meeting Minutes Website
III.C.2 Technology Master Plan
III.C.3 CMS assessment report, Spring 2010
III.C.4 2013 Spring Faculty Satisfaction Survey
III.C.5 Service Level Agreement
III.C.6 Sample Service Level Agreement - Desktop Support
III.C.7 2013 Spring Staff Satisfaction Survey
III.C.8 Sample of Professional Development Evaluation Survey
III.C.9 Professional Development Planning Survey Results From Spring 2013
III.C.10 Learning College Week Agenda
III.C.11 eCampus offerings, Applications jump page
III.C.12 SkillPort Link
III.C.13 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey
III.C.14 Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda June 12, 2013
III.C.15 Various Iterations of the Technology Master Plan
III.C.16 Information Technology Program Review
III.C.17 Technology Spending Plan
III.C.18 Technology Committee Meeting Minutes from the September 2012
III.C.19 Measure G Series A and A-I Official Statement
III.C.20 Board of Trustees Meeting, Sept 14, 2011
III.C.21 Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Meeting, December 12, 2011
III.C.22 Technology Committee Minutes for October 16, 2012
III.C.23 Service Level Agreement Blackboard
III.C.24 Appendix F of Technology Master Plan
Standard III.D. Sources of Evidence

III.D.1  Educational Master Plan
III.D.2  Program and Services Review Process
III.D.3  College Planning Matrix
III.D.4  Budget Development Timeline
III.D.5  Budget Committees Meeting Agendas
III.D.6  College Council Meeting Agendas
III.D.7  IIO/PIO Matrix
III.D.8  Annual Assessment of Goals and Objectives
III.D.9  2013-2014 Final Budget
III.D.10 District Facilities Master Plan
III.D.11 Technology Master Plan
III.D.12 Measure A
III.D.13 Measure G
III.D.14 Staffing Plan
III.D.15 Annual Budget
III.D.16 College Strategic Plan Annual Assessments of Goals and Objectives Assessment Documentation Tool
III.D.17 College Strategic Plan 2010-2015
III.D.18 Board of Trustees Presentation
III.D.19 College 2012-2013 Final Budget
III.D.20 2012-2013 Quarter 2 Financial Report (memo)
III.D.21 2012-2013 Quarter 2 Financial Report
III.D.22 2012-2013 Quarter 4 Financial Report (memo)
III.D.23 2012-2013 Quarter 4 Financial Report
III.D.24 Note 7 Financial Statements
III.D.25 Official Statement 1
III.D.26 Official Statement 2
III.D.27 PIO planning process
III.D.28 Budget Manager Meeting Agendas
III.D.29 Budget Committee Agendas
III.D.30 Program Improvement Objectives Spreadsheet
III.D.31 Budget Forum Agenda
III.D.32 Report 311
III.D.33 FON Report
III.D.34a Audit report Evidence 1
STANDARD III.D. FISCAL RESOURCES

III.D.34b  Audit report Evidence 2
III.D.34c  Audit report Evidence 3
III.D.34d  Audit report Evidence 4
III.D.34e  Audit report Evidence 5
III.D.34f  Audit report Evidence 6
III.D.35  CA Ed Code Section 84040.5 / Administrative Procedure 6400 Audits/Periodic Reports
III.D.36  2012-2013 Audit Report
III.D.37  Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Website
III.D.38  Foundation Finance Committee Meeting Minutes
III.D.39  DDAS Meeting Schedule
III.D.40  ASOC Board minutes
III.D.41  Foundation Board Presentation
III.D.42  Foundation Fundraising Meetings
III.D.43  2011-2012 Program Compliance Audit
III.D.44  Business Services Department Program Reviews
III.D.45  2011-2012 Annual Audit
III.D.46  Cash Flow Project for 2013-2014
III.D.47  2011-2012 Year End Actuals
III.D.48  2012-2013 Q3 Financial Report (memo)
III.D.49  2012-2013 Quarter 3 Financial Report
III.D.50  Board Policy 6320, Investment
III.D.51  2012-2013 Tentative Budget Memo
III.D.52  2012-2013 Tentative Budget to Board
III.D.55  Board Policy 6320, Investment
III.D.57  “Design It, Build It, Ship It” grant (memo)
III.D.58  “Design It, Build It, Ship It” grant
III.D.60  OPEB Liability (Trust Fund)
III.D.61  Compensated Absences
III.D.62  Actuarial Study
III.D.63  2013-2014 Final Budget
III.D.64  Budget Process
III.D.65  Higher One
III.D.66  Accessible Technology Initiative
III.D.67  Board Policy
III.D.68  Administrative Procedure 6345,
III.D.69  Auditor’s Recommendations addressed
III.D.70  Annual Assessment of Goals & Objectives Tool
STANDARD IV.A. DECISION-MAKING ROLES AND PROCESSES

Standard IV.A. Sources of Evidence

IV.A.1 Mission Values Goals
IV.A.2 College Council ByLaws
IV.A.3 Board Policy 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making
IV.A.4 List of Student Clubs
IV.A.5 2013 Spring Student Satisfaction Survey
IV.A.6 2013 Spring Staff Satisfaction Survey
IV.A.7 2013 Spring Faculty Satisfaction Survey
IV.A.8 College Council Minutes from September 10, 2012
IV.A.9 College Council Minutes from September 17, 2012
IV.A.10 College Council Minutes from October 8, 2012
IV.A.11 College Council Minutes from October 22, 2012
IV.A.12 College Council Minutes from December 10, 2012
IV.A.13 College Council Minutes from March 11, 2013
IV.A.14 College Council Minutes from December 5, 2003
IV.A.15 College Council Minutes from April 12, 2010
IV.A.16 College Council Minutes from February 14, 2011
IV.A.17 College Council Minutes from February 28, 2011
IV.A.18 College Council Minutes from March 14, 2011
IV.A.19 College Council Minutes from May 9, 2011
IV.A.20 College Council Minutes from May 23, 2011
IV.A.21 College Council Minutes from October 3, 2011
IV.A.22 College Council Minutes from October 10, 2011
IV.A.23 College Council Minutes from February 13, 2012
IV.A.24 College Council Minutes from February 27, 2012
IV.A.25 College Council Minutes from March 12, 2012
IV.A.26 College Council Minutes from April 23, 2012
IV.A.27 District Facilities Master Plan
IV.A.28 Program and Services Review Webpage
IV.A.29 Administrative Procedure 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making
IV.A.30 Planning and Decision-Making Handbook
IV.A.31 Educational Master Plan
IV.A.32 Technology Master Plan
IV.A.33 CTE ED Strategic Plan
STANDARD IV.A. DECISION-MAKING ROLES AND PROCESSES

IV.A.34 Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning and Program Review
IV.A.35 Board Policy 4020, Program and Curriculum Development
IV.A.36 Accreditation Documents Webpage
IV.A.37 Registered Nursing Accreditation
IV.A.38 PAC Webpage
Standard IV.B. Sources of Evidence

IV.B.1 Board Policy 2200, Board Duties and Responsibilities
IV.B.2 Board Policy 2431, Selection of President/Superintendent
IV.B.3 Board Policy 2210, Officers of the Board
IV.B.4 Board Policy 2310, Regular Meetings of the Board
IV.B.5 Board Policy 4025, Philosophy and Criteria for Associate
IV.B.6 Board Policy 4020, Program and Curriculum Development
IV.B.7 Board Policy 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making
IV.B.8 Board Policy Chapter 4, Academic Affairs
IV.B.9 Board Policy Chapter 6, Business and Fiscal Affairs
IV.B.10 Board Policy 6200, Budget Preparation
IV.B.11 Board Policy 6250, Budget Management
IV.B.12 Board Policy 6300, Fiscal Management
IV.B.13 Board Policy 2010, Board Membership
IV.B.14 Board Policy 2100, Board Elections
IV.B.15 Board of Trustees Minutes from June 2012
IV.B.16 Board Member Guide
IV.B.17 Board Policy Chapter 5, Student Services
IV.B.18 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Manual
IV.B.19 California Education Code Section 70900-709002
IV.B.20 Board of Trustee Minutes for Bond Language (July)
IV.B.21 Board Policy 4220, Standards of Scholarship
IV.B.22 2012 Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC)
IV.B.23 Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda from October 12, 2011
IV.B.24 Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda from June 10, 2011
IV.B.25 Available Upon Request
IV.B.26 Board Policy Chapter 2, Board of Trustees
IV.B.27 Board Policy 2410, Policy and Administrative Procedure
IV.B.28 Board Policy 2310, Regular Meetings of the Board
IV.B.29 Faculty Senate Meeting March 2011
IV.B.30 Ohlone College Trustee Orientation
IV.B.31 Board Policy 2745, Board Self-Evaluation
IV.B.32 Board Policy 2710, Conflict of Interest
IV.B.33 Board Policy 2715, Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice
IV.B.34 Board of Trustee Meeting Agenda from December 14, 2011
### STANDARD IV.B. BOARD AND ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV.B.35</th>
<th>Tri City News October 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.36</td>
<td>Board Policy 3200, Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.37</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Meeting from May 14, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.38</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Meeting from March 11, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.39</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Meeting from February 9, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.40</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Meeting from October 8, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.V.B.41</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Members and Meeting dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.42</td>
<td>Board Policy 2430, Delegation of Authority to President/Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.43</td>
<td>Board Policy 3100, Organizational Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.44</td>
<td>College Council Meeting Minutes from July 11, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.45</td>
<td>President State of the College – August 24, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.46</td>
<td>President State of the College – August 25, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.47</td>
<td>College Council Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.48</td>
<td>Research and Planning Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.49</td>
<td>Administrative Procedures Chapter 3, General Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.50</td>
<td>Administrative Procedures Chapter 6, Business and Fiscal Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.51</td>
<td>Administrative Procedures Chapter 7, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.52</td>
<td>Administrative Procedure Chapter 6, Business and Fiscal Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.B.53</td>
<td>Faculty Position Prioritization Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>