We broke into 4 groups to review sections of the educational master plan.
EMP Task Force Meeting - 9/6/19 (Sara’s group)

EMP Notes - Section 4 (Pages 14-17)

- Growing College Connection program is more related to Dual Enrollment - should be in that section?
- Only one bullet point related to professional development - add something about integrated professional development
- Guided Pathways - change the language to reflect that GP is not totally focused on time, and should also be focused on issues of access, completion, and persistence (not just efficiency)
- On page 14, intro section should include a sentence about how institutional resources will need to be committed to achieve these goals
- Under Access, stronger language than “Examine” - maybe “examine and implement”
- Under Access, not just technology that is the issue - the whole process should be addressed
- Under Access, outreach plan should include communities that historically under-utilize education (non traditional students, community groups, etc)
- Page 15, Resource Allocation section - this could be a problematic statement and may be an issue in getting faculty senate approval
- Page 17, Dual Enrollment section - “bolster college enrollment rates and progress toward college completion” - remove parts about HS graduation rates and high school GPAs - not related to Ohlone?
- Dual enrollment - second bullet point - replace “credentialed instructors” with “qualified college faculty”
- Add a section about improving Online Education
- Remove “Classroom” from the section about Professional Development

From: Terry Exner <TExner@ohlone.edu>
Date: Friday, September 6, 2019 at 11:19 AM
To: Andrew Lamanque <alamanque@ohlone.edu>
Cc: Rose-Margaret Itua <RItua@ohlone.edu>, "Narinder S. Bansal" <NBansal@ohlone.edu>
Subject: Additional comments related to the EMP from our group

Group please chime in if I misspoke or missed anything that we didn’t already cover in the meeting today:

The following are our group comments for pages 1-3:

Page 1. Last paragraph. We all thought that the phrase recognizing we are a smaller college than ten years ago is not relevant to the plan. We thought that
“yet strategically prioritizing our initiatives” was more focused on the need to do a better job of allocating the more limited resources we now have.

Page 2. First paragraph. We still need to think we need to recognize that the plan will not only help us achieve our institutional goals, but also provide relevant input into the five year strategic plan.

Page 2 Major Planning Activities: Career Education has also been a major planning activity. Should that go under one of the existing major activities or should it be a separate Activity all its own?

Page 3. Mission Statement: Should we include how or what elements of the Mission Statement will be supported by the EMP. While we have the Mission Statement in the plan, we don’t really tie into it in the document.

My additional comments:
On another note, regarding Resource Allocation (page 15): I do agree with Ghada/others regarding that we do need to keep a reference to balancing economic and community need with current commitments/resources. I also agree with someone’s comment that costs would be an additional consideration.

Also maybe we can add our group thought on In-coming student preparation as part of the Areas to review for Additional Support section?

Thanks for the Zoom option today. It really helped!

Terry Exner
Business Administration Faculty
Ohlone Community College
Hi Andrew,

My group (Darlene Gunsauls, Leslie Buehler, Mike Taguchi) also looked at section 3.

The comments about section 4 look accurate. From section 3 (pp. 7-13) – this is is what I recall from our discussion (Mike Taguchi took notes, so you may want to follow-up w/ him):

- Top of pg 8, enrollment planning section (but before enrollments by location) = consider adding a sentence or two to help frame all of the info provided before; provide some narrative or explanation about what or how we are using that info moving forward; also makes that section more consistent w/ other sections
- Under Enrollments by location- Fremont – “This projection is based on the opening of the academic core buildings, increased marketing and outreach efforts, a focus on retention, noncredit expansion and guided pathways work aimed at helping more students complete in a timely manner.” Consider revising to something like “guided pathways work aimed at providing more effective support to help students succeed and complete in a timely manner”

There was discussion about the “online” section of enrollments as well – you would have to follow-up w/ Mike about anything specifically recorded since he was our notetaker.

Here are my suggestions for pp.14-15 on Guided Pathways. I think its important that we provide a narrative that reflects the equity & accessibility issues related to efficiency, rather than state efficiency, which is a value in and of itself; additionally, I think its important to have more presence of how student services is involved – otherwise, it looks like that Guided pathways is just about flow charts and schedules, not about student experience, or equity issues – we may fall into the trap of presenting Guided Pathways the way some of its detractors see it – as a pipeline to get students in and out:

- Develop and/or refine student support services based on data results OR Develop student success strategies and processes based on data results (data coaches mentioned but then not mentioned again until toward the end of the document so tried to kill two birds w/ one stone)
- Improve student time to degree through development of clearer, more accessible course patterns, supported by a consistent schedule of classes
- Technology statement fine

I realize this will end up “on the shelf” but I would like anyone who picks it up in the future to see that we saw Guided Pathways a certain way, beyond just meta majors and program maps.

Kind regards,

Larissa Akiko Bailon-Favela
Assistant Professor of Communication Studies
Coordinator of Forensics Program & Guided Pathways
Department of Communication Studies
Ohlone College
Hey Andrew,

I want to share some feedback from faculty regarding the faculty pieces of the EMP.

Best,

Jesse

1. While it is obvious that funding cannot be ignored, I’m not sure that we want to make the statement that potential for revenue generation should be the only deciding factor in whether to hire in a department/program. Deaf Studies immediately comes to mind as a program that is important to the identity of Ohlone but probably not a big money-maker. We should be having college-wide discussions on how to balance funding needs with maintaining our own identity (and, as part of that, defining what our identity is). There’s lots of language in this plan right now that sounds like the administration has already made the decision to ignore our identity and focus exclusively on funding.

2. I’ve never been on the Faculty Prioritization committee, so I can’t speak to what discussions have been had in that committee (I would also object to the dialogue being referred to as “college-wide” since those meetings have been limited to a small number of people, with very little transparency to the rest of us. I don’t like the idea of separating out some positions from the rest (and I assume the counselors & librarians would object to being separated out like that). Instead, I think the criteria for ranking should be expanded to consider a wider variety of factors that measure the “value” of a position. I also question the notion that there are any positions that are “required” - once the plan made reference to possible program closures, no position is “required” (it may only be required if the decision is made to keep the program at Ohlone).

3. The Curriculum Committee should certainly be involved with course deactivations, but I’m not sure it’s healthy for the college or the faculty to have that committee weighing in on what programs should be eliminated. And, again, I disagree with the notion that there is one metric for determining whether a program has value (i.e., the number of degrees awarded, which is what the document suggests).