REPORT FROM UFO PRESIDENT

Alan Kirshner

A former faculty member, Walt Halland, created an urban myth about my first day at Ohlone. He said that as I stood up to talk at the Faculty Senate meeting I placed my fist in the air and said, "power to the faculty." While I am fairly sure I never did that, it was 1971 after all, there is little doubt that Walt's tale accurately reflects my attitude as to who should be making the decisions on a college campus. As President of the United Faculty of Ohlone I visualize my role, my mission, as being an advocate for faculty power. In my mind, that translates to supporting and defending faculty rights. There is no need of any faculty member to battle a wrong alone. As we all know there is strength in numbers and so I say to any of you who feel wronged or fear you will be wronged, the UFO and it's President are here to serve. Please do not just go around bitching about an issue. Speak with me. I will be happy to stand with you to try and redress the grievance.

On a similar note, if you do not understand why the UFO took a stand on an issue or failed to obtain a provision in our contract that you believe to be vital to faculty and our power, I am willing to try any explain our reasoning or the reality of our present lack of faculty power. While you may not be satisfied with my explanation, I believe it is healthier to exchange views.

Exchanging views-- having open dialogue--is part of the Ohlone Way. I said it at this year's Orientation and I want to repeat it here. We are lucky to have so many administrators who do communicate openly and honestly. Not all of them are willing to recognize that power should belong to the faculty, but they are willing to share some of that power. At most other colleges faculty have to battle to get any respect. I know most of our present administrators respect us. It has been a long time since I heard administrators refer to themselves as managers, to us as employees and to our students as products. Personally, I think the thing I like best about dealing with most of our administrators is that they do not flinch at my lack of candor and my tactlessness. I remember many years ago an administrator said to me that she appreciated my support for the faculty, but did not like my approach. So be it--if it serves the power of the faculty, it works for me.

So outside of the table negotiations-- the contract--which I leave to our esteemed colleagues, Darren and Heather, to inform you about, let me relate a few things achieved since mid-Spring semester. In resolving individual issues we were able to obtain benefits for all. We have received, for the first time, a touch of due process for part-time faculty. No longer can a part-time faculty member be removed from a class without knowing why. The individual now has the right to contest that removal and any investigation must be concluded in a month's time. The specific wording will be worked out at the table.
Part-time faculty members forced to take a course or workshop on campus to maintain their position will be reimbursed at the rate of $32.50 per hour.

Working together with the Faculty Senate, as it the issue is in it's domain, we have been able to obtain office space for part-time faculty. We have had common space previously, but now there will be dedicated offices. Dean's have been provided with a list of officers that they can distribute.

At our recent Executive Board meeting the UFO voted to support Measure G. This Measure would bring our campus $350 million dollars to help us move forward on our facilities use plans. We ask all members of the Ohlone Community to find some time to work for this Measure. The vote, as to be expected, was unanimous. You can head over to the Yes on G campaign headquarters directly across from the campus at: 43430 Mission Blvd, Suite 240.

Your Executive Board also voted to endorse two of the three candidates for the two vacant seats on the Ohlone College Board of Trustees—Garrett Yee and Jan Giovannini-Hill. The Faculty Senate also endorsed the same two candidates. Garrett has served the Ohlone Board well over the years and has been a friend to the faculty during all that time. Jan Giovannini-Hill has spent 40 years of her life working in higher education as an instructor, a staff member and as an administrator. She presently serves as a Financial Analyst at CalState, East Bay. All four of her children and her husband have taken classes in the past at Ohlone. In the case of the third candidate, Ishan Shah, we simply felt that as a young man straight out of High School taking classes at Ohlone College this semester, he would not only have to recuse himself on many issues pertaining to the college, but he needed to spend a bit more time as an activist in life. He would make an excellent candidate for the Student Representative to the Board in future years.

In Solidarity, 
Alan

THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE
Mark Wade Lieu

Since January, the Community College League of California (the League), which is the organization that represents college presidents, district superintendents, and local trustees, has been convening a group called the Commission on the Future (COTF) to draft a report and recommendations on how to move California’s community colleges forward in addressing the ever-present and perhaps increasingly important issue of the success of students enrolled in our colleges. While we might be tempted to ignore this report as just another in a long line of similar efforts, there are several reasons to take this report more seriously than most.

First and foremost, this is an internal as opposed to an external effort. When outside researchers and organizations pontificate about what the community colleges need to do, there is a strong degree of resistance from community college students, staff, and faculty. However, in this case, the COTF has involved vice-presidents, deans, faculty, classified staff, and students, in addition to presidents, superintendents, and trustees that it represents. Furthermore, the final report of the commission will follow the expected route for participatory governance on the state level - first an airing in the Consultation Council (similar to our College Council) and then a presentation to the Board of Governors. There has already been a degree of buy-in, so the report already has stronger legs than outside efforts.

Second, the commission was strategically convened to get ahead of other efforts to change the community colleges. There has been growing interest in “fixing” the community colleges on the part of the Legislature in recent years, exemplified by a narrowly avoided (and decidedly detrimental) change in the community college funding formula in the last legislative session. By convening the commission last spring, the League forestalled other poorly informed and potentially deleterious proposals and drew all legislative attention to the work of the commission. From what I hear, legislators are waiting to get the final report in order to plan future legislation, and the recommendations are predicted to inform future student success efforts by our System Chancellor, Jack Scott.

The first public draft of the final recommendations from the report, “The California Graduation Initiative: A 2020 Vision for Student Success for California’s Community Colleges,” is being publicly vetted during the months of September and October, with a final version of the report expected in early November. I attended the first of six public information sessions about the report on September 16, 2010, in Sacramento.

The 17 recommendations are divided into four broad categories: leadership and accountability, intensive student support, teaching and learning, and finance and affordability. The vast majority of these recommendations address issues that are outside the purview of local bargaining agents, but they all involve the faculty, particularly through the authority of local academic senates. However, there are three recommendations that I want to highlight for the United Faculty of Ohlone.

The first of these states, “Student success should be the focus of a reinvented professional development effort for community college trustees, administrators, faculty and staff.” Currently, faculty are largely free to construct the form their professional development takes. A coordinated professional development effort that includes all staff, administrators, trustees and faculty will significantly impact this flexibility. In addition, given that student success is one of the areas subject to participatory governance and the purview of the academic senate, faculty will undoubtedly need to take a strong leadership role in any such effort in addition to their other responsibilities.

A second recommendation states, “Colleges should schedule classes in an interdepartmental manner with the goal of meeting the needs of first-time entering students, promoting full-time enrollment, and enhancing education program completion.” As we are all well aware, while the convenience of students plays a part in the scheduling of courses, there is an equal consideration given by administrators to when faculty want to teach. In order to create a schedule that meets the student success goals
mentioned in the recommendation, faculty will need to put a greater emphasis on these overarching goals and less on individual preference.

Finally, the report recommends that “Academic hiring practices should encourage (or require) candidates to demonstrate knowledge of effective teaching and learning techniques, particularly in the basic skills subject areas.” On the state level, this could lead to a change in the minimum qualifications for teaching in the community colleges. Much more likely, this will be implemented locally. Such a change to our local minimum qualifications will require thoughtful conversation as to how such knowledge can be evaluated in applicants.

Given the strong likelihood that the recommendations from the COTF report will be influencing state and local policies and practices in the coming years, it’s a good idea for all of us to make the effort to engage (and in some cases re-engage) in these issues now. You can get more information about the COTF and its membership at www.ccleague.org/cotf. The final report will also be available at this URL when it is published.

Mark Wade Lieu, an ESL faculty member, served as one of the three faculty members of the 31-person commission.

FACULTY CONTRIBUTION

CHEATING - A PROBLEM THAT GROWS BIGGER
Sheldon W. Helms

The Summer Session of 2010 required an unprecedented amount of adjustment for many of us who taught for the first time on the Newark campus. Since nearly all of the classes were taught there this summer as a cost-cutting measure, faculty (and many students) arrived ready to navigate unfamiliar parking lots, hallways, classrooms, and facilities.

One thing I did not anticipate, however, was the tremendous increase in cheating I would encounter.

In my General Psychology class, six chapter tests are given which constitute 30 percent of the final course grade. Each of these tests consists of a multiple-choice portion, supplemented by a short-answer essay. Like many faculty, I require that students use a Scantron sheet to answer the multiple-choice portion of each test.

I have used this method of assessment in my General Psychology class for nearly 15 years, and it has worked well for me and for the students. I could not have anticipated that something as simple as a change in environments could so easily derail my time-tested system. More specifically, in our efforts to make our classrooms on the Newark campus ergonomic, sleek, and functional, we have placed students only inches away from each other, meaning that the students’ tests (and answers) are positioned virtually in front of their neighbors on both sides of them.

In a normal classroom environment, students sit in individual desks that, although still uncomfortably close, are separated by feet, not inches. This makes cheating much more obvious, and dramatically reduces its frequency. I say this not from any speculation, but from personal experience. In a normal semester, I might discover two instances of cheating/copying in all five of my classes. This summer, on the Newark campus, I exposed 13 individual cases of academic dishonesty in only two classes! This does not include the several cases where students quickly dropped themselves from the class to avoid a disciplinary charge, nor does it count any cases that might have avoided my detection.

Of course, many of you reading this will likely wonder why I didn’t simply make numerous copies of my tests and pass them out in a manner that ensured that no student was sitting next to someone with the same test. Good suggestion (albeit a surprisingly time consuming one), but probably not something one would think of until such a situation presented itself, which is precisely why I am writing this article. It’s also not a fool-proof solution, since almost half of the instances of cheating occurred after I began using multiple versions of my tests, even though I had fully informed my students of the change!

In short, my experience this Summer taught me an important lesson. In order to ensure the integrity of your classes, anyone using Scantron tests on the Newark campus has two choices. 1. Use multiple versions of your tests, or 2. Invite your students to cheat.

SADLY...
Rosemary O’Neil

Last Spring we said good bye to Pilar Lewis.
This Fall we said good bye to Curtis Bressler.

So close on the heels of such a shocking and sad event, this newsletter is timely. It gives us a place to continue the conversation that began last week in the faculty forum on Fixed Flex. We sat with the silence, gathering our emotions, thoughts, and stories about Curtis. Grieving honors the person we lost and the space they shared in our heart. Grieving together, in a public forum, was pretty remarkable I think.

Driving home that afternoon, I had time to reflect. I was so touched by everyone in the room. I don't know of too many work places where people would pull together in such an open way to share their stories of a man they loved and admired with such honest and heartfelt expression. With the sudden news we were all in shock. Some of us were able to speak openly, and others of us were more private and quiet. One thing for sure is
that everyone was in a very open hearted space. So open and deep of heart, it was palpable.

For those who attended flex week’s diversity training, that open space had begun. There, we talked about noticing our differences and our similarities; to listen to what is said and not said; to sit with silence, not feeling like we have to rush to fill the space.

Curtis shared with Ron Travenick, that he felt noticed by the Ohlone Community. And maybe for one of the first times, felt like he had a place where he belonged and could thrive.

What a start to our semester. What a gift he ended up giving to us. We have come together and it is my hope that we can stay in this open space, where we notice each other, and nurture each other through the sorrow and the joys.

As my friend and colleague Maria Ramirez shared with me “Look what Curtis has brought about for our betterment”.

**EDITOR'S CORNER**

**UFO'S NEGOTIATION PROCESS**

*Heather McCarty*

This article is in response to questions that the editor received about the UFO’s negotiation process. This question was forwarded to Heather McCarthy, one of the two co-negotiators of UFO. The other co-negotiator for UFO is Darren Bardell.

As Alan has explained in the most recent Close Encounters, the UFO's approach to negotiating most resembles an interest based bargaining model. The ultimate goal is to find ways to meet everyone's needs and improve Ohlone. Many other colleges have antagonistic labor relations where it is an "us" verses "them" dichotomy, we've managed to largely avoid that at Ohlone over the years by working together to find arrangements that are mutually beneficial to all parties.

Darren Bardell and I represent all faculty, and Carol Lawton joined us during our most recent negotiations to bring insight to part-time issues at the table. Bob Bradshaw, Bennett Oppenheim, and Alan Kirshner remain available to us when we need consultation; we're very grateful for their historical memory. Currently Dean Mikelyn Stacey, HR Director Shairon Zingsheim, and Kathleen Johnson sit for the administration.

Last contract negotiations the administration's representatives were perpetually in flux. The only people consistently at the table were Deanna Mouser (a labor lawyer) and Kathleen Johnson; Mikelyn Stacey joined part-way through the process.

Each time we negotiate the contract we typically have three openers, in addition to salary which is automatically reopened. This means we can open any 3 issues/ sections of the contract in addition to salary. In order to determine which issues to address, Darren and I survey the faculty, both adjunct and full time. We then choose the 3 items that received the most requests, and we open those. We always open the the part-time employee section of the contract to address whatever issues our part-timers raise in the survey.

Darren and I draft an initial proposal and present it to the HR director and the administration's representatives. They respond to our proposal, and then provide their own initial proposal. The administration also the opportunity open items/ sections of the contract. Then we set dates and come to the table to negotiate.

Negotiations continue till w work our way through all the openers. The last contract and this contract have involved negotiating during the spring, the summer, and part-way into the fall. We're optimistic that when economic times are not as challenging and HR is fully staffed that the process will take less time.

After we come to a tentative agreement(TA) at the table, we take this TA back to our membership for ratification. If the TA is voted up, we're done. If the membership votes it down, we go back to the table.

If you have any questions about this process feel free to e-mail Heather at HMccarty@ohlone.edu

**OFFICE SPACE FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY**

*Carol Lawton*

UFO-Part-time representative

Last summer, members of the Faculty Senate worked with Jim Wright on obtaining seven vacant private faculty offices for Adjunct use.

- These will be "hoteled." Translation - each office will be used by different Adjunct Faculty at different times.
- Each office will have a desk a telephone connection and perhaps internet.
- If there is a large demand some of the other vacant offices will be made available.
- If you, Adjunct Faculty, are interested in future availability of office space check with your Dean.

Here is some additional information regarding Hoteling Offices:

1. Definition- Hoteling Offices are ‘temporarily’ assigned to Adjunct Faculty per semester.
2. Hoteling Offices are assigned to each Dean.
3. Hoteling Offices assignments will be based on Adjunct Faculty requests made DIRECTLY to the Dean’s office, and will be based off of class schedules. Office assignments will then be determined by the Dean’s office (keys will be requested) and notification to the adjunct faculty members of their office mates.
4. General work areas for Adjunct Faculty are still available for general drop-in work areas: Rooms 1407A and 2203B-E

FUN & FITNESS FOR THE OHLONE FAMILY
Alison Germaine

The Ohlone Family could benefit from more collaboration, communication & healthy competition; therefore, I am proposing the creation of faculty sports teams. Administration & staff would be invited to form teams as well & we would all play on/in existing on-campus areas (the pool, sports fields). We could form teams according to departments & students could attend games to cheer for their favorite staff member(s), teacher(s) or counselor(s).

For example, imagine the dynamic soccer game between the Nursing & History departments: the nurses score a goal; their fans erupt in cheers as they chant “Nice shot, Nurses!” Imagine how many spectators would attend a water polo game between the English & Math departments! Excitement would fill the air at a baseball game between Human Resources & Campus Security.

If a department were too small to form its own team, it could merge with another department to form a “blended team.” Teams would create team names, decide on uniforms, and work with team coaches to achieve success. Teams could potentially raise money for Ohlone, as well as serve as an example of Ohlone’s high regard for teamwork.

This is my idea, a work-in-progress, and I welcome your thoughts.

DID YOU KNOW?

PLANS TO REBUILD FACULTY AT OHLONE

At the September 1, 2010 senate meeting Jim Wright presented a plan to rebuild the full time faculty contingent by 2020. A few of the highlights:

For the 2007-2008 school year, Ohlone had 152 full time faculty, about 8500 FTES, and 68% of our sections were taught by full time instructors.

At the start of the 2010-2011 school year, Ohlone has 127 full time faculty, about 9000 FTES, and about 50% of our sections are taught by full time instructors.

Ohlone has a significantly lower number of full time faculty than California community colleges of similar size.

Dr. Wright's plan calls for us to get back to a level of 152 full time faculty by 2020.

The full plan can be found at this link: http://dev2.ohlone.edu/people2/joconnell/senate/docs/rebuilding.pdf

YOUR OPINION PLEASE...

The article below emphasizes the need for science faculty to get a more equitable lab: lecture pay. Paul Belasky and Yvette Nicolls have fought for this cause for over 5 years and some parts of this article may have appeared in a earlier edition of Close Encounters. This time, we are requesting UFO negotiators to bring back this issue on the table. If any faculty have any objections /arguments in favor or against this article please e-mail the editor and your comments will be published in the next newsletter.

INEQUITABLE TEACHER LOADS DUE TO LOWER WEIGHT FACTOR FOR SCIENCE LABS
Yvette Nicolls and Paul Belasky

Some Background and why the situation is inequitable

As things stand today, the science instructor who teaches a lab gets 71.4 cents on a dollar, when compared to the instructor who teaches a lecture of the same length. This situation is particularly inequitable for science faculty, and in 2006 a science faculty committee at Ohlone College decided to argue in favor of a more equitable ratio.

Each faculty member went out and inquired at all the nearby colleges to see if they faced a similar plight. It was found from this rough research that the schools with the most equitable (i.e., closest to 1-to-1) ratio had implemented this policy when the campus first began. That is to say, once a school has established a weight ratio, then it is more difficult to get it increased. And it’s easy to see why – the upward increase of cost in faculty salaries from even a tiny upward shift can amount to a great amount of increase in cost to the district per year. It was also discovered that the Ohlone College, together with several other Bay Area colleges, was at the bottom of the barrel and had the lowest lab/lecture weight ratio (then at 0.682). Why do we believe that this is not fair, especially for the science faculty?

When a science instructor teaches a lab, there are countless hours spent before and after the actual student contact hours. Yes, it’s true that the lab technician sets up the experiment. However, the instructor has to set up 30 stations for each lab practical prior to lab – which can easily require more than an hour. Furthermore, some smaller science department at Ohlone, such as Geology/Geography/Anthropology (and until recently Physics/Astronomy), do not have lab technicians at all. These faculty members do all the prep, set-up, and clean-up. Then after lab they have to grade the lab reports and practical papers. This
is in addition to grading lengthy lab reports – one or two reports per student each week. For a science instructor to teach 4 sections, they may have 120 lab reports, 120 lab practicals, 120 homework, and 120 tests or quizzes to grade every week -- conceivably up to 480 graded items.

Typical time spent by science faculty per week:
12 hr prep/grading for lecture per week
20 hr prep and grading for lab per week
2 hr ordering supplies; testing equipment and/or activities
6 hr lecture, student contact
15 hr lab, student contact
5 office hours

Science grand total = 60 hr per week

Compare this to an instructor who is teaching 4 sections of a subject with (non-science) lab. Below is the typical time spent by faculty who are paid for lab hours which require little or no preparation
12 hr prep/grading for lecture per week
2 hr ordering supplies; testing equipment and/or activities
6 hr lecture, student contact
15 hr lab, student contact
5 office hours, student contact

Non-science grand total = 40 hr per week

This is in addition to the time required to set up teaching demonstrations, expected in a quality science curriculum (and not part of the lab technician’s duties). Lab prep is very time consuming, because so often the instructor needs to modify the lab procedure for improved results. This all adds up to one conclusion: there is a big, big difference between teaching a “lab hour” for a science class than other classes – definitely far beyond what the word “lab” was originally intended to mean when the weighting factor was first implemented.

One obvious temptation would be for the science faculty to simply water down the science curriculum. All of us have heard of weak science curriculum offered at some colleges, where students never are tested on their lab skills - where labs are so weak and unchallenging that the instructor easily finishes all the grading before students leave the lab. Is this what we want at Ohlone?

Some achievements by the UFO in 2007

Bennett Oppenheim, the former UFO Union Negotiator who stepped down in 2008, achieved improvement to this ratio by fighting for the rights of all faculty who teach labs. He was successful in improving the weight from 0.682 to 0.714 for all labs, but only for the current contract with no guarantee that in the future it would not slide back to 0.682. So this was a start, but only a small, perhaps even a temporary step.

When asked what challenges he faced in achieving a more equitable weight ratio for the lab instructors, Bennett pointed to two concerns. From the viewpoint of the administration, the increased weight given to lab hours throughout all subjects (not just science) amounted to an expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars. The exact added expense is still the subject of disagreement. From the viewpoint of the UFO Faculty Union the increased weight for lab hours has adverse affect on the WSCH/FTES growth formula – potentially reducing funding that comes to Ohlone College from the state.

However, if the lab/lecture equity ratio is further improved for science lab faculty only, the fiscal effect would be far smaller – there are simply not that many science labs taught. And it is the right and a fair thing to do. But because science faculty are staggering under the long hours – exacerbated by the new 16-week semester, they virtually never serve on the governing bodies of College Council, Faculty Senate or Curriculum Committee. They are simply too busy coping with their teaching loads. As a result, the science faculty became underrepresented in important campus discussions. They simply don’t have time to become significantly involved in campus life outside their labs and lecture halls. Science issues are rarely heard; science faculty are almost invisible. This can’t go on forever.

Much Work is Left to be Done

What is the solution? Certainly Bennett Oppenheim urges the next faculty union negotiator to work patiently towards further increase of the weight for all lab hours from 0.714 to something more equitable. But science faculty and others propose to go further: why not have a more honest and truthful definition of the lab hour? Clearly it originally implied vastly less out-of-class prep time for the instructor than a lecture hour. The current weight was designed with this “hour” assumes minimal preparation and grading.

What is a lab hour any way? The PE instructor devotes lab hours when overseeing their students as they practice on the field. The art instructor devotes lab hours to listening in on headsets while the students practice their language skills. And math instructors devote hours to overseeing the tutoring center.

Do these instructors work as hard as the science instructor during their lab hours? Absolutely.

Do these instructors do any preparation and grading outside of the lab? Yes, but NOT as much as the instructors in science labs.

Science instructors are teaching a different sort of “lab hour”, so it needs to be called by a different name that implies the enormous amount of out-of-class work that it entails. Instead of “lab hour”, the science classes (and other subjects with enrichment activities which place heavy burden on the instructor) need to call these “science lab hour” or “research hour” – the name is unimportant. But the distinction needs to be made and the load inequity addressed accordingly. The science instructor deserves equal pay and equal load for science lab as compared to lecture, not 0.714. Otherwise, the science instructor at Ohlone must chose between offering students a weak, watery curriculum or a 60-hr work week.
Years have passed, and little has been done to address this science lab/lecture inequity. The situation is not getting any better for faculty who teach increasingly labor-intensive science labs. We are hoping that the Ohlone faculty, staff, and administration understand the fairness of our request, and we are asking for their solidarity and support.

**EDUCATION ARTICLES**

**CALIFORNIA MUST MAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE MORE AFFORDABLE BY RAISING STUDENT FEES.**

A recent article in the LA times, (Sept 27, 2010), emphasizes why California community colleges need to raise student fees. Their argument - raising fees would qualify the colleges for more federal money, helping to offset budget cuts and opening up space in classes students need.

The article states that in the second round of federal stimulus money for higher education, California's community colleges only received $5 million. That’s pittance compared to a $10-a-unit increase which would bring in $125 million more per year, and the state would still have the least expensive community colleges in the nation.

The $10 increase, would amounts to about $300 a year for the average student. The article states that this would in fact save the students money, as in the current situation, due to budget cuts, students are not able to get into the classes they need. Because of this, many of the students have to spend an extra semester or even a year to earn the credits needed for a degree, certificate or transfer. One extra semester of living expenses costs a lot more than $300.

The extra money that would be available by increasing student fees would be used for (a) offering more classes for the students and (b) waiving the fees for students who can’t afford them.

In fact a 2009 report by the state Legislative Analyst's Office suggested raising student fees by $14 a unit. The office also reported that higher fees do not keep students from enrolling, but lack of classes does. Community college enrollment has fallen by 200,000 this academic year, which the colleges attribute to the unavailability of classes.

**UFO NEWSLETTER GOES GREEN**

All full and part time faculty at Ohlone College will be receiving an electronic copy of the newsletter by e-mail. Some hard copies of the newsletter will be available outside the mailroom. If for some reason, you are not able to obtain a hard-copy from the mail room, please e-mail the editor (aganguly@ohlone.edu) and request a hard copy.

We want to hear from you

Please send your comments and feedback regarding this newsletter to the editor at aganguly@ohlone.edu

This newsletter is a publication of the United Faculty of Ohlone
Ohlone Community College District bond proposition, Measure G (November 2010)

An Ohlone Community College District bond proposition, Measure G is on the November 2, 2010 ballot for voters in the Ohlone Community College District in Alameda County.

A 55% supermajority vote is required for approval of Measure G.

Ohlone Community College has campuses in Fremont and Newark, and an enrollment of about 20,000 students.

Ballot question

OHLOYNE COLLEGE JOB TRAINING/QUALITY EDUCATION LOCAL BOND:

To improve and continue affordable college education, job training/workforce preparation by constructing/acquiring equipment/sites/facilities and making repairs/upgrades, including:

- Renovating classrooms/science laboratories,
- Acquiring up-to-date classroom technology,
- Upgrading for earthquake/fire safety, and
- Improving disabled access,

shall Ohlone Community College District issue $349,000,000 of bonds, at legal rates with all funds spent locally, independent citizens’ oversight, annual audits, no money for administrators’ salaries or Sacramento?

The UFO executive board recommends

YES on Measure G