



**ACCREDITING  
COMMISSION  
for COMMUNITY and  
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

*Western Association  
of Schools and Colleges*

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD  
SUITE 204  
NOVATO, CA 94949  
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234  
FAX: (415) 506-0238  
E-MAIL: [accjc@accjc.org](mailto:accjc@accjc.org)  
[www.accjc.org](http://www.accjc.org)

Chairperson  
SHERRILL L. AMADOR  
Public Member

Vice Chairperson  
STEVEN KINSELLA  
Administration

President  
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President  
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President  
KRISTA JOHNS

Vice President  
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President  
JOHN NIXON

Associate Vice President  
NORVAL WELLSFRY

July 3, 2014

Dr. Willard Lewallen  
Superintendent/President  
Hartnell College  
411 Central Avenue  
Salinas, CA 93901

Dear Superintendent/President Lewallen:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 4-6, 2014, reviewed the Follow-Up Report submitted by Hartnell College and the Report of the Evaluation Team that visited Friday, April 25, 2014.

The Commission took action to remove Probation, **issue Warning**, and require the College to submit a **Follow-Up Report by March 15, 2015**. The Report will be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.<sup>1</sup>

Warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course deviating from the Commission's Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, or Commission policies to an extent that gives concern to the Commission. The institution is expected to resolve its deficiencies, refrain from certain activities, or initiate certain activities. If the warning is issued after a sanction resulting from an institution's educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, then reaffirmation continues to be delayed during the period of warning. The accredited status of the institution continues during the warning period.

**Need to Resolve Deficiencies:**

The Commission found that Hartnell College has addressed Recommendations 1, 6, 8, 10, and 12, resolved the deficiencies, and now meets Eligibility Requirement 5, and Standards I.A; I.A.3; II.C.1.e; III.A.2; III.A.3.a; III.A.6; III.D; IV.B; IV.B.1.a-j; and IV.B.2.a-e as they pertain to these recommendations.

The Accreditation Standards, as an integrated whole, represent indicators of academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Deficiencies in any Standards will impact quality at an institution, and ultimately the educational environment and experiences of students. The Commission found Hartnell College deficient in meeting the following Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards: Eligibility Requirements 10 and 19, and Standards I.B.1,2,3,4,5,6,7; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i; II.A.3; II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f; II.B.4; II.C; II.C.1; II.C.1.a; II.C.1.c; III.A.1.b, c; III.A.2; III.A.3.a; III.A.5.a; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.1; III.D.1.a, b, d; III.D.2.b, e; III.D.3; III.D.3.h; IV.A.2; and IV.A.2.a from the College recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11, written to meet Standards.

Dr. Willard Lewallen  
Hartnell College  
July 3, 2014

The Follow-Up Report should demonstrate that the College has addressed the recommendations noted below, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards.

**Recommendation 2.** As previously noted in Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 in the 2007 Comprehensive Team Report and in order to meet the Eligibility Requirements and the Standards, the team recommends that the College develop a comprehensive integrated planning process that includes participatory governance and meets both the strategic and annual needs of the College. The team further recommends that all institutional plans of the College (e.g., budgeting, technology, Student Services) be linked to its planning process and that the outcomes of these processes be regularly communicated to all college constituencies. The team further recommends that budget planning and allocation of resources inform financial projections. (Eligibility Requirement 19, Standards I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.5; II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f; II.B.4; III.C.2; III.D.1; III.D.1.a, d; III.D.2.b; III.D.3)

**Recommendation 3.** As previously noted in Recommendation 3 in the 2007 Comprehensive Team Report and in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College develop a regular systematic process for assessing its long term and annual plans, as well as its planning process, to facilitate continuous sustainable institutional improvement. The team further recommends that the college systematically review effectiveness of its evaluation mechanisms. (Standards I.B.6; I.B.7)

**Recommendation 4.** As previously stated in Recommendation 4 by the 2007 Comprehensive Evaluation Team, to meet Eligibility Requirement 10, and in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College fully engage in a broad-based dialogue that leads to the identification of Student Learning Outcomes at the course and program levels, and regular assessment of student progress toward achievement of the outcomes. The team further recommends that, in order to meet the standards, the College develop student learning outcomes and assessment that is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement, where student learning improvement in all disciplines is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the College. The team further recommends that training be provided for all personnel in the development and assessment of learning outcomes at the course, program, institution and service levels. The team further recommends that faculty teaching online be evaluated regularly and that assessment of student learning be measured regularly for online students. (Eligibility Requirement 10; Standards II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.g; II.A.2.h; II.A.2.i; II.A.3)

**Recommendation 5.** In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College create an evaluation and assessment process for the library and support services that is integrated with the college's program review processes, and that includes an assessment of the process for integrating library acquisitions into circulation in a timely manner and how the needs for staffing, maintenance, and technology support are addressed.

Dr. Willard Lewallen  
Hartnell College  
July 3, 2014

The team further recommends that the College create a process to evaluate the impact of minimal library and learning support services at the King City Education Center and Alisal Campus to ensure the sufficient availability of library and support services, including better up-to-date counseling online. (Standards II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f; II.B.4; II.C;II.C.1; II.C.1.a; II.C.1.c)

**Recommendation 7.** In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College ensure that evaluation processes and criteria necessary to support the college's mission are in place and are regularly and consistently conducted for all employee groups. The team further recommends that professional learning opportunities be formally and regularly offered to all employee groups to ensure equity in employee development opportunities. The team further recommends that faculty and others responsible for learning have as a component of their evaluation effectiveness in producing those student learning outcomes. Use the results of employee evaluations as a basis for continuous improvement. (Standard III.A.1.b, c; III.A.2; III.A.3.a; III.A.5.a)

**Recommendation 9.** In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College ensure that program review processes are ongoing, systematic, and used to assess and improve student learning, and that the College evaluate the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes. The team further recommends that the institution:

- Review and refine its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness;
- Use the results of program review to clearly and consistently link institutional planning processes to resource allocation, including physical resources.  
(Standards III.B.2.b III.D.1.a, b; III.D.2.e; III.D.3.h)

**Recommendation 11.** To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College implement and evaluate a governance model and establish a key participatory governance group to provide an avenue for meaningful input into decision-making including but not limited to resource allocation. (Standard IV.A.2; IV.A.2.a)

Under U.S. Department of Education enforcement regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to terminate the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any standard. In the alternative, the Commission can provide the institution with additional notice and a deadline for coming into compliance that is no later than two years from when the institution was first informed of the noncompliance. In exceptional situations, if the institution has done all within its authority to reach compliance on any standard but remains out of compliance, the Commission is permitted by regulations to allocate a one-time, short-term "good cause extension" for the college to reach compliance prior to acting on the institution's termination. However, continued noncompliance with multiple standards would diminish the appropriateness of such an extension.

Dr. Willard Lewallen  
Hartnell College  
July 3, 2014

The Commission notes that the deficiencies cited in Recommendations 2, 3, and 4 which related to findings of the 2007 evaluation team have been resolved. The remaining deficiencies, noted above, were first identified in June 2013. Hartnell College should fully resolve the noted deficiencies by **March 2015**.

The Follow-Up Report submitted in March 2014 will become part of the accreditation history of the College. The Commission requires that you give the Report, the External Evaluation Report, and this letter appropriate dissemination to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your Follow-Up Report. This group should include the campus leadership and the Board of Trustees.

The Commission also requires that the Follow-Up Report, the External Evaluation Report, and this Commission action letter be made available to students and the public by placing a copy on the College website. *Please note that in response to public interest in disclosure, the Commission now requires institutions to post accreditation information on a page no more than one click from the institution's home page.*

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring institutional integrity, effectiveness, educational quality, and student success.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.  
President

BAB/tl

---

<sup>1</sup> Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review *Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission*. It contains the background, requirements, and format for each type of report and presents sample cover pages and certification pages. It is available on the ACCJC website under College Reports to ACCJC at: <http://www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc>.