

# HARTNELL COLLEGE



**Academic Senate Response to the  
Self Study in Support of  
Reaffirmation of Accreditation**

Submitted by

**The Hartnell College Academic Senate**

156 Homestead Avenue

Salinas, CA 93901

(831) 755-6700

[http://www.hartnell.cc.ca.us/academic\\_senate/](http://www.hartnell.cc.ca.us/academic_senate/)

to

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges**

**Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

March 2007

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>STANDARD ONE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS .....	3
ESL .....	3
Other ALC labs .....	5
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND CONSISTENCY WITH GOALS .....	6
<b>STANDARD TWO.....</b>	<b>8</b>
PROGRAM AND SERVICES REVIEW.....	8
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs).....	10
COLLEGE PRIORITIES: INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND DISTANCE EDUCATION ...	11
COLLEGE SERVICES .....	12
Counseling .....	12
<b>STANDARD THREE .....</b>	<b>14</b>
EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEARNING EFFECTIVENESS .....	15
COLLEGE INSTRUCTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS.....	15
Faculty Positions.....	15
Staff Positions .....	17
QUALITY AND CONTINUITY OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES.....	17
BUDGET COMMITTEE.....	18
FINANCIAL PRACTICES .....	20
Budgeting.....	20
Financial Standards.....	21
TECHNOLOGY .....	22
<b>STANDARD FOUR .....</b>	<b>25</b>
THE STATUS OF SHARED GOVERNANCE.....	26
HONESTY AND INTEGRITY .....	27
THE GOVERNING BOARD.....	27
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION .....	29
ACTION PLAN.....	30
Proposal.....	30
Process .....	30
Questions.....	30
Timeline .....	30

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

### Standard 1

Exhibit No.	Page	Exhibit Type/Name
1	4	Language Lab Job Announcement
2	4	Language Lab Technology Response
3	4	Language Lab Hours (2004 – 2007)
4	5	Computer Center Lab Hours (2003, 2006)
5	6	Community Survey Final Report
6	7	Student Opinion Survey
7	7	PowerPoint—Enrollment at Adjacent Community Colleges

### Standard 2

Exhibit No.	Page	Exhibit Type/Name
8	8	Comments to Site Visit from Fall 2000
9	9	Discontinuance Process
10	9	Program Analysis (consultant report)
11	10	AVMA Program Analysis
12	10	Comments to Site Visit from Fall 2000 (see Exhibit 7)
13	11	Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary for Programs
14	12	PowerPoint—Committing to Distance Education

### Standard 3

Exhibit No.	Page	Exhibit Type/Name
15	15	PAWS Waitlist—English Courses Fall 2006
16	15	Faculty Seniority Lists (2003 – 2007)
17	15	Job Announcement—Physics Instructor Spring 2007
18	16	EIS Physics Enrollment Data
19	16	Comments to Board—October 3, 2006
20	17	Crisis Counseling Center Information
21	17	Crisis Counseling Center Survey Results
22	18	Institutional Planning Committee Handbook definition
23	18	Budget Committee Handbook definition
24	19	Budget Committee Meeting Schedule
25	20	Budget Comparison 1996-1997 vs. 2006-2007
26	20	FTES Revenue Comparison
27	20	Class offering reduction
28	21	Information Requests/Repetitive Responses
29	21	Assessment by Phil Adams
30	21	CPA Audit Report
31	22	<i>Salinas Californian</i> article—“Hartnell Chamber Still Split Over Project,” Bond Oversight Committee minutes
32	22	Technology Issues email from the VP of Academic Technologies

<b>Standard 4</b>		
<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Exhibit Type/Name</b>
33	26	Comments to Site Visit from Fall 2000 (see Exhibit 7)
34	26	Senate Resolution 207—Shared Governance
35	26	<a href="http://www.hartnell.edu/academic_senate/governance.html">http://www.hartnell.edu/academic_senate/governance.html</a>
36	27	<i>Salinas Californian</i> article—“Look for the facts in the Hartnell faculty dispute”
37	27	<i>Salinas Californian</i> article—Hartnell faculty complaints unfounded
38	28	<a href="http://www.hartnell.edu/board/">http://www.hartnell.edu/board/</a>
39	29	Prior Accreditation reports—1995 through 2003
40	29	Comments to Site Visit from Fall 2000 (see Exhibit 7)

## INTRODUCTION

The Institutional Self Study in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation Report should accurately analyze the strengths and weaknesses of an institution and how it intends to improve. The purpose of accreditation is to honestly evaluate the institution's performance against standards. A Self Study should be a college's frank observations of its strengths, weaknesses and progress toward the standards. It is with this philosophy that the Academic Senate reviewed the Self Study and prepared this Response. The Senate's intention is to directly address some areas in need of improvement. Faculty take pride in the work they do to educate students and fulfill the faculty role in governance. The college is important to us and we are interested in continued improvements. However, improvements cannot be made without a true evaluation of the current state of Hartnell College.

The Hartnell College Academic Senate realizes that the Self Study is designed to take an honest look at the College and its effectiveness. This Response to the Self Study is intended to give the reader a factual picture of what exists.

The faculty believes the strengths of the college include:

- Highly qualified and outstanding faculty
- Effective teaching and learning
- Student success demonstrated through graduation, transfer rates, and employment
- Collaboration among faculty and staff on the Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, Distance Education Task Force, and Student Learning Outcomes Work Group, for example

However, the faculty believes that the mission of the college is seriously undermined by the following:

- The disengagement between planning and budgeting
- The lack of support for full-time staffing of academic areas as well as classified positions
- The distortion of shared governance
- The negative impact of Administrative decision-making

The Self Study would lead readers to believe that the college is progressing in a harmonious, collaborative environment, with much attention paid to planning and integrating this planning throughout the work of the college. This is incorrect. In the pages that follow, we illustrate some of the most important areas where the Academic Senate sees the Self Study not reflecting the reality of the college.

This report is not an attempt to sabotage the accreditation process or portray the college in a bad light. On the contrary, the Academic Senate recognizes many positive and effective college programs. However, the Academic Senate knows we can do better. The first step in doing better is to recognize and address the weaknesses.

In the following pages, the Academic Senate has described some key areas of concern. They are categorized by standards and include supporting evidence in the exhibits followed by a summary and proposed action plan to address and resolve those concerns within the purview of the Academic Senate.

**STANDARD ONE  
INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS**

- A1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.**
- B1. The institution maintains ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.**
- B2. 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 collaborative toward their achievement.**
- B3. 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.**
- B4. 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.**
- B5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.**
- B6. 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.**
- B7. 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.**

**STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS**

**ESL.** The Self Study states that “Spanish and languages other than English are the primary languages spoken in large numbers of homes in several communities in the Salinas Valley” (p. xi). In addition it provides numerous statistics on the demographics of our student population as follows:

- 57% of our students are Latinos.
- 41%+ of our college’s students are non-native speakers

- 45%+ of local residents have less than a high school education
- 80%+ have less than a college education.

These statistics reflect to a large degree who our students are and the population that we serve. Hartnell College has been federally designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution and has been the recipient of a number of grants as a result of this status. We therefore would expect that learning programs would be especially aligned with the needs of our students who require basic skills/remedial courses in areas such as English, math, ESL and computer technology. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that the college gives a high priority to our ESL program or basic skills courses, which are offered under the auspices of the Academic Learning Center (ALC).

In 2004 the College hired a full time faculty Language Lab Specialist in order to meet the needs of language learners. A Language Acquisition Lab had been created for those students learning a new language. Here they were to use technology for listening practice, reading practice, and other activities necessary for language acquisition. Modern language learning relies more and more on technology and the development of the lab and the Lab Specialist faculty position were positive steps for the ESL program (Exhibit 1).

However, the reality of the situation has not been at all positive. The technology in the language lab has been problematic. The computers in the lab did not allow the students to hear the audio from the website that accompanied the text. Requests for technical support were met with the response “we will try to get there as soon as possible” (Exhibit 2). Meanwhile, the Language Lab courses ESL 136 and ESL 146, which are pronunciation and oral/aural practice courses, could not operate as the course outline of record and the course catalog describes. The instructor was forced to resort to using the old technology. It had to be taught with all students together using a tape player, rather than meeting the individual needs of the students.

While originally the Lab was open 20.5 hours per week, by fall 2006 the Language Lab open lab hours were limited to 11.5 hours per week. In spring 2006, further cuts were made to the Language Acquisition Lab hours. Hours have now been cut back to only 9.5 hours per week (Exhibit 3). This schedule is extremely limited given the need of our second language student population (41%) and begs the question “Why?” The Language Lab should be serving the students from many courses that have either a mandatory lab or an optional lab component. For example, there are reading courses, grammar courses, and oral/aural courses that have a lab component. Given that the Lab has been equipped and the Specialist hired, it is inefficient to not fully use those resources.

Besides the inefficiencies in the Language Acquisition Lab, the ESL program has other problems that point to the low priority that the program has been accorded by the administration. For example, the program has lost full-time faculty that have not been replaced. In addition, a full-time faculty member on maternity leave has not been replaced with a full-time temporary position. There is no evidence that any of the recommendations from the ESL Program Review documents have been acted upon or even passed along to those who could act on them.

A third area of concern for the ESL program is the ESL assessment. The Self Study indicates that ESL faculty have developed an assessment to measure ESL writing competencies that has been validated locally and that has been approved by the Chancellor's Office (p. 59 and 72). However, ESL faculty report that they also need assessment and placement instruments that measure listening, reading, and speaking. While these instruments exist and are in use at other colleges, such as American River and Golden West, no attempt has been made by our institution to acquire such instruments.

An in-class survey of students by an ESL faculty member has also revealed that many students are self-placing, are not being given appropriate guidance about whether to take ESL or English placement tests, and are not being allowed to take the English assessment once they have taken the ESL placement and vice versa. All of this results in students being incorrectly placed in ESL and developmental English classes.

Finally, there are problems with the way the assessment results are handled. Most importantly, the tests are not being read and scored in the same way that they were when the test was validated. Each test should be read by two readers, with a third reader if the first two don't agree. The readers were paid and had paid training, including a norming session. These components were an important part of the validation of the assessment, yet they have been discontinued. This is a problem not only with compliance to Standard 1, but with Standard 2B3.e which requires the college to regularly evaluate placement instruments and practices to evaluate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

**Other ALC labs.** The Language Lab is not the only lab to have hours cut during the last year or two. The Computer Center serves as the primary instructional area on campus for students taking classes that require a computer component. Faculty who teach in the Computer Center are instructors of record for the self-paced computer courses. These faculty also provide supplemental/tutorial instruction to students who are coming into the Center to work on assignments for other classes that require computer use. In addition, the Computer Center faculty offers support to online students who need access to computers or assistance in navigating and using the course management system used at Hartnell College. In 2003, the Computer Center was open six days a week, providing instructional support for a total of 61 hours. As of Spring 2007, while the Center remains open six days a week, the hours have been reduced to 41 (Exhibit 4). Furthermore, the decision was made this semester (Spring 2007) to close the Computer Center altogether for the summer. Therefore, no instructional support will be available during "out-of-class" time for those students who will be taking courses requiring computer use.

With the reduction in hours and instructors, students who are employed during the day are being affected the most because evening and weekend hours have been cut. This results in a small window of time during which these students have access to computer resources and instructional support. While computers are available in the library, there is no instructional support available. The library is also closed for weekend hours, thus eliminating that resource completely.

The Math Lab has similarly experienced cuts in hours. The Lab now closes one hour earlier and it is open only 3 nights per week rather than 4. Another cut experienced in the Math Lab is that full time faculty are no longer able to work in the lab as part of their load or as overload. In

addition, there are peak hours where previously there were two instructors and now there is only one. These cuts are a direct result of the fact that the budget for the Academic Learning Center has been reduced, and much of what remains comes from grant funding.

## **INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND CONSISTENCY WITH GOALS**

The disconnectedness between the E&FMP, the Self Study, and the institution demonstrates that “vision without resources is hallucination.”

The Self Study makes numerous references to the essential nature of the Educational and Facilities Master plan (E&FMP), e.g. (Standard One, p. 12). The 2004 update of the E&FMP is, indeed, an expansive document including:

- Analysis of District demographics and projections regarding population patterns, employment trends, etc., with extensive documentation
- Various existing grants and strategic initiatives
- Goals (short, medium and long-term) of the various institutional divisions, including goals for program development and staffing
- Similar language for student services, the library and the business office

In contrast to the Self Study, the E&FMP does provide considerable detail regarding progress to date (2004) in the specific programs. Current staffing shortages are identified and future staffing shortages are foreseen, and budget implications identified.

Although the Self Study asserts (p. 12) that “each unit . . . reviews its portion of the plan . . . and makes changes and additions based upon input from their constituencies . . .” few faculty have seen the report and faculty in general are unaware of any serious effort to realize these goals. Indeed, the Self Study is replete with repetitive references to numerous surveys and reports (few of which are more recent than 2005) but lacking in any evidence of implementation. Nonetheless, the E&FMP was duly updated in 2006, on schedule ([http://www.hartnell.edu/h/oversight/report/FEIR\\_Hartnell.pdf](http://www.hartnell.edu/h/oversight/report/FEIR_Hartnell.pdf)). However, a review of the most recent E&FMP update will only show an environmental impact report regarding construction on Hartnell’s main campus. The update was prepared and presented by an outside contractor for buildings that were being planned.

The Self Study cites heavily various surveys performed by the Institutional Research and Planning Office (<https://www.hartnell.edu/irp/reports.html>) regarding student satisfaction, community needs, and other topics. The self-evaluation for standard A1 (p. 2) states, “The results of recent surveys also show that 88% of the community respondents agree that Hartnell course offerings meet community needs, and 53% of the student respondents are satisfied with course availability . . .” Upon examination, it was found that only 400 surveys were sent out, and yet we serve a population of 255,000. In addition, it is worth noting that the sample was not random. The 2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report (Exhibit 5) states that “Those surveyed

included representatives from the Hartnell College advisory committees, and the Boards of Trustees/Directors for Hartnell College, the Foundation, and the Western Stage. In addition, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of athletic program boosters, public school administrators, city and county officials, and business and civic leaders” (p. 1). While a random sample of 400 could validly represent a population of 255,000, this was not a random sample. Thus drawing conclusions about the population is not valid. Furthermore, it should be noted that of the 400 surveys sent out, 66 responses were received. Thus, the 88% satisfaction represents a response of 60 out of the 66 responding. It is also only 60 responses out of 400 surveys. Once again these responses seem to represent a small self-selected group.

In the 2005 Student Opinion Survey (Exhibit 6), the results indicate that, “The typical respondent was a 19 year old or younger Latina freshman who attended full-time during the day and whose educational goal was to transfer to a four-year college or university. She also worked part-time, did not receive financial aid, and was pursuing a career in the health professions” (p. 1). While this may very well be representative of the typical respondent for this particular survey, these characteristics are not in alignment with our typical student as is illustrated in the following table. (percentages are taken from the Introduction to the Self Study)

<b>Typical Respondent</b>	<b>Hartnell Student Demographics</b>
19 years old	22% of the students were less than 20 years old
Full-time, day	48% attended classes during the day
Goal - transfer	22% intended to transfer to a four-year college
Doesn't receive aid	Nearly 60% of all Hartnell students receive some form of financial aid

Another report about our students was presented at a 2006 Board meeting by the IRP office. The study documented the exodus of students from Hartnell to adjacent community colleges (Exhibit 7). It indicates that these students are typically white and male and recommends that it would be useful to find out why these students are not enrolling at Hartnell. Although the report was published in August 2006, the data were collected from 2000 through fall semester of 2004. Sufficient time had passed so that some kind of analysis and planning should have been developed by the time of publication. Instead, when asked in August 2006 why these students were leaving, the IRP director’s answer was, “Well, we don’t know. They are not our students anymore, therefore we can’t ask them.”

In conclusion, Hartnell College does administer a number of surveys as indicated in the Self Study. However, it is fair to ask whether the conclusions drawn by survey results are valid. It is also important to look for evidence that any actions come as a result of the knowledge gained.

## **STANDARD TWO STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES**

- A1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and met the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.**
- A2. 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.**
  - A2.e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.**
  - A2.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.**
- B1. 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.**
- B3.d. The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.**
- B4. 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.**

### **PROGRAM AND SERVICES REVIEW**

Program and Services Review is an example of a process that is mentioned throughout the self study, but unfortunately is not integrated into the College in the way it is portrayed. In comments made to the visiting team in 2000-01, the Academic Senate noted that Program and Services Review had been developed but that the college had not begun to implement it until shortly before the site visit. There was little institutional interest in a review process that allowed for continuous evaluation with integration of the evaluation results into planning and resource allocation (Exhibit 8). After the 2000-01 site visit, instructional programs were reviewed on a

scheduled basis, so the Senate was hopeful that the Program and Services Review process would be fully implemented. The process includes the review of services (including both student services and administrative services) as well as instructional programs. While the Self Study states that “As of 2005, each program at the college has undergone Program Review” (p. 25), it says little about the comprehensiveness of either the student services reviews (called P.E.E.R.) or administrative services review, indicating only “The process for Administrative Support Program Review has been developed” and “During 1998-99. . .the Student Services review process was piloted with the Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS)” (p. 32).

We urge the team to look carefully for evidence that the Board approved Program *and Services* Review is taking place on a wide scale. Which student services departments have undergone P.E.E.R. Review since the pilot? Which administrative services departments have undergone review? Has the Program and Services Review Committee (P&SRC) published a schedule with a review cycle for these departments? Most importantly, is there any evidence that the results are integrated into planning and resource allocation?

The self study makes the following claims (p. 25)

The recommendations of Program and Services Review are utilized in the enhancement of instructional programs, instructional resources, and student services. In addition they are used for accreditation, hiring, institutional planning and budget development;

As a result, program evaluation has been integrated into institutional evaluation and planning as intended.

This was the intent of those developing the process; however, the Self Study provides no evidence that this is so. In fact, program review documents have been received by the P&SRC but no written recommendations by the committee have been forwarded to the departments, the Institutional Planning Team, the Hiring Committee, or the Budget Committee. Therefore, the collection and analysis of data never results in any planning or resource allocation.

The Animal Health Technology program is one example of the disconnectedness of Program and Services Review from allocation of resources, planning, and improvement. Since 2003, the AHT program had endured two highly disruptive facility moves. The program director left in December 2005 to take a dean position elsewhere and no replacement hiring was planned; as a result, the program was left with no full-time faculty. Despite excellent student performance on national and California licensing exams and demonstrated need in the community, in spring 2006 the program was targeted for discontinuance. Students and community members flocked to Board meetings and wrote letters urging the Board to take action to save the program. As a result of student and community voices, the Board took interest. The Academic Senate also took action, reminding the administration that there was a Board-approved process for discontinuing any program (Exhibit 9). Consequently, a “program analysis” of the AHT program was conducted by a hired consultant, which was completely outside the Board-approved program review process (Exhibit 10). Ironically, in March 2005, the AHT program had just completed Hartnell’s Program Review process in conjunction with its accreditation by AVMA. The result

was a detailed analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, along with recommendations (Exhibit 11). If the P&SRC was operating as intended, the administration would have known that it already had an analysis of the program. In addition, if the recommendations made by the program faculty and the AVMA in the program review documents had been addressed, the crisis could have been lessened or eliminated altogether.

This is not an isolated incident. We urge you to look for evidence that the results of the Program and Services Review Process are actually used as they should be and as the self study claims they are. Unless there is a visible institutional commitment to using the results and integrating the findings of program review into planning, budget development, and hiring priorities, it will be difficult for faculty to take much interest in this process. The Senate had the same concerns about the lack of institutional commitment to Program and Services Review at the time of the last Self Study in 2000 (Exhibit 12) and little has changed.

### **STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs)**

The Self Study is inaccurate in describing the progress in identifying and assessing student and program learning outcomes. The college has made progress in determining how student learning outcomes will be implemented at Hartnell. Members of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group (SLOAWG) are applying to the Academic Senate to become a shared governance committee and developing their function, structure and committee linkages for the Committee Handbook. Faculty in many disciplines have begun working on SLOs at the discipline level. On campus training has been done with many faculty and the SLO coordinator regularly reports at Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee meetings. However the Self Study gives the impression that the college has completed much of the implementation of SLOs and this is not the case. The Self Study is also inaccurate in some of the facts about the work that has been done on SLOs.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have not been developed for each new course. They are not part of the Course Outline of Record submitted to the Curriculum Committee. However, some disciplines have identified SLOs for some courses. For example, the English faculty have identified SLOs for English 1A, have developed an assessment rubric, and have collected and assessed the data. The Math faculty have identified SLOs for Beginning Algebra, have developed an assessment instrument and have collected data. No mathematics data has yet been evaluated. The Disabled Students Program and Services faculty and staff have identified program outcomes and conducted a pre-post survey to use as an assessment instrument. Other disciplines are similarly in different stages of SLO development.

In contrast to the claims in the self-study, the official course outlines do not (and will not) identify SLOs for each course. Instead, the Curriculum Committee has determined that SLOs will be listed separately from the course outline form. Discussions at the Curriculum Committee have centered around the need for SLOs to be more fluid than the course outline and the fact that SLOs are not required for each course (especially in light of limited resources for assessment of the SLOs).

The Self Study seems to consider the ideas of course objectives (on the Course Outline of Record) and course learning outcomes to be identical. This is not the case. Neither the Curriculum Committee, nor the SLO work group has defined SLOs to be the course objectives on the outline. Similarly the Self Study confuses methods of assessment, recorded on the course outline and used in individual courses, with formal assessment of course level SLOs.

Although a number of disciplines on campus are progressing with the assessment methods, all work on measuring student learning is greatly hindered by limited institutional support. No monies have been released for training, all travel expenditures have been cancelled and the new faculty co-chair of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group has been denied access to off campus training. There is no evidence that funds are available for purchasing assessment instruments, should faculty determine that such instruments are needed to assess outcomes. Even a relatively small institutional commitment, clerical support to take minutes at SLO Work Group meetings, has been denied. The Chair takes notes as she runs the meetings.

SLOs for the program and institutional levels have begun but are nowhere near complete. Prior to formation of the SLO work group in 2003, an Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Subcommittee (subcommittee of the Institutional Planning Committee) was formed to assist in several research-related tasks including:

1. Developing and monitoring the institutional effectiveness assessment plan
2. Providing information for institutional planning and decision making

This committee, composed of faculty, administrators and classified staff, developed an Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Implementation Process which included procedures for assessing Transfer Education, General Education, Career Preparation Developmental Education, Workforce Development and Community Education, Student and Career Development, Access, Retention, Campus Diversity, Student Goal Attainment, Technology and Personnel.

This committee researched and discussed several instruments for assessing general education including College BASE, The Academic Profile, and CAAP for assessing students' general education learning. The committee recommended that the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) be used to assess student learning in writing, math, and critical thinking. However, there has been no further development of institutional student learning outcomes or assessment and many questions have not been resolved. For example, the Student Learning Outcomes Plan of 2003 (Exhibit 13) calls for instituting embedded test questions into departmental math exams in certain courses. However, the math department faculty have not ever had departmental final exams and there is no evidence that this proposed plan was ever presented to the math department faculty.

#### **COLLEGE PRIORITIES: INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND DISTANCE EDUCATION**

The Self Study calls into question the priorities of the leadership of the college. The report states in 3 A1a that, "The College is challenged by greater needs for academic employees than there are funds to support them and expects this to be the case for the next several years" (p. 90). On the other hand it points out in 3 A2 how "the College's organizational structure continues to be

adjusted to meet the changing needs and challenges of the College” (pp.97-98). While it appears that the College will be unable to meet academic staffing needs, it has experienced a 30% increase in management positions since 2000 (p. 97).

The Self Study discusses the ability of the College to “readjust its management structure to support the changes in the Board’s Goals” (p. 98). It continues to discuss the Board goal of expanding international student enrollment and the new positions created to support this goal (Coordinator of International Intercultural Education Programs and Dean of Institutional Advancement). The Senate would like the visiting team to be aware that both faculty and staff have questioned the priority being placed on the International Education Program. This program, which as of Spring 2007 has an enrollment of only 27 students, has a dedicated director and staff. Meanwhile, our distance education program, which has 1,042 students as of Spring 2007 census, does not have a full-time dedicated director position. The Director of the Academic Learning Center also has responsibility for distance education. The Self Study addresses distance education in Standard One stating that “The College recognizes that distance education development is needed and continues to develop vocational as well as general education online offerings” (p. 2). Yet, it continues to be reluctant to provide funding to continue this development. A presentation was made to the leadership team in Spring 2006 by four faculty members to educate the leadership and encourage and promote distance education growth (Exhibit 14). Initially, there was some response by management and meetings were coordinated with the faculty team. However, because of the financial troubles facing the college, efforts to focus on Distance Education growth have come to a halt.

As mentioned earlier, there is no dedicated director position for distance education at the college, and yet International Education is supported by both a director and program coordinator. The only clerical/staff position that was somewhat allocated for distance education was vacated nine months ago and has not been filled. The instructional technologist who supports distance education is part-time and is also tasked with technical and training support for the satellite at Natividad, along with training and support for the Faculty Resource Center on our main campus. The College has made the argument that while there are fewer international students than distance education students, they bring in eight times the amount of funding that a local student does. If this is the rationale for putting dollars and support into the International Student Program versus distance education, it directly contradicts our mission statement that “Hartnell College provides the leadership and resources to ensure that **all** students shall have equal access to a quality education and the opportunity to pursue and achieve their goals.” (Catalog, p. 1)

## **COLLEGE SERVICES**

**Counseling.** The Self Study acknowledges that there is “increased pressure” on counselors to do more with less (p. 69). It goes on to say that “The counseling director has held discussions regarding the need for ‘academic advisors.’ What the Self Study fails to mention is that the Counseling Department is strongly opposed to the concept of academic advisors. One of the unique and most significant aspects of the California community college system is the access to professional counselors.

Counselors with their educational background and professional training have been designated as the “providers of these counseling programs and services” (Ed. Code and Hartnell Board Policy No. 3170). As professionals, counselors annually attend seminars, workshops and association conferences to stay current and competent with the critical information which students need to complete their educational and career goals.

While the Counseling department does oppose academic advisors, it has held discussions on “**peer advisors**” i.e. students who would be trained to assist other students with forms, procedures and other non-professional activities. Peer advisors might also be used, in conjunction with the professional counselor, for outreach purposes.

The Self Study also admits that the counseling division has difficulty maintaining high school recruitment efforts at the same time as continuing its retention efforts with current students (69). It notes a lack of funds for hiring additional hourly counselors. It doesn't mention that because of the high student to counselor ratio, counseling appointments are scheduled for fifteen minutes only. When, as often happens, an educational plan cannot be completed in fifteen minutes, the student is expected to make a second appointment and return to have the plan completed. At the very least, the planning agenda for this item should include some planning for improving the student to counselor ratio or the time per counseling appointment.

## **STANDARD THREE RESOURCES**

- A1. 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 those programs and services.**
- A1c. 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.**
- A2. The institution maintains 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.**
- A.6 Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.**
- B1. 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.**
- C1. 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.**
- C1.a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.**
- C1.b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.**
- D1. The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.**
- D1.a Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.**
- D1.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.**
- D2. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.**

**D3. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.**

**EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEARNING EFFECTIVENESS**

As is mentioned throughout the Self Study, the SLO group was established in 2003, and work has been in progress for the development of course level and program level SLOs. The Self Study states in the Standard 3.A1c Planning Agenda that it will “Negotiate with faculty association to include effectiveness in producing stated student learning outcomes as a component of the faculty evaluation” (p. 96). However, in October 2006 the faculty association and the district completed negotiations for contracts through August 2008 with no mention of evaluation tools to meet this standard. In addition, the planning agenda for this standard only addresses evaluation of faculty for effectiveness in producing learning outcomes. However, learning outcomes exist at every level of the institution: the course level, programs and services level, and institutional level. We are all stakeholders in the process. Therefore, the Planning agenda must address the inclusion of evaluation criteria for all employees, not just faculty.

**COLLEGE INSTRUCTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS**

As reported in our discussion in Standard One, many in-district students are choosing to attend other colleges such as MPC and Cabrillo. Since this trend was not analyzed by the office of Institutional Research and Planning, we are left to speculate as to the reasons that these students aren't attending Hartnell. One possible explanation is that full-time faculty positions are not being filled, resulting in a decreased number of sections being offered for high-demand classes. For example, in spring 2005 there were a total of 421 students on waiting lists for English classes alone. In fall 2006 the number of students on waiting lists for English classes had climbed to 551 students (Exhibit 15).

**Faculty Positions.** In Standard Three, the Self Study discusses the process of hiring full-time faculty (p. 90-93) and admits to shortcomings in the currency of job descriptions, etc. It states that 117 faculty were employed at Hartnell as of fall 2005, a 7% increase since 2000 (p. 97). However, as of 2006, the number of full-time faculty is 104, a 4.6% decrease since 2000 (Exhibit 16). While we do meet the Chancellor's Office Full-Time Faculty obligation of approximately 104 (which is a **minimum** requirement), the number of full-time teaching faculty has decreased through retirements and attrition. Those positions are not being filled, thus impacting instructional programs. What follows is one example of the impact of recent hiring freezes on academic programs:

As of fall 2006, Hartnell College had no full-time physics instructor and no approval by the Board to hire one. For the fall semester, Hartnell hired three adjunct physics instructors, only one of whom returned in spring 2007. The Board did approve hiring a full-time temporary instructor, but for spring only (Exhibit 17). The hiring process was not timely and interviews for the position were not even conducted until the second week of the semester. The retired instructor covered classes for the first five weeks of class, until the new instructor could start. The Board has not approved any hiring for Physics for fall 2007. Presumably the college intends to resume staffing with adjunct instructors only.

Why do we need a permanent physics instructor, i.e., someone who not only teaches classes but assumes responsibility for the program? This is a core science, required not only for physical sciences but life sciences. Math majors apply their mathematical concepts in physics. Hartnell has secured over \$1.5 million in grants to support its engineering program and to promote science education, including:

- STEP grant, which promotes college preparedness for students planning to study math and science (\$902,000)
- NASA-CIPA grant to upgrade engineering education with project management training at Hartnell (\$400,000)
- CSEMS grant to provide scholarship support for computer science, math and engineering students at Hartnell (\$190,000)
- MESA program to provide academic support for financially disadvantaged students of math, science and engineering (\$81,500, with equivalent matching funds provided by the district)

These initiatives suffer without a full-time permanent physics instructor to drive and develop the physics program.

It is perhaps premature to identify consequences of the instability in the physics program, but the downward shifts in enrollments in physics classes is suggestive (Exhibit 18). Will these trends spread to the related disciplines as well?

The physics example is especially egregious, but the administration is not filling other critical positions, either. The English department has lost 3 full-time faculty positions in the last two years, leaving 8 full-time instructors to support 78 sections. None of these positions is slated to be filled despite demand for classes in this discipline. Hartnell is aggressively trying to establish new programs in health professions as well as strengthen its nursing program, but the anatomy instructor retired and the Board has not approved the hiring of a replacement. This is a Hispanic-serving institution, yet an ESL instructor position remains unfilled, the replacement of a retired ESL instructor has not been approved and no action was taken to temporarily replace an ESL instructor on maternity leave. The administration cites declining enrollments as a reason to make faculty cuts and dismisses efforts to justify staffing needs as “political pressure” (Self Study, p. 107). This is a distortion of both the hiring process described in the Self Study (Self Study, p. 90) and the planning delineated in the Educational and Facilities Master Plan. Failing to fill these positions negatively impacts the quality and continuity of programs, and will not increase enrollments. While adjunct faculty teach classes, they have little incentive and no responsibility to serve on committees, develop curriculum, or contribute to long-term planning in a substantial way.

In recognition of this long-standing situation, faculty have publicly addressed concern over faculty attrition repeatedly during the last year, including presentations at Board meetings (Exhibit 19).

**Staff Positions.** In addition to not filling faculty positions, many staff positions on campus remain unfilled. As a result of inadequate planning, both in terms of human resources and financial resources, top management unilaterally reassigned staff in the latter part of the Fall 2006. This was done without input or consultation from faculty or staff. Staff who were providing full-time administrative services have had the time for those positions reduced by 50%, with the remainder of their workload in grant funded positions. These individuals are now filling multiple job positions at various locations both on the main-campus and also at satellite locations. In essence, they are performing two-to-three job functions that previously required 40 hours per week per staff member. As a result, administrative services and products are not adequate. For example, there is currently no administrative assistant in Occupational Education, the staffing in the Office of Instruction has been reduced by 50%; the Math/Science Division Office, the Academic Learning Center, and other offices have suffered staff cuts as well. There are academic divisions where teaching contracts for the Spring 2007 semester have not been generated as we enter the fifth week of the semester. There is one individual who is supporting three different areas by assisting with scheduling and payroll. A staff member in the Administrative Information Systems area is currently handling help desk functions, payroll functions, and serving as the administrative support for the Medical Laboratory Technician program. There is no evidence that these reassignments and staff cuts were made as a result of an analysis of efficiency or needs. Nor is there evidence that the cuts were the result of the Program and Services Review or Planning processes.

## **QUALITY AND CONTINUITY OF STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES**

The Self Study cites the College's Crisis Counseling Center as one of the accomplishments since the last accreditation. Hartnell College and the RHORC have supported, operated, and pilot tested a small-scale Crisis Counseling Center since April 2004 (Exhibit 20). This program was supported by outside grants, which end in June of 2007. Our Crisis Center has developed supervisory, administrative, and service delivery protocols. The Center has served over 130 clients using three to four Masters in Family Therapy Interns. These clients were 61 percent Latino and 33 percent white. The project's demographics reflect the local population and demonstrate how to provide access to mental health services to an underrepresented population. The Center's clients expressed a high level of satisfaction with the services they received, rating the program an average of 4.8 on a scale of 5.0 (Exhibit 21).

Benefits of the Crisis Center to the College and the students are: providing an innovative service-based program that helps to decrease students' emotional distress and increasing academic productivity resulting in improved student retention, persistence and success. The interns have benefited from ongoing training, experience with underrepresented students, improved linkages to the community and the mental healthcare industry, and professional interaction with colleagues. Hopefully, through their experience with our students, the interns will elect to stay in our community and continue their work with our students. The number of students represented in the 2005 data indicates a reduced number of students served as compared to the 2004 data. This decrease in student use was partially because the Crisis Center lost their office in the RHORC trailer which resulted in students thinking the program was discontinued. Presently, the Crisis Interns are sending out flyers and continue active outreach. The numbers of students are beginning to increase. Because of the loss of Grant funding, the Crisis Center is not going to be

operational after Spring 2007. Faculty have expressed great concern that this program will be discontinued, leaving our underrepresented students without mental health services. This loss will impact our student's productivity, success, and retention.

The Academic Senate believes that the Crisis Center should be incorporated into the institutional plan and its funding be supported as a line item in budget planning.

This pattern of securing a grant, providing a service without committing to institutionalizing the service and thereby withdrawing it at the end of the grant period, is all too common at Hartnell. Other examples include the Supplemental Instruction program operated through the ALC. It has been funded through grant funding (Title V, then the Title V collaborative grant, and now through the NSF STEP grant) but there are no plans to institutionalize the program despite positive results. Similarly, a variety of learning communities were supported through the collaborative Title V grant, but now that the grant is over, and despite the documented success of learning communities, there is no support.

## **BUDGET COMMITTEE**

The faculty took initiative through the Academic Senate in 1999-2000 to establish two shared governance committees to address the need for a planning and budgeting process. The Institutional Planning Committee (Exhibit 22) was to be the driving force on campus to form a comprehensive plan to prioritize needs and allocate resources for the present and the future of the College. This Committee was formed with the Director of Research and Planning co-chairing with a faculty member. To connect the budgeting process to planning, the Budget Committee (Exhibit 23) was formed to augment actual financial resources available to the college based on the Institutional Plan. This committee was formed with the Vice President of Administrative Services as chair. Three faculty members with extensive knowledge of budgeting, managing financial resources and in depth expertise in the college volunteered for the Budget Committee.

While management and the faculty recognized the need for connecting planning and budgeting, the reality is that there is little connection. The committees designed to ensure this relationship have been rendered ineffective and do not serve their intended purposes. Soon after the Accreditation process was completed in 2000, the Vice President of Administrative Services disconnected the Budget Committee from Institutional Planning by changing the responsibility of the Budget Committee to allocate Block Grant Funding money only. Thus, the purview of this committee is Block Grant approval, which is approximately 1% of the budget.

In the committee structure documentation, it appears that the Institutional Planning Committee drives the work of the Budget Committee as intended. The Self Study states "Budget preparation at Hartnell College has broad participation" citing the participation of Vice Presidents and Deans in "serving as major conduits for submitting budget requests" (p. 131). A closer look, however, shows that the Deans request funding, and the Budget Committee makes recommendations for budget augmentations to fill the funding requests. These augmentation requests are allocated from block grant funds, which in recent budgets have accounted for approximately \$500,000. A review of the most recent Institutional Plan will only show an environmental report presented by

an outside contractor for buildings that were being planned. This is a very small role in budget development.

In addition to severely limited participation in resource allocation, the Budget Committee has other problems. The Chair has all the authority to call a Budget Committee meeting and all responsibility for setting the agenda. Meeting dates have been changed from the regularly scheduled first Wednesday of the month to randomly scheduled meetings based on the availability of the Chair (Exhibit 24). Canceling and rescheduling meetings are common, with the rescheduled date often occurring during winter, spring, or summer break, during faculty non-work periods.

It is true that the faculty had two “work to contract” periods during the last ten years. In fact, the earlier “work to contract” period was resolved just prior to our Accreditation visit in 2000. The most recent one took place in spring and fall 2006. For the Budget Committee, however, “work to contract” had little influence. Even when faculty were fully participating, the random meeting schedule made it difficult for faculty to consistently participate. In addition, the limited role gave faculty a clear message that a serious budgeting program would not include faculty involvement and not be a part of the Budget Committee process.

The actual budget is developed by the Vice President of Administrative Services and a draft is presented to the Board in June. In fact, the only individual who has the detailed information of the budget prior to it being introduced to the Board, is the Vice President of Administrative Services. Despite the recommendations of the Accreditation visiting team in 2003 for a review of information and learning resources with “linkage to the budget and planning process,” there has been no change in the way the budget is developed. This includes no line items developed for technology and an over dependence on grant funding for technology and information resources.

In spring of 2006 the college hired the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) to do a fiscal review of the college. The FCMAT report issued in May 2006 also finds problems with the process for development of the budget. In particular, it recommends that the college “Consider increasing the activities of the budget committee to include providing input to the administration and President on issues affecting the college budget and financial future (p. 13).” In addition to a role for the budget committee, the FCMAT report notes that the business office alone projects FTES (and thus revenue) for budgeting purposes. No input from Admissions and Records or the Enrollment Management Team is used. The report recommends that the college establish procedures for budget revenue projections “that involve key staff members from the business office, Admissions and Records, and the Office of Instruction in order to incorporate all the related factors of classes offered, available students, and the level of revenue needed to support the annual college costs (p. 6).” The FCMAT report also supports the linkage between budget development and faculty hiring, recommending communication of FTES projections used for budgeting to Human Resources (p. 7) to be used in hiring recommendations by the Full Time Faculty Hiring Committee.

In the months since the report was issued, the Board has asked in meetings that the administration prepare a response to the recommendations. Yet, there is no evidence that the administration has complied with this request. In addition, no changes in the Budget Committee

role have been proposed to the Academic Senate, despite requests since 2005 for committee chairs to revise and update their pages of the Committee Handbook.

## **FINANCIAL PRACTICES**

**Budgeting.** The failures become evident in reviewing the Vice President of Administrative Services' continued use of an archaic "rollover" budgeting process based on a 1995-96 budget outline (Exhibit 25), which reflects a comparison of the two budgeting periods, 1996-97 and 2006-07. Total "rollover" budgeting numbers reflect decreases as a percentage of budget in the areas of Academic Salaries, Supplies, and Capital Outlays. The increases are in Classified Salaries, Benefits, and Other. These same increases and decreases found in the total budget are also reflected in the comparison of Unrestricted Funds budgets.

Special note should be given to two categories on these comparisons.

1. The unexplained "Other" account which reflects an increase in unrestricted budget dollars from 15.8% of unrestricted budget in 1996-97 to 20.1% of unrestricted budget in 2006-07. This is an unallocated amount of funds whose spending is at the discretion of The Vice President of Administrative Services alone.
2. The Appropriation of Contingencies which is 6.8% of the unrestricted budget dollars.

In summary, over 25% of this year's unrestricted budget remains as a reserve, with no details as to how these funds are to be spent.

Exhibit 25 reflects that in fiscal year 1996-97, Hartnell College had a total budget of \$24.7 million. The estimated total budget for the year 2006-07 is \$50.1 million, which shows a 103% increase in spending. A more realistic evaluation shows that unrestricted budget dollars have increased from \$19.4 million to \$35.7 million during the same period, an 84% increase in funding. The administration cites declining enrollment as the cause of its inability to meet staffing needs and revenue shortfalls. Since the administration has engaged for many years in a practice of borrowing, buying, and repaying FTES, this figure has proven to be malleable. However, data from the Chancellor's Office show that Hartnell's total revenues steadily increase, even if FTES decrease (Exhibit 26). So, the college's funding has increased considerably over the last ten years. During that period, however, financial projections for the college have led to reduced academic funding, decreased support for programs (such as Animal Health Technology and Construction Technology), reduction in class offerings (Exhibit 27), and thus a decline in enrollments.

Since there is no line item for Technology in the budget (Self Study, p. 122), growth and technology are funded with grants. Technology support, sabbatical leaves, staff development, and off-campus travel are unfunded as a result of unilateral decisions by the administration. The non-replacement of retired faculty is used as a budget reduction, which effectively serves as a budget cut. Repeatedly, the explanation given by the Vice President of Administrative Services is that the funding difficulties are created by declining enrollments.

In the Introduction to the Self Study, the response to Visiting Team Recommendations for Standard 6.5, 6.7 was:

A review of the needs of information and learning resources has been conducted through several means: library needs for technological applications are well established in the Technology Master Plan; all faculty are contacted annually asking for collection recommendations in their discipline areas; the library's web site is regularly updated with information about how to recommend materials, and subscriptions to online resources and permanent collections of e-books are routinely evaluated to determine usability and user satisfaction. Through Administrative Program Review processes, the Associate Vice-President for Information Technology and Library Services sets yearly goals pertaining to information and learning resources needed. *While the needs have been documented and presented through budget allocation processes, the sources of funding have been scarce due to the current budget crisis.* (p. xxx, emphasis added)

This analysis shows that sources of funding have not been scarce; in fact, revenues are increasing. Hartnell does have the funding to meet the needs of the Hartnell community and can afford to hire additional full time faculty and staff to replace faculty and staff retirees; offer adequate course sections to meet the needs of students, and continue programs, such as AHT, auto technology, and construction to meet the needs of the community.

**Financial Standards.** The Vice President of Administrative Services reports Hartnell spending only in summary format. No detailed spending information is made available to the community, faculty, or even the Board of Trustees. Exhibit 28 shows the difficulty that the community and faculty have in attaining any actual spending information. Requests for information are met with letters that delay the process. The attached exhibits are evidence that spending information is not readily available. In addition, spending information is concealed through the redaction process.

A basic ethical financial rule, separation of financial duties, is violated at Hartnell (Exhibit 29). Separation of duties helps to protect an organization's financial integrity. At Hartnell College, however, the Vice President of Administrative Services is the sole individual responsible for financial information. He puts together a summary budget, approves all expenditures, and reports the expenditures to the state. Sound financial standards require separation of financial duties and responsibilities. The condition of the financial operations at Hartnell College can best be summed up in the audit conducted by Vavrined, Trine, Day & Co, Certified Public Accountants (Exhibit 30, italics added for emphasis).

However, *we noted certain matters involving the internal control over financial reporting and its operation that we consider to be reportable conditions.* Reportable conditions involve matters coming to our attention relating to *significant deficiencies in the design or operation of the internal control* over financial reporting that, in our judgment, could affect the District's ability to record, process, summarize, and report financial data consistent with the assertions of management in the financial statements.

In addition, sound financial standards (and the California Public Records Act) require that detail be provided to enhance summary budget information when requested. Repeated requests for budget details have been made by Board members, the public, and the Salinas Chamber of Commerce (Exhibit 31). Either no detail is provided, the request for financial information is met with lengthy responses in legalese, or when provided the information is redacted. The Board of Trustees has requested detailed financial information from the Vice President of Administrative Services but has not persisted in its requests.

## **TECHNOLOGY**

The College has seen much growth in the availability of technology resources for students. As is stated in the Self Study, we have a wonderful, new facility (the LRC) which offers state-of-the-art technology to students. The number of computers accessible to students and faculty has increased from 35 to 200. However, no change in staffing or support services accompanied this growth. To quote the Vice President of Academic Technologies,

As all of you know, staffing is an issue. Our computer population is now approaching 1,400 computers in a network that spans over fifty miles. We also have about fifty smart classrooms. We are running about 30 computer switches, four microwave links, 35+ servers that support fifty+ software programs and systems, such as our newly installed smart card system. To support all of this the college has one network administrator, two computer repair technicians and two computer instructional aides. An industry standard is one computer repair technician for every 50 to 100 computers (this standard does not include smart classroom support, microwave links and all the rest). As you can see, we are severely challenged (Exhibit 32).

Not only is staffing inadequate and woefully lacking, there continues to be a decline. While the Self Study indicates that there are three instructional technologists to support training, faculty and online education, the number has actually dropped to one. One technologist was reassigned to a different area and the other recently resigned. That position remains vacant and there are currently no plans to fill it. Budgetary constraints are cited as the reason for freezing positions.

The Academic Senate is concerned that this pattern of planning and implementing growth of facilities and technology will continue while there is no planning for increasing the staffing needed to support the growth. As is indicated in various sections of Standard Three, another new building, the CALL building, has been approved and is now in the bidding stages with plans to open in late 2008. This building, which will house basic skills labs, classrooms, assessment, disabled students computer labs and the open instructional computer lab, will have approximately 400 computers. These computers are in addition to the existing instructional and faculty computers. We currently have two computer/network technicians who serve all of the academic technologies. Currently, there are no plans for increasing this number. These individuals will be shouldered with the responsibility of maintaining the additional new computers along with any software and/or hardware technology issues that come with this new facility.

To directly quote the self-evaluation from section 3 C1.c., “Academic and administrative software and hardware are replaced as the **budget allows**. This can be a challenge in that technology obsolescence is not funded as a line item in the budget.” Since there is no line item in the budget, the budget cannot possibly “allow” for upgrades and replacements. In fact, all of the computer hardware and software purchases and upgrades that have occurred since the last Self Study have been funded through federal grants, block grants and VTEA funding, sources which are limited and not a long term solution.

The report continues with, “The lack of budgetary support for maintaining campus technology has been an ongoing problem that has been identified repeatedly in shared governance committees as a major problem for the College but as of yet remains unsolved due to continuing budget constraints” (p. 122). And yet, the reports states, in Standard 3 B1.b. that, “Beautification projects such as new flower beds, trees and benches are ongoing to ensure that students and faculty enjoy their learning and working environments” (p. 111). Perhaps the District needs to re-examine its budgetary priorities, especially when the goal is to ensure that students and faculty enjoy their learning and working environments. The Academic Senate places a higher priority on functioning equipment and smart classrooms that actually work. These **are** the learning and working environments for our faculty and students.

For the last two years, the academic network has increasingly experienced technical problems resulting in lost connections for both students and faculty. When student connections are lost, they lose data. Loss of access to the network also results in an inability to use instructional software, teach classes requiring information from the internet, do testing that requires technology, read and respond to email, etc. All of these are essential instructional needs.

This problem continues and has increased in severity as a result of the new technologies of the LRC. We are now to a point where the switches on our network are ten years old and can no longer handle the amount of traffic that runs over the network. The fact that the college does not, and has never had, a line item in the budget for technology seems to be a direct contradiction to their vision statement of “Hartnell College shall seek and dedicate resources to be a technologically advanced institution.” (Catalog, p. 1)

The Self Study indicates that problems and failures of a technical nature are reported to the office secretary/trouble desk specialist in AIS (page 123). It should be noted that because of the reassignments noted earlier, this individual is now split between two job functions on two different campuses. As a result she has only 20 hours/week to dedicate to her AIS duties and work orders are backlogged.

The primary location for students to receive instructional support for classes that require a computer lab environment is the Academic Computer Center. As the Self Study indicates (page 120), the Center offers instruction and self-paced courses on a variety of applications and topics and also provides instructional support to online students. However, the amount of instruction time that is available to students continues to decrease. As of the last site visit, hours in the Computer Center have dropped from approximately 70 hours down to 41. As discussed elsewhere in this report (p. 5), weekend hours have been reduced as well as evening hours, thus

impacting the amount of instruction that can be made available to those students who work during the day. Computer Center hours have been completely eliminated for summer. While the new LRC facility has increased the number of computers made available to students, it is important to note that there is no instructional software or support available to assist students with projects and assignments. There is simply a technician who can assist students with technical issues such as logging on, printing, etc.

Training that is made available to instructors on developing courses for distance learning delivery is actually provided by one part-time instructional technologist, not two as indicated in the Self Study (page 120). In addition, the web master has no responsibility in terms of training faculty for online course delivery as the Self Study states (page 120).

## **STANDARD FOUR LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE**

- A2. 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.**
- 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.**
- 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 other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.**
- 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 used them as the basis for improvement.**

**Recommendation 5 (from 2003 Mid-term Report) The board, administration, faculty, staff and students need to reach a common understanding of the roles and responsibilities of all constituencies in institutional governance.**

- B1.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.**
- B1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.**
- B2. 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.**
- B2.d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.**
- B2.e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.**

## THE STATUS OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

One of the highly touted accomplishments in the 2000 Self Study was the development of the governance structure and the compilation of a Committee Handbook adopted by the Board in 2000. While this was a collaborative effort between the Academic Senate and the Administration, the Administration was slow in reaching mutual agreement with the Senate regarding committee structure (which committees Hartnell would have, what the charge and function of each would be, and what the membership would be). Substantial forward movement on the process by the Administration did not begin until the site visit was imminent, which supported the Academic Senate's fear that was a lack of real commitment to implementing the governance model (Exhibit 33). In looking at events between 2000 and 2007, that concern appears to be legitimate.

The Committee Handbook has not been revised since 2000. Meanwhile, committees, work groups, and task forces not listed in the Handbook have proliferated. Some, such as the Distance Education Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Subcommittee, were subcommittees of existing committees. Others, such as the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group and the short-lived General Education Task Force were separate committees formed by the administration. The Academic Senate was not involved in determining the role, the purpose, or the membership of the group. Other committees listed in the handbook seemed to have outlived their usefulness and no longer meet.

In 2005-06 the Academic Senate began to act on concerns about committees not meeting, the committee structure, and of the Committee Handbook. It requested that all current committee chairs submit an updated version of their committee's handbook pages and report at Senate meetings. Committee chairs were also asked to submit a list of current committee members since there was no up-to-date listing of committee members (as used to be housed in the Office of Instruction). Despite repeated requests, The Technology Master Planning Team and the Curriculum Committee were among the few committees that honored the requests. Citing the proliferation of new committees, the filling of committee seats without appointment by the Academic Senate (as required by Board policy), and the lack of communication of committees with the Senate by way of committee reports and posted minutes, the Academic Senate passed Resolution 2.07 in November 2006 (Exhibit 34). The Senate President has begun to post committee membership on the Senate's website, but progress in completing even this membership information is slow due to lack of response from committee chairs, most of whom are administrators (Exhibit 35).

Finally, in fall 2006, the subject of the Committee Handbook and the revision of the committee structure became a topic of interest to the administration and a discussion at College Council ensued. However, the only committees reporting regularly at Academic Senate meetings are the Curriculum Committee and Student Learning Outcomes Work Group (both faculty-chaired) as well as the Technology Master Planning Team, of which the Senate President is a member. The Self Study (p. 145) states in the planning agenda that the Vice President for Instruction has sent copies of the Handbook to each committee chair requesting that they review it and that "This review should be complete." We urge the visiting team to look for evidence that this review has even begun.

The Self Study states, “Shared governance committees, as documented in the Committee Handbook, include appropriate membership to reflect the employee groups that are impacted by the decisions and actions of each committee” (p. 138). While the Committee Handbook and the committee structure have been laid out on paper, a closer look for committee minutes, committee agendas, meeting schedules, and documentation of membership (documents that are often non-existent) shows what the actual practice is. While the Handbook and committee structure show linkages of committees, there is little evidence to be found that this communication and formal linkage exists. A solid example of this is the fact that the Faculty Hiring Committee, Enrollment Management Team, and the Institutional Planning Committee have no input into budget development. Despite the statement in the Self Study that “All planning and budget priorities are then routed from the Institutional Planning Committee directly to the Budget Committee” (p. 159 Standard 4), the Budget Committee only allocates block grant funding; it does not apply budget priorities to budget development.

A further example of the disconnect between what the documents say, what is actually done, and what is in the Self Study regarding governance is a portion of Standard 2 discussing program elimination. The Self Study states, “Currently the College is developing a formal policy on program discontinuance” (p. 46). In fact, there is already a Discontinuance Process that has been mutually agreed to by the Academic Senate and adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 1, 2001 (Exhibit 8). The Self Study makes it seem as though the college has no formal process for Program Discontinuance. This is untrue. It also leads the reader to believe that there are ongoing efforts to develop such a process by stating in the planning agenda, “Develop a formal policy on program elimination” (p. 46). However, if changes are being planned for the existing process, the Academic Senate must be involved. To date the Senate has not been notified of any discussion about revising the Discontinuance Process. Either the Self Study is inaccurate, or a process is being developed without the knowledge or participation of the Academic Senate. Either one of these is a problem.

## **HONESTY AND INTEGRITY**

Two examples call into question the integrity of the processes protecting private information of employees. These involved publication of personnel information in local papers, and occurred in 2005 and 2006. One is an editorial written by the payroll supervisor, a member of the staff of the Vice President of Administrative Services (Exhibits 36). The article refers to payroll information about the faculty at Hartnell College (including overtime pay) and city of residence. While no faculty member is actually named, the article could only be written because the author is a confidential employee (and as such is expected to keep this information private). Another editorial, written by the campaign manager of one of the Trustees, directly connects payroll and personnel file information with a specific Hartnell College employee (Exhibits 37). Although not actually naming the faculty member directly, the details of the article are sufficient to identify the individual as the Faculty Association President. How did he obtain this information?

## **THE GOVERNING BOARD**

Board members are elected officials and should be responsible to their constituents. Board meetings are public meetings, and the agendas and results of the meetings should be easily

available to interested members of the public. The Hartnell College Board is not easily accessible to its constituents. For example, the webpage for the Board does not list any contact information for any Board member (Exhibit 38). Until recently, Board minutes and agendas posted on the college website were current only until April 2006. Subsequently, Board minutes and agendas have been completely removed from the college website (Exhibits 38). Board agendas are posted on campus (usually on the Friday before a Tuesday meeting). In addition, the Board often used the provision of the Brown Act allowing Special meetings with only twenty-four hours notice. Agendas are also sent to the Hartnell College LRC and the Salinas Public library so that interested members of the public have access to them. However, the Hartnell College LRC is not open on weekends, and the Salinas Public Library also has limited hours. This results in agendas being only sporadically available to members of the public.

Minutes of Board meetings are not readily available for public inspection. The college president serves as Board secretary and thus is responsible for writing and posting minutes of Board meetings. Even before the minutes disappeared from public view in April 2006, members of the public repeatedly expressed concern over the lack of detail presented in them. Board members concurred with this concern and expressed interest in improved documentation of Board activity. However, an agenda-level discussion of what policy the Board will have for the form, level of detail, and availability of the Board minutes has not occurred. Repeated attempts to place this discussion on the agenda have been rebuffed by the President/Superintendent, but the Board has not insisted on action.

Even though agenda building is a standing item on the Board meeting agenda, the Board does not have the ability to set its own agenda. The public has witnessed numerous occasions where Board members proposed items for the agenda (e.g., making board packets available electronically, discussing distance education, form for minutes, etc.). Not only were these items dismissed out of hand by the President/Superintendent, but they have never appeared as discussion items on future agendas.

The Board does not have, nor does it demand, timely access to documents. Members of the public have witnessed at least four instances in which the Board approved a contract without reviewing it. Board members have complained that documents are not provided with sufficient time for review, if at all. The board nonetheless ratified all of these contracts. Board members have requested to get copies of all contracts in their Board packets. The President has responded that the contracts are often lengthy and, consequently, difficult to provide. Board minutes do not show a formal policy decision about the form, level of detail, and availability of contracts to be ratified. However, the February and March 2007 Board packets were available online so perhaps the issue has been resolved.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

As described in the preceding pages, the Hartnell College Academic Senate believes that the college's Self Study report does not adequately respond to the previous Self Study recommendations. Additionally, for each standard, the description and self-evaluation sections are not comprehensive and do not accurately describe the strengths and weaknesses of the college. Furthermore, the planning sections lack specificity and are incomplete.

The Academic Senate has shown throughout this Response examples of serious issues that the college must address. As stated in the introduction, the Academic Senate believes that some of the strengths of the college include:

- Highly qualified and outstanding faculty
- Effective teaching and learning is taking place
- Motivated students achieving academic success
- Student success as evidenced through graduation rates, transfer rates and employment
- Collaboration and leadership among faculty and staff on the curriculum committee, academic senate, distance education sub-committee, and student learning outcomes work group, for example

However, the Academic Senate believes that the mission of the college is seriously undermined by the following:

- The disengagement between planning and budgeting
- The lack of support for full-time staffing of academic areas as well as classified positions
- The distortion of shared governance
- The negative impact of administrative decision-making

A look at the accreditation history of Hartnell College since 1994 when accreditation was deferred shows that progress has been made. However, the timeline also shows that progress was mostly made during periods when the commission was requiring annual midterm and progress reports and visits (Exhibit 39). For example, in 1997 the visiting team validated the focused midterm report (the third report in three years), noting progress and a sense of “cautious optimism.” By the 2000 site visit (with no intervening visits or reports for three years), the Academic Senate reported to the visiting team that what had begun in 1997 had languished (Exhibit 40). The Program and Services Review process, the governance structure, and the link between planning and budgeting had not progressed between 1997 and 2000. The visiting team once again was concerned enough to require a report and a visit for the very next year. The Academic Senate was hopeful that the renewed attention would lead to progress. Faculty, staff, and administration collaborated to make the progress that was shown in the ensuing reports of 2001, 2002 and 2003. Unfortunately, in 2007, those gains have slipped away. The college is still grappling with the same issues as well as others documented in this Response.

## **ACTION PLAN**

The Academic Senate realizes that many of the weaknesses identified above stem from a governance structure that doesn't operate as the documented model implies. As a result, The Academic Senate is proceeding with the following proposal to reform the college's shared governance model and ultimately improve the college:

**Proposal.** Given the length of time since implementation of the governance structure and concerns expressed by faculty, staff and administration, the Academic Senate will embark upon a review and assessment of the college’s shared governance model and make recommendations to the Board of Trustees for change.

**Process.** The Academic Senate will establish a task force and invite a representative of the classified senate, student senate, administration, faculty union and Board to join us in this important endeavor. This task force will receive written documentation and oral testimony from those involved in the college’s shared governance committees.

**Questions.** The Academic Senate wants to know if the current shared governance model/process is really working or are the Committees just window dressing. Does the work done by the committees lead to results? The following questions will be asked of all shared governance committees:

- What is the purpose of the committee and is it meeting this purpose? Provide evidence of how it contributes to the operation of the college.
- What are the strengths of the committee?
- What are the weaknesses of the committee?
- Is there a better way/method to conduct the business of the committee? How?
- What direct impact if any does the committee have on student enrollment/retention/graduation?
- What direct impact does the committee have on curriculum and faculty issues?
- What impact does the committee have on the overall administration of the college?
- Should the college retain this committee or do away with it?

<b>Timeline</b>	
March 2007	Form the task force
April - May 2007	Receive data and input
September 2007	Assess data and develop recommendations and changes
October 2007	Present draft recommendations to campus community
November 2007	Review campus input and develop final recommendations
December 2007	Present recommendations to Senate and Board of Trustees