

## **Hartnell College Follow-Up Report 2**



*Submitted by:*

**Hartnell College**

**411 Central Avenue**

**Salinas, CA 93901**

*Submitted to:*

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,**

**Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

**March 15, 2015**

**Certification of the Follow-Up Report**  
**March 15, 2015**

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and believe that this Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Elia Gonzalez-Castro  
President, Board of Trustees, Hartnell Community College District

3/4/2015  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Willard C. Lewallen, Ph.D.  
Superintendent/President

4 Mar 2015  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carol Kimbrough  
President, Academic Senate


3/4/2015  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Delia Edeza  
President, California School Employee Association

3/4/15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Raul Tapia  
President, Associated Students of Hartnell College

3/4/15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ismael Ramirez  
Chief Steward, L-39

3/4/15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lori A. Kildal, Ph.D.  
Accreditation Liaison Officer

3-4-15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

<b>Certification of the Follow-Up Report .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Statement of Report Preparation .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Response to Commission Action Letter .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Recommendation 1 .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Recommendation 2 .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Recommendation 3 .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Recommendation 4 .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Recommendation 5 .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Recommendation 6 .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Recommendation 7 .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>45</b>

<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Recommendation 8.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Recommendation 9.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Recommendation 10.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Recommendation 11.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Recommendation 12.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Appendix A: Master List of Evidence.....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Recommendation 2.....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Recommendation 3.....</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>Recommendation 4.....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Recommendation 5.....</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>Recommendation 7.....</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>Recommendation 9.....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Recommendation 11.....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b><u><a href="#">Planning Agendas</a></u>.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Standard I : Institutional Mission and Effectiveness .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>I.A.3 .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>I.B.2.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>61</b>

<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>61</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>61</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>61</b>
<b>I.B.3</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>I.B.4</b> .....	<b>63</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>63</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>63</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>63</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>63</b>
<b>I.B.6</b> .....	<b>64</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>64</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>64</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>64</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>64</b>
<b>I.B.7</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<b>II.A.1</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<b>II.A.1.a</b> .....	<b>67</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>67</b>

<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>68</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>68</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>68</b>
<b>II.A.1.b</b> .....	<b>69</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>69</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>II.A.1.c</b> .....	<b>71</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>71</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>72</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>72</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>72</b>
<b>II.A.2</b> .....	<b>73</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>73</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>74</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>74</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>74</b>
<b>II.A.2.a</b> .....	<b>75</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>75</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>75</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>75</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>75</b>
<b>II.A.2.e</b> .....	<b>76</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>76</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>76</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>76</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>76</b>
<b>II.A.2.f</b> .....	<b>77</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>77</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>77</b>

<b>Conclusion</b> .....	77
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	77
<b>II.A.3.a</b> .....	78
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	78
<b>Next Step</b> .....	78
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	78
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	78
<b>II.A.3.c</b> .....	79
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	79
<b>Next Step</b> .....	80
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	80
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	80
<b>II.A.4</b> .....	81
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	81
<b>Next Step</b> .....	82
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	82
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	82
<b>II.A.6.a</b> .....	83
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	83
<b>Next Step</b> .....	83
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	83
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	83
<b>II.A.6.b</b> .....	84
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	84
<b>Next Step</b> .....	84
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	84
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	84
<b>II.A.6.c</b> .....	85
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	85
<b>Next Step</b> .....	85
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	85

<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>II.B.1 .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>II.B.3.b.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>II.B.4.....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>II.C.1.....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>II.C.1.a.....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>II.C.1.b.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Next Step .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation .....</b>	<b>96</b>



<b>II.C.1.c</b> .....	<b>97</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>97</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>97</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>97</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>97</b>
<b>II.C.1.d</b> .....	<b>98</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>98</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>98</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>98</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>98</b>
<b>II.C.1.e</b> .....	<b>99</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>99</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>99</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>99</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>99</b>
<b>Standard III: Resources</b> .....	<b>100</b>
<b>III.A.1.b</b> .....	<b>100</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>100</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>100</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>100</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>100</b>
<b>III.A.5.a</b> .....	<b>101</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>101</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>101</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>101</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>101</b>
<b>III.C.1</b> .....	<b>102</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>102</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>102</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>102</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>102</b>

<b>III.C.1.a</b> .....	<b>103</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>103</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>103</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>103</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>103</b>
<b>III.C.1.b</b> .....	<b>104</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>104</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>104</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>104</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>105</b>
<b>III.D.2.a</b> .....	<b>106</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>106</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>106</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>106</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>106</b>
<b>III.D.3.f</b> .....	<b>107</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>107</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>108</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>108</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>108</b>
<b>III.D.3.h</b> .....	<b>109</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>109</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>109</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>109</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>109</b>
<b>Standard IV: Leadership and Governance</b> .....	<b>110</b>
<b>IV.A.1</b> .....	<b>110</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis</b> .....	<b>110</b>
<b>Next Step</b> .....	<b>110</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>110</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation</b> .....	<b>110</b>

<b>IV.A.2.a.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Next Step.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>IV.A.3.....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Next Step.....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation.....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>IV.B.1.....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Next Step.....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation.....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>IV.B.1.g.....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>Next Step.....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation.....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>IV.B.2.a.....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Next Step.....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation.....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>IV.B.2.b.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Resolution Analysis.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Next Step.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Supporting Evidence/Documentation.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Appendix B: Master List of Planning Agendas.....</b>	<b>124</b>

**Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness.....124**  
**Standard II: Learning Programs and Services .....124**  
**Standard III. Resources.....127**  
**Standard IV: Leadership and Governance .....127**

## Statement of Report Preparation

Hartnell College received the Team Report and the Commission's Action Letter on July 3, 2014. The report and letter were broadly distributed via campus email and made available to the public on the college website immediately upon receipt.

This Follow-Up Report #2 was prepared by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), lead administrators assigned to the 7 remaining recommendations and 44 Planning Agendas, and the Accreditation Council, a shared governance council comprising representatives from all employee groups. Information was gathered from all college constituents, including full- and part-time faculty, classified staff, students, and managers/administrators.

Drafts of this report were updated monthly by the lead administrators and posted on Google docs. These updates were reviewed and edited by members of the Accreditation Council on May 19, 2014, September 15, 2014, October 20, 2014, November 17, 2014, December 15, 2014 and January 26, 2015. The Accreditation Council approved the Follow-up Report #2 at its January 26, 2015 meeting. A consultation draft was emailed to the Hartnell College community on January 27, 2015 asking them to review the report for accuracy and to send in comments and corrections to the ALO by February 4, 2015. All responses were compiled and sent to the lead administrators, who addressed minor revisions. This version was reviewed by the College Planning Council at its February 4, 2015, meeting and by the Academic Senate at its February 10, 2015, meeting. It also was presented to the Board of Trustees as a first reading on February 17, 2015. The College Planning Council approved the report at its February 18, 2015, meeting and the Academic Senate approved the report February 24, 2015. The Board of Trustees discussed and approved the final Follow-Up Report #2 at its regular monthly meeting on March 3, 2015.

The Follow-Up Report, including all hyperlinked evidence files, was disseminated to the college community on March 15, 2015, by posting it to the college website.

## Response to the Commission Action Letter

### **Recommendation 1**

In order for the college to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college develop a process for regular and systematic evaluation of its mission statement. Additionally, the team recommends that the college implement this process to thoroughly review and revise its mission statement to more clearly reflect its intended population and address student learning

In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 1 was resolved.

## 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.

### Resolution and Analysis

#### *Development and Implementation of Annual Integrated Planning Process*

The college has developed a comprehensive integrated planning process that includes participatory governance and meets both the strategic and annual needs of the college. All of the college's institutional plans are linked to this integrated planning process, and the outcomes of these processes are regularly communicated to all constituents

Hartnell's Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement (2.1) was approved by the College Planning Council at its meeting on September 17, 2014 (2.2). The College Planning Council had previously approved, at its meeting on February 5, 2014, several documents that collectively contribute to this comprehensive integrated planning process (2.3).

Annual program planning and assessment (2.4) consists of provisions for:

- Participation—appropriate faculty members, staff and/or administrators conduct the review.
- Completion of a report—an annual review of and action plan for either an academic program through which student outcomes data are analyzed, or a service, office, or non-instructional program through which service area outcomes data are analyzed.
- Content review—by the supervising administrator.
- Oversight—by the divisional Vice President and respective governance council(s).
- Archiving of completed reports—by the dean of institutional planning and effectiveness.
- Improvements—to be determined and subsequently implemented by relevant faculty members and their deans for an academic program, and relevant staff and their supervising administrator for a service, department, or non-instructional program.

The compressed integrated planning process that commenced with program review/program planning and assessment (PPA) in fall 2013 was implemented through spring 2014 to inform budget development for FY 2014-15 (2.5, 2.6). The expanded integrated planning process that began with program review/PPA in spring 2014 (2.7), and that applies to all subsequent annual integrated planning processes moving forward (2.8), allows for:

- A full (spring) semester of program planning/assessment activities and intra-divisional content review and oversight; followed by
- Summer months during which Vice Presidents summarize priorities for funding requests; then

- A full (fall) semester of governance council involvement in reviewing and discussing PPA results, and making recommendations concerning priorities for funding; and finally
- Transition into the next academic year after the Superintendent/President's decisions regarding which funding requests from program review/PPA will move forward into the tentative budget for the subsequent fiscal year.

The key document governing budget development processes and funding decisions involves formalization of chronologically sequenced procedures for making four types of budgetary requests (2.9):

- Program planning and assessment for new activities and requests for augmentation, which occurs 12 to 18 months in advance of the applicable fiscal year. All designated programs, services, and offices are required to engage in planning and assessment activities and they must make these requests to be eligible for funding of new activities or augmentation of funding for current activities.
- Budget rollover to fund ongoing, year-to-year needs, which occurs 3 to 6 months in advance of the applicable fiscal year. All designated programs, services, and offices are required to engage in this budget development activity.
- Requests for supplemental funding, which occurs during the operating year for those occasions when requesting funds in advance of the fiscal year was not possible.
- Requests to meet urgent needs, which also occur during the operating year but were not anticipated.

The participatory governance model encompasses two tiers of governance, in addition to various other committees and workgroups that serve specific purposes (2.10). The first tier includes councils and planning groups that correspond largely to the college's divisional structure—such as councils for academic affairs (2.11), administrative services (2.12), advancement (2.13), student affairs (2.14), and technology development (2.15). The College Planning Council (CPC) resides in the second tier; it reviews recommendations on policies and procedures, plans and initiatives, and resource allocation requests from the lower level councils, and in turn makes recommendations to the superintendent/president (2.16), which may be operationalized through the President's Executive Cabinet.

Starting in fall 2013, all program reviews, related budgetary requests, and planning documents or summaries began to flow through the new governance structure for discussion, recommendation, and approval, as appropriate. The College Planning Council, for example, voted to support the recommended prioritization of full-time faculty positions from the Full-Time Faculty Hiring Committee at its February 5, 2014, meeting (2.3), and to recommend approval of prioritized resource allocation requests for FY 2014-15 at its April 2, 2014, meeting (2.17).

Starting in fall 2014, all long-term institutional plans are being presented to, reviewed, and/or approved by relevant governance bodies prior to being approved by the College Planning Council. The Timeline for Deliverables of 3 Major Plans provides an example of this sequencing through the governance system (2.18). The master meeting schedule for AY 2014-15 depicts when and how frequently governance councils meet (2.19), while the academic and governance



Google calendar displays governance meetings on in a format available to everyone, to inform all college employees on a timely and ongoing basis ([2.20](#)).

***Linkage of Long-Term Institutional Plans to Integrated Planning Process & Communication of Outcomes to College Constituencies***

All long-term institutional plans of the college have been or are being linked to the annual integrated planning process. Starting in fall 2014, the outcomes of these processes are being communicated regularly to college constituencies.

The following nine plans were identified as long-term institutional plans in FY 2014-15 ([2.21](#)); they are listed in chronological order according to their development and approval status.

<u>Title of Plan</u>	<u>Status</u>
1. Technology Plan 2011-2018	Established 2011; revised Spring 2014
2. President's Task Force Funding Plan 2012-2017	Established 2012
3. Equal Employment Opportunity Plan	Approved by Board 6/4/13
4. Strategic Plan 2013-2018	Approved by Board 10/1/13
5. Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018	Approved by College Planning Council 9/17/14
6. Basic Skills Initiative Action Plan	Approved by College Planning Council 9/17/14
7. Student Success and Support Program Plan	Approved by Board 10/7/14
8. Student Equity Plan	Approved by Board 12/9/14
9. Facilities Master Plan	To be approved by Board Spring 2015

The college's Strategic Plan 2013-2018 serves as the umbrella plan for the institution in that it encapsulates the Board's six priorities through spring 2018 ([2.22](#)); it is therefore essential that all annual and long-term plans are linked to one or more of its priorities and goals. Requests for funding that appear in annual action plans must establish such linkage regardless of the specific program, service, or office submitting such plans. Although requests for funding specific components of long-term plans must be forwarded through the annual integrated planning process, it is nonetheless important that each long-term institutional plan establish clear linkages to the college's Strategic Plan. To this end:

- The Technology Plan 2011-2021 ([2.23](#)) has been updated to ensure explicit alignment with the Strategic Plan ([2.24](#)).
- The funding priorities in the President's Task Force Funding Plan 2012-2017, previously tied directly to the six priorities of the Board of Trustees as written into the college's Strategic Plan, are currently linked to the goals in the Strategic Plan ([2.25](#)).
- The Continuous Improvement (CI) Plan 2013-2018 describes the alignment between specific CI processes and goals in the Strategic Plan, whereby each of the 11 goals is supported by one or more CI processes ([2.26](#)).

- The Student Success and Support Program Plan speak directly to multiple goals in the Strategic Plan ([2.27](#)).
- The Student Equity Plan includes reference to goals in the Strategic Plan ([2.28](#)).
- The draft Facilities Master Plan links each potential project to one or more goals in the Strategic Plan ([2.29](#)).

Strategic decisions and other key outcomes are systematically communicated in various ways in fulfillment of the established continuous improvement process governing internal and external communications ([2.30](#)). Vehicles of communication include:

- Highlights document of meetings of the Board of Trustees reported by the Superintendent/President, including planning-related actions taken by the Board ([2.31](#)).
- Highlights document of meetings of the College Planning Council ([2.32](#)).
- Actions/Recommendations of the Academic Senate ([2.33](#)).
- Minutes of governance council meetings posted on the college website ([2.34](#)).
- E-mails sent by the Superintendent/President to the college on budgeting and other decisions ([2.35](#)).
- Addresses made by the Superintendent/President to the college ([2.36](#)).
- Briefings on Board meeting highlights made by the Superintendent/President at monthly administrator meetings ([2.37](#)).
- Presentations, communications and reports posted on the President's Corner webpages ([2.38](#)).

### ***Linkage between Budget Planning/Resource Allocation and Financial Projections***

Hartnell College has refined its financial planning and development process to demonstrate the linkage between resource allocation and institutional planning. Financial projections are built on this linkage. A three-year financial projections worksheet was created in FY 2012 and shows projections through 2017. It is designed for “what if” scenarios ([2.39](#)). This tool has been used in preparing PowerPoint presentations shared with the college community ([2.40](#), [2.41](#)). The worksheet provides summary financial projections consolidating all departments and divisions.

The planning process follows a budget calendar designed to move forward all requested resources through the review process in a timely manner ([2.6](#)), ([2.7](#)), ([2.8](#)), ([2.9](#)). Budget worksheets provided to Deans and VPs provide current year budget, current year activity to date, and prior year actuals ([2.42](#)).

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

- [2.1 Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement](#)
- [2.2 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting September 17, 2014](#)
- [2.3 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting February 5, 2014](#)

- [2.4 Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- [2.5 Timeline for Fall 2013 PPA Process](#)
- [2.6 Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15](#)
- [2.7 Timeline for 2014 PPA Process](#)
- [2.8 Annual Budget Development Calendar](#)
- [2.9 Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes](#)
- [2.10 Governance & Planning Model](#)
- [2.11 Academic Affairs Council Handbook](#)
- [2.12 Administrative Services Council Handbook](#)
- [2.13 Advancement Council Handbook](#)
- [2.14 Student Affairs Council Handbook](#)
- [2.15 Technology Development Council Handbook](#)
- [2.16 College Planning Council Handbook](#)
- [2.17 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting April 2, 2014](#)
- [2.18 Timeline for Deliverables of 3 Major Plans](#)
- [2.19 2014-15 Master Meeting Calendar](#)
- [2.20 Academic and Governance Calendar](#)
- [2.21 Inventory of Long Term Plans with Leads FY 2014-15](#)
- [2.22 Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)
- [2.23 Technology Master Plan 2011-2021](#)
- [2.24 Technology Plan 2011-2018](#)
- [2.25 President’s Task Force Funding Plan 2012-2017](#)
- [2.26 Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018 7-1-14](#)
- [2.27 Student Success and Support Program Plan](#)
- [2.28 Student Equity Plan](#)
- [2.29 Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)
- [2.30 Internal & External Communications – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- [2.31 Highlights of Board of Trustees Meeting February 4, 2014](#)
- [2.32 Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014](#)
- [2.33 Actions from Academic Senate Meetings September 23 & October 14, 2014](#)
- [2.34 Access to Minutes of Governance Council Meetings](#)
- [2.35 2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent - President September 5, 2014](#)
- [2.36 President’s Forum April 11, 2014](#)
- [2.37 Administration Meeting Agenda September 3, 2014](#)
- [2.38 President’s Corner - Presentations, Communications and Reports](#)
- [2.39 Financial Projections Worksheet](#)
- [2.40 Hartnell Budget Presentation Tentative budget 2013-14](#)
- [2.41 Hartnell Budget Presentation Tentative budget 2014-15](#)
- [2.42 Budget Worksheet](#)

### **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.

#### **Resolution and Analysis**

##### ***Development of Systematic Processes for Assessing Long Term Plans, Annual Plans & The Integrated Planning Process***

The college has developed regular systematic processes for assessing its long-term and annual plans, as well as its integrated planning process, to facilitate continuous sustainable institutional improvement. Specific processes or review mechanisms have been developed for evaluating the college's strategic plan, long-term institutional plans, comprehensive program plans, annual program plans, and the overall integrated planning process.

The process for assessing the strategic plan is documented in the continuous improvement process, Development, Review & Revision of The Strategic Plan ([3.1](#), [3.2](#)). The process entails an annual evaluation of selected goals, outcomes, and key performance indicators (KPIs) in the plan, with a complete evaluation of the plan in its final (2017-18) year of implementation. The first progress report--which was focused specifically on the first two priorities, Student Access and Student Success--was presented to the Board of Trustees at its development meeting on November 12, 2014 ([3.3](#)).

The process for assessing long-term institutional plans is provided in the continuous improvement process, Development, Review & Revision of Long Term Institutional Plans ([3.4](#)). This process consists of an annual assessment of the extent to which the plan's implementation is on, behind, or ahead of schedule, relative to the final year of the plan's implementation, descriptions of the linkages between the initiatives in that plan and strategic plan goals, and a quantitative assessment of progress made on each initiative. Assessment of the Technology Plan and President's Task Force Funding Plan provide detailed examples ([3.5](#), [3.6](#)).

Processes for reviewing comprehensive and annual program plans are delineated in the continuous improvement processes, Comprehensive Program Review and Annual Program Planning & Assessment ([3.7](#), [3.8](#)). Faculty, staff, and/or administrators in all designated programs, services, and offices ([3.9](#)) are responsible for completing an annual—and periodically, a comprehensive—review that requires responses to multiple evaluative items.

Both qualitative and quantitative indicators are considered as appropriate to the program and/or services offered. Annual assessment includes completion of program planning and assessment (PPA) reports ([3.10](#), [3.11](#)) and submission of student learning or service area outcomes assessments per the continuous improvement process, Annual SLO Assessment ([3.12](#)). A separate comprehensive review involves evaluating specific programs, services, offices, and campuses/sites at least once every five years so that the participants reflect back several years and project several years into the future. The annual review of the chemistry program reveals

how the criteria are applied to a specific academic program (3.13). The comprehensive review of the newly established Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness highlights the various components of this review as applied to a service unit (3.14).

The initial mechanism for reviewing planning at the college encompasses a broad spectrum of criteria associated with the integrated planning model (3.15) and various continuous improvement processes, such as long-term institutional planning, annual program planning, governance, budget development, and other processes (3.16, 3.17, 3.2, 3.4, 3.7, 3.8, 3.12, 3.18). The key features of integrated planning have been charted to display an overview of continuous improvement that has occurred and is expected to occur from 2010 through 2015 (3.19).

A second, ongoing mechanism has been established through the College Planning Council's approval of a Continuous Improvement Committee at the Council's meeting on September 17, 2014 (3.20); this committee will function as a subcommittee of the council. One set of the committee's responsibilities is Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning: to "review alignment, and recommend ways to maximize alignment, between and among the college's strategic and long term plans," and "review strategic integration of, and recommend ways to better integrate, annual planning and budgeting" (3.21). The committee will begin meeting in late 2014 or early 2015.

### ***Systematic Review of Effectiveness of Evaluation Mechanisms***

In fall 2013, the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness conducted an initial systematic review of the college's evaluation and assessment mechanisms relative to: (a) which mechanisms/processes were currently in place; (b) how frequently relevant elements were scheduled to be evaluated per the existing evaluation cycle; (c) whether a complete master list of elements existed; and (d) to what extent all elements in that inventory had recently been evaluated. It was determined that the college had 17 formalized evaluation mechanisms. A review showed varied weaknesses and challenges, such as irregularity of evaluation cycles, incomplete or non-comprehensive master lists of programs, and inconsistent or irregular evaluation of specific elements (3.22).

Later, it was determined that certain key continuous improvement processes either did not exist or were not explicitly documented. Subsequent grouping of the existing mechanisms into 5 categories—organizational effectiveness, effectiveness of strategic planning, effectiveness of strategic operations, processes for employee hiring and job classification, and performance evaluation procedures—pointed to the limited usefulness of the previous evaluative practices, particularly within the categories of organizational effectiveness, effectiveness of strategic planning, and effectiveness of strategic operations. Documenting the need for improvement in various critical institutional areas, deciding how improvement might best be accomplished, and determining whether improvement was later accomplished were all hampered by the relatively narrow range of previous evaluation mechanisms, the lack of fully developed evaluation processes, and inconsistent history of their application at the college.

The aforementioned empirical findings and analysis led to the decision to create a structured system of evaluation procedures, based on the identification of all key institutional continuous improvement processes as the starting point for aligning evaluation mechanisms over the

timeframe of the newly developed Strategic Plan (2013-2018). The processes have been developed utilizing a template that addresses four areas with sub-components, including: (a) the continuous improvement process, cycle, and process lead; (b) participants, tasks, and evidence in the evaluation process; (c) participants, tasks, and evidence in making improvements in effectiveness; and (d) participants, tasks, and evidence in making improvements in process effectiveness (3.23). Designing this approach to cultivating institutional effectiveness encompassed a framework of the five continuous improvement categories delineated above and represents 30 total processes, nearly doubling the number previously in place (17): organizational effectiveness (5), effectiveness of strategic planning (7), effectiveness of strategic operations (6), processes for employee hiring and job classification (5), and performance evaluation procedures (7) (3.24). Approved by the College Planning Council at its meeting on September 17, 2014, the Continuous Improvement Plan and accompanying Handbook of Continuous Improvement Processes—currently with 27 completed templates of the 30 total processes—highlight the college’s commitment to sustainable continuous quality improvement (3.25, 3.26, 3.27).

A second, ongoing approach to reviewing the college’s evaluation mechanisms has been incorporated into the second set of the newly established Continuous Improvement Committee’s responsibilities, Continuous Improvement of Institutional Effectiveness: to “review progress on and outcomes of institutional continuous improvement processes,” and “recommend creative ideas, innovative practices, and data driven approaches directed toward sustainable continuous quality improvement at the college” (3.21).

Hartnell endeavors to become a role model for other colleges in the area of continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness. Competitive proposals for presentations on this topic have been accepted for inclusion in the annual CCLC Convention program in November 2014 and the annual ACCCA conference in February 2015 (3.28, 3.29).

#### **Next Steps**

None

#### **Conclusion**

Completed

#### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

- 3.1 [Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)
- 3.2 [Strategic Plan Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 3.3 [Strategic Plan Progress Report - Student Access and Student Success](#)
- 3.4 [Long Term Institutional Plans – Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 3.5 [Assessment of Technology Plan FY 2013-14](#)
- 3.6 [Assessment of President’s Task Force Funding Plan FY 2013-14](#)
- 3.7 [Comprehensive Program Review – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 3.8 [Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)



- [3.9 Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 Completed Through Spring 2014](#)
- [3.10 Academic PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)
- [3.11 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)
- [3.12 Annual SLO Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- [3.13 Chemistry Program Annual Review – Spring 2014](#)
- [3.14 Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Comprehensive Review – Spring 2014](#)
- [3.15 Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement](#)
- [3.16 Governance System – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- [3.17 Mission, Vision & Values Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- [3.18 Budget Development & Resource Allocation – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- [3.19 Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning 2010-2015](#)
- [3.20 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting September 17, 2014](#)
- [3.21 Continuous Improvement Committee Handbook](#)
- [3.22 Review of Evaluation Mechanisms – Fall 2013](#)
- [3.23 Template – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- [3.24 Inventory of Continuous Improvement Processes](#)
- [3.25 Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018](#)
- [3.26 Handbook of Continuous Improvement Processes 2013-2018 11-14-14](#)
- [3.27 Overview – Key Components of Continuous Improvement Processes](#)
- [3.28 CCLC 2014 Annual Convention Program](#)
- [3.29 2015 ACCCA Conference Session Selection Notification](#)

#### **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 members teaching online be evaluated regularly and that assessment of student learning be measured regularly for online students.

#### **Resolution and Analysis**

Since the ACCJC External Evaluation Report issued in July 2013, Hartnell College has systematically and continuously improved the quality and quantity of assessment of all levels of outcomes across the campus. Core competencies (institutional-level outcomes) appear in the college catalog ([4.1](#)) and on the Outcomes & Assessment (O&A) Committee webpage ([4.2](#)); program-level outcomes appear in the college catalog along with each program (certificates and degrees) ([4.3](#)) and on the O&A Committee webpage ([4.4](#)). Course-level outcomes appear in the syllabus ([4.5](#)) for each course as well as on the website ([4.6](#)). Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) also appear on the O&A Committee webpage ([4.7](#)).

The dean of academic affairs, languages, learning support, and resources (LLS&R) continues to collaborate with other college administrators and faculty and staff members to ensure that outcome assessment at all levels is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement. Faculty members and staff members demonstrate that student learning improvement is a priority, which is evidenced by increased meetings and discussion among colleagues regarding the analysis of outcome assessment data ([4.8](#), [4.9](#), [4.10](#)). Discipline meetings for assessment planning took place in December 2013, with follow-up meetings in January to discuss and analyze assessment results from Fall 2013. In August 2014, faculty participated in assessment activities to begin discussing assessment of spring 2014 assessment data, which was submitted in November 2014 ([4.11](#)). Assessment results for fall 2014 will be submitted by February 13, 2015. ([4.12](#)).

The O&A Committee continues to meet on the second and fourth Mondays of the month and has collaborated with the Curriculum Committee to establish a process to review all newly created and revised SLOs at the course and program levels ([4.13](#)). Both committees recognize the importance of ensuring that course-level SLOs are accurately reflected in all locations (syllabi, CurricUNET, and eLumen). In fall 2014, the O&A Committee sponsored an SLO Verification Day, where a discipline representative for each discipline verified that course and program SLOs were consistent and accurate. ([4.14](#), [4.15](#), [4.16](#), [4.17](#)).



As noted in the External Follow-up Evaluation Report from April 2014, discipline faculty members developed five-year course assessment calendars in fall 2013, which they are continuing to follow (4.18). Calendars were first developed in Excel and then transferred to more user-friendly Word documents for easy reference (4.19, 4.20). This planning tool helps to facilitate consistent and cyclical course/program assessment/reassessment by full-time and adjunct faculty members and to ensure that assessments at all levels are conducted and evaluated on an ongoing basis. Course and program outcomes are either assessed or reassessed based on analysis and discussion of data after the determination has been made as to whether expectations were met. Fall 2013 and spring 2014 course-level assessment reports, housed on the college's shared internal drives, align with calendars (unless modifications to the schedule were made based on assessment data) (4.21). Faculty members collaborate about assessment schedules and make adjustments if necessary (for example, assessments may be postponed if interventions are being conducted and evaluated).

The following assessment cycle adopted by the college will help to steadily improve the percentage of offered courses that have been assessed.

- Data are collected in the current semester based on selected outcomes for assessment (as determined by assessment calendars and need, based on previous assessments and interventions to “close the loop”).
- Data from the previous semester are aggregated, discussed, and analyzed by faculty members during the next semester. Currently (until eLumen is fully implemented), faculty members post-course level assessment summary forms that contain their aggregated data and salient discussion points on the college's internal shared drive (R Drive) (4.21).
- Course-level assessment data are used to examine program-level outcomes; results and discussion are recorded on the program-level assessment summary forms and posted in the internal shared drive (R drive) (4.31). Faculty members answer prompts on the form to address what was examined, what actions were taken, and what, if any, the next steps are.

Since fall 2013, faculty members have engaged in systematic and continuous assessment planning and assessment. In December 2013, faculty members attended mandatory meetings and were required to submit assessment plans for courses offered in fall 2013 (4.22). In January 2014, both full-time and adjunct faculty attended workshops to analyze their aggregated fall 2013 course data, which also was used in program-level outcome assessment (4.23). In fall 2014, faculty discussed and analyzed core competency assessment data from the 2014 Graduation Survey, which repeated questions from the spring 2012 survey and included Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) questions to assess core competencies (4.10, 4.24, 4.25, 4.26). Spring 14 assessment data and analysis were submitted by November 15, 2014 (4.27). During flex days at the beginning of the spring 2015 semester, faculty attended presentations on alignment and integration of assessment strategies and tools of SLO assessment and rubrics: strategies in practice; introduction to eLumen, and aligning course objectives and SLOs with online modules (4.28).

The college has been using a less than optimal system for collecting and cataloging assessment data, but an improvement is on the near horizon. Through the fall of 2014, the data have been recorded on Word documents and saved to an internal shared drive called the R Drive. This limits access and requires a time-consuming manual “counting” process to determine the number of courses that have been assessed. As early as 2012, the college recognized the need for a better system, and so it embarked on a process of evaluating the systems available. After a thorough vetting process, the college decided to purchase eLumen software in the fall of 2013 to assist it with a systematic collection and analysis of outcome assessment data needs (4.51). By integrating assessment data, eLumen links course learning outcomes to both program learning outcomes and core competencies. Reports with aggregated data can then be used to measure student learning at different levels over time.

The process to transition from the R Drive repository of assessment data to eLumen began in spring 2014 with the inputting of all outcomes, the mapping of outcomes to program outcomes and core competencies, and the development of course groups for both degree and certificate level assessment. These activities will provide faculty members with more specific data for program analysis. In addition, a pilot group of 10 faculties was convened and tasked with learning eLumen, developing training materials, and then actually training faculty and staff to use the software.

The pilot group met regularly during the fall 2014 semester to develop mastery of eLumen and to create training materials in several modalities, including PowerPoint (4.30,) and clear, easy-to-use training video modules to walk their peers through every part of the eLumen process. (4.52, 4.53, 4.54, 4.55). It developed an eLumen training schedule with 15 two- to three-hour time slots to train other faculty, full-time and adjunct (4.50, 4.29). Implementation began on a small scale in fall 2014 with a wider implementation planned for spring 2015. In addition to the pilot faculty, in January approximately 10 percent of faculty received training, and by mid-February 2015, faculty will have entered assessment results for all courses offered in fall 14 on which assessment was conducted. The college’s goal is for 90 percent of all instructional disciplines to have outcome assessment recorded in eLumen by the end of spring 2015.

Currently, the course and program summary forms remain housed on the internal shared drive (4.21, 4.31). Faculty members have assessed or reassessed most courses taught in fall 2013, spring 2014, and fall 2014 and have aggregated assessment results from multiple section courses. As a result, the number of active courses assessed has increased from 71 percent to 80 percent. In addition, faculty members have engaged in broad-based discussion to examine results, to discuss potential modifications, and to use course-level assessment data to assess at least one program-level outcome (4.31). Program-level outcomes will again be assessed in spring 2015. Survey results from the Third Annual Student Success Conference Day were analyzed and training sessions were provided (4.23, 4.26).

In its External Follow-up Evaluation Report from April 2014, the team made the following observation and suggestion:

“the team noted that some courses that have not been assessed because they have not been offered recently in the schedule. Those courses unable to be assessed or offered to students within a reasonable time should be removed from the catalogue. It is the team

suggestion that these courses be inactivated to allow the College to have a true indication of its progress in course assessment.” (4.57)

All academic areas are reviewing their curriculum to determine if courses that are not regularly offered are still relevant. Those that are not will be moved through the college’s Curriculum Committee’s inactivation process. A course scheduling matrix that includes all courses that are necessary (active) to meet the learning outcomes of the program and students will be included in program planning documents to help plan for more efficient schedule development.

It has been challenging for disciplines without full-time faculty members to keep curriculum decisions and assessments on track, so the college has been working to address those challenges. In the fall of 2014, the college made hires in two of those disciplines: theatre arts and sociology. Additionally, in the fall of 2014, the Board approved AP 4021 to provide a procedure for establishing, revitalizing, or discontinuing academic programs (4.32).

Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) have been developed for all non-instructional areas, and one cycle of assessments already has occurred. Staff in non-instructional or service areas has continued to develop and assess outcomes on a regular basis. If assessment results do not meet expectation criteria, interventions are planned and implemented before reassessment. One example of this improvement cycle can be found in the area of human resources, where an analysis of focus group comments regarding the college’s employee recruitment process resulted in the purchase of software to ensure more efficient and effective hiring, onboarding, and evaluation procedures. The selection process will be reassessed after the new procedures have been implemented (4.33). If outcome expectations have been met, new outcomes that will provide meaningful data are developed and assessed

To provide assessment information to college constituents and the public and to align with instructional reporting, service areas have provided summaries of their assessments by describing what they “looked at,” what they “found,” and what the “next steps” are. These summary forms are accessible through the Outcomes & Assessment webpage on the college’s website. One hundred percent of service area outcomes have been assessed and analyzed. Where necessary, interventions have been implemented and reassessment will take place to “close the loop” (4.34).

All core competencies (institutional outcomes) were assessed (and some reassessed) in spring 2014. On May 30, 2014, the second Graduation Survey was administered to 260 students at graduation rehearsal. This survey included the original 10 questions from the 2012 Graduation Survey as well as 15 questions that were supplements to the CCSSE survey conducted in spring 2014 (4.24). Discussion and analysis of results among faculty members occurred during the college’s fall 2014 convocation in August (4.11). This activity involved small group, across-discipline discussion and analysis of survey results by full-time and part-time faculty members. Each group selected a recorder, who was responsible for entering the group’s responses to discussion prompts provided in a Google document (4.26). These results have been discussed in the O&A Committee and will be shared with faculty members during the spring 2015 semester to include in assessment discussions and analysis.

To ensure transparency and to provide information to college constituents, the college updated the O&A webpage, which contains committee meeting agendas and minutes and outcome and assessment data for all levels of outcomes. Presentations about outcome assessment have been

made to the Board of Trustees (4.35), various college councils (4.36), full-time and part-time faculty members (4.37), and service area administrators and staff members (4.38, 4.39).

The O&A Committee continues to offer training to faculty members on outcome assessment and rubric development (4.40, 4.41, 4.42, 4.43, 4.44, 4.49). Faculty members and administrators participate in professional development activities to continue to improve teaching and learning on our campus. Examples include attendance at an Accreditation Regional Workshop in Spring 2014 by the Dean of Languages, Learning Support, and Resources (LLS&R) and the O&A Specialist; attendance by seven faculty members (including the Academic Senate President and the O&A Specialist), staff (the College's Data Analyst), and management (the Dean of LLS&R) at the RP Group's "Strengthening Student Success Conference" in Fall 2014; attendance at Fall and Spring Academic Senate Plenary sessions, and annual attendance at the Curriculum Institute. Participation in professional development has assisted the college in continuing to ensure that assessment processes are providing useful and meaningful data.

The College administration continues to reinforce the concept of "continuous quality improvement, where student learning improvement in all disciplines is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college" and to ensure that activities that encourage broad-based discussion are scheduled and well-attended to achieve this goal. To support this endeavor, a faculty assessment specialist position was created and now two specialists are providing assistance to faculty members and staff members in developing tools and rubrics as well as data analysis (4.45). The college has encouraged the participation of adjunct faculty members in assessment activities by providing a stipend for meeting attendance during which discussions and analysis of assessment data occur. The results of these discussions is recorded in course- and program-level assessment reports (4.21, 4.31, 4.34). Deadlines for outcome data assessment reporting have been established, and communication among staff and faculty members help to track compliance. The Dean of LLS&R, assessment specialists, the Curriculum Committee chair, and deans have worked closely with faculty members and staff to ensure assessment reports reflect assessment activities across the campus.

All faculty members teaching online courses will be evaluated according to the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the District and the faculty association. The components of the evaluation process for faculty members teaching online and face-to-face are identical; however, because of the nature of the online environment, worksite observations for faculty members teaching distance education (DE) courses are adjusted to provide equivalent opportunity for observation and feedback. The CBA thus provides:

The evaluator will evaluate one learning unit of the course, which should be roughly equivalent to the material that would be covered in no more than one week of class. Access would include all materials posted by the instructor and discussion thread posts by both the instructor and students for that learning unit. Access will also include access to documents that apply to the entire course and are outside the unit, including: syllabus, class policies, required class activities, exams, and any current announcements posted for the course (4.46).

To be consistent with materials for face-to-face courses, online course materials are expected to have identical SLOs to the face-to-face course, which are detailed in both the course outline of

record file in CurricUNET and course syllabus.

To sustain this climate of assessment and improvement, workshops addressing assessment and forums for discussion and analysis will be regularly scheduled and ongoing. For example, full-time faculty members teaching online are required to participate in professional development relating to online teaching and learning periodically, at least six (6) of the twelve (12) flex hours per year. A workshop was presented in spring 2014 to specifically address outcome assessment in DE courses ([4.47](#)).

In addition, to provide for consistent and regular student and instructor evaluation procedures for and the effective delivery of distance education courses, the following has been implemented or planned:

- An online template allowing DE students to complete a student appraisal of their course identical to the face-to-face appraisal was developed and implemented for those classes whose instructors were being evaluated, as of spring 2014.
- A student satisfaction survey is being developed by the DE committee. It will guide future decisions for training and technical needs. It will be administered to all on-line students on an annual basis.
- A template surveying DE faculty members on questions asked in the annual CCCCCO report was developed by the instructional technologist and presented to the DE Committee at its October 2014 meeting. It is to be administered to all online instructors on an annual basis. ([4.56](#))

### **Next Steps**

The college will continue to practice outcomes assessment that is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement of all practices and structures across the college. The Title V Research Group just conducted a survey of faculty asking for identification of data needs for program planning and assessment (PPA) ([4.48](#)). Data collection and reporting will be easier and more accurate after eLumen is fully implemented. The college has developed student learning outcomes and assessment that is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement; training has been provided for all personnel in the development and assessment of learning outcomes at the course, program, institution and service levels; faculty members teaching online are evaluated regularly; and assessment of student learning is measured regularly for online students. The cycle of data collection and analysis has been occurring on a semester basis with evidence of an established, sustainable pattern.

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[4.1 Core Competencies \(Catalog\)](#)

[4.2 O&A Webpage \(Core Competencies\)](#)

- [4.3 Degree Samples with SLOs in Catalog](#)
- [4.4 O&A Webpage \(PLOs\)](#)
- [4.5 Sample Syllabi](#)
- [4.6 O&A Webpage \(SLOs\)](#)
- [4.7 O&A Webpage \(SAOs\)](#)
- [4.8 Assessment Discussion Samples](#)
- [4.9 Hartnell College Mail -ECE Retreat for SLO Discussion](#)
- [4.10 Graduation Survey Group Activity Results \(8.25.14\)](#)
- [4.11 Fall Convocation agenda \(8.15.14\)](#)
- [4.12 Elumen Training Flyer](#)
- [4.13 SLO revision instructions \(10/2014\)](#)
- [4.14 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 1](#)
- [4.15 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 2](#)
- [4.16 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 3](#)
- [4.17 Sample Spreadsheet for SLO Verification-CHM Spr 15 SLOs](#)
- [4.18 Instructions for SLO From Phase II](#)
- [4.19 BIO-SLO-PLO Mapping and Calendar](#)
- [4.20 Course SLO Assessment Schedule Samples](#)
- [4.21 Course Outcome Assessment Report Samples](#)
- [4.22 Hartnell College Mail - Plan to Assess Course SLOs for Fall 2013, Mandatory Meetings Schedule](#)
- [4.23 3rd Annual Student Success Conference \(Flex Day\) Agenda 1.16-17.14](#)
- [4.24 Core competencies-CCSSE survey results \(convocation f14\)](#)
- [4.25 Graduation Survey 2014](#)
- [4.26 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation](#)
- [4.27 Hartnell College Mail - NOT URGENT -- YET!! \(SLO S14 Assessment Due Date\)](#)
- [4.28 2015 4th Annual Success Conference agendas](#)
- [4.29 Elumen Training Calendar \(2/2015\)](#)
- [4.30 Elumen PPT](#)
- [4.31 Program Outcome Assessment Report Samples](#)
- [4.32 Establishing, Revitalizing, and Discontinuing Academic Programs \(AP 4021\)](#)
- [4.33 HR SAO 1](#)
- [4.34 Service Area Outcome Report Samples](#)
- [4.35 Presentation to the Board \(2\)](#)
- [4.36 CPC Presentation](#)
- [4.37 Presentation--orientation](#)
- [4.38 Service Area Outcome-Assessment Summary Form \(instructions\)](#)
- [4.39 SAO summary Report Form and Path](#)
- [4.40 Assessment Activities PowerPoint \(1/2014\)](#)
- [4.41 Checklist for Flex Day Assessment Activities](#)
- [4.42 ACCJC SLO Workshop Handout](#)
- [4.43 Hartnell College Mail - April Outcomes Assessment Workshop](#)
- [4.44 Hartnell College Mail - Outcome and Assessment Workshop](#)
- [4.45 Assessment Specialist Position Description](#)
- [4.46 HDFA Appendix DE2013](#)



- [4.47 Hartnell College Mail - Assessment Workshop Using Online Technologies](#)
- [4.48 Data Needs Survey \(11/2014\)](#)
- [4.49 Alignment & Integration of Assessment Strategies PowerPoint](#)
- [4.50 Instructions for Core Competency Survey Activity \(8.14\)](#)
- [4.51 SLO Management-Assessment Software - Side by Side Comparison](#)
- [4.52 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 1](#)
- [4.53 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 2](#)
- [4.54 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 3](#)
- [4.55 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 4](#)
- [4.56 Distance Ed Committee Meeting 10-14-14](#)
- [4.57 External Follow up Evaluation Report](#)

## **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. 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.

## **Resolution and Analysis**

The library has set institutional goals for its services, and staff members have engaged in conversations to develop these goals. These goals are reviewed and updated if necessary during the library's program planning and assessment (PPA) process. In addition, the library staff collaborates with the staff at satellite sites to improve awareness of the library's online databases and other resources that are equally accessible for all students, regardless of which campus they attend. To better inform students and faculty of the many online services the library has to offer, faculty have received an e-mail and flyer inviting them to take advantage of both online and face-to-face services and encourage their students to do so as well; faculty often post informational flyers in locations accessible to students ([5.1](#)). The new website includes a "For Faculty members" tab, where faculty members can request a library purchase and schedule a library orientation, for example.

To address the information competency needs of students, the library offers three sections of information competency credit courses during the fall and spring semesters, and often offers a summer course. Librarians track the individual assistance provided to students at the Reference Desk in the Reference Daily Statistics Log. Since the reference email account was created in December 2013, the number of faculty and students using this service has been increasing. Usually the annual number of library orientations is slightly more than 100. The librarians reached out to faculty members during the spring 2014 semester ([5.2](#)), and as a result, the number of orientations and attending students increased in 2014. As of November 2014, 120 orientations had been taught. October 2014 was a very busy month, with 22 orientations taught and 516 students attending.

The library is now purchasing books pre-cataloged and pre-processed to speed up workflow in the technical services area. In addition, more books in electronic format are being purchased to allow for quick and easy access to all Hartnell students, especially those enrolled in online courses and at our remote sites. The library has established Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and has assessed most of these services ([5.11](#)). The assessments are located with the other college SAOs on the campus R drive. Future assessment results will be entered into eLumen along with SLO and other SAO assessment data. A Service Area Outcome was created to assess and improve the cataloging workflow issue. The results of assessments have been integrated into the



library's program review/program planning and assessment (PPA) document and have been used to justify requests for staffing, maintenance, and technology support (5.10). The library also has purchased the Credo Academic Core Reference Collection, which is an easy-to-use tool for research projects and homework. Through this online library students may search in hundreds of encyclopedias, dictionaries, thesauri, quotations, and subject-specific titles, as well as 200,000+ images and audio files, and nearly 200 videos (5.12).

To better serve the library and information needs of students at the Alisal Campus and the King City Education Center, the library requested in its 2014 PPA a 20-hour per week part-time outreach librarian who would work at both King City Education Center and the Alisal Campus. This position was not funded in the 2014-15 fiscal year.

To better serve the needs of all students and faculty at Hartnell, the library requested through the PPA process and the Full-Time Faculty Hiring Committee, replacement of the full-time student services librarian (previous faculty librarian retired three years ago). Although this process is not yet completed, this position did not rise to the top of the Hiring Committee's recommendations for faculty hiring for 2015-16.

Hartnell's systems/technology librarian created a prototype online orientation in the college's learning management system (Etudes), and is working with distance education faculty to test it in spring 2015. The online orientation will be provided not only to students enrolled in distance education classes, but also will be available to all Hartnell students. (5.3)

A student satisfaction outcome was developed and administered in fall 2013 to determine if students have adequate access to library and learning support services at the King City Education Center and Alisal Campus:

Students and faculty of the King City Center will report that they have adequate access to library and learning support services.

Students and faculty of the Alisal Campus will report that they have adequate access to library and learning support services.

The criterion for assessment is that a minimum of 50 percent will indicate they are satisfied/very satisfied with library/learning services at external sites. An initial Library Service User Survey was given to 237 students from 10 classes at the King City Center during September 17-26, 2013. Survey results revealed that most students were either somewhat satisfied (43 percent) or not satisfied (38 percent) with library services provided at the King City Center. Many students indicated that they needed the following services to be successful in their classes: two-hour textbook check out (68 percent), access to reference materials/dictionaries (44 percent), and a

reference librarian to talk to or call (29 percent). Students also indicated that they would like to have a quiet place to read or to study on that campus ([5.4](#)).

Additionally, surveys (using Google Forms) were administered at all three campuses in October and November 2013 to measure this outcome, with 113 students responding at the Alisal Campus, 151 responses at the King City Center, and 407 responses at the Main Campus. Staff at all three sites contributed in recruiting patrons/students to participate. ([5.5](#), [5.6](#), [5.7](#), [5.8](#)).

A summary of responses is below:

<b>Question</b>	<b>Main Campus</b>	<b>Alisal Campus</b>	<b>King City Center</b>
Satisfied/Very Satisfied with existing library and learning support services?	90%	39%	34%
Satisfied/Very Satisfied with access to library services?	NA	66%	39%
Satisfied/Very Satisfied with access to tutorial services?	NA	46%	48%
Importance of library services and resources in Hartnell classes?*	97%	94%	89%
Importance of tutorial services in Hartnell classes?*	85%	78%	87%

\*Results represent services are important/very important

The results from these surveys clearly indicate that students who attend the Main Campus are more satisfied with library and learning support services than students who attend classes at our satellite locations.

Based on results from the survey administered in fall 2013, improvements have been made to tutorial support at both the King City Center and the Alisal Campus. For example, at the King City Center, a professional expert assists students in assessing their reading skills by using the Reading Plus software program. Once a student's skills have been assessed, activities to help the student improve are made available. There were 57 students who used Reading Plus in fall 2014 ([5.9](#), [5.13](#), [5.14](#)), and there are 62 students who will be using Reading Plus on the Main Campus in spring 2015.

Additionally, tutor and supplemental instruction (SI) support has increased and become more consistent at all three campuses. The Tutorial Center on the Main Campus is now open two evenings a week and on Saturday mornings. At the Alisal Campus, additional math and English tutors, especially in the CSIT-in-3 program, have been assisting students to successfully complete courses.

In addition, a pilot program using an online tutorial service (Eduwizards) will be offered to students beginning in spring 2015. Tutoring support programs in both math (using ALEKS software in MAT 121 and MAT 123) and in English (using Reading Plus software in ENG 253) are being piloted at all three sites. Students can visit the ESL lab, Tutorial Services, or the Computer Center to receive tutoring support on the Main Campus.

The college has developed better, up-to-date counseling online, and will continue to make improvements to these processes. First, during the 2014 spring semester, it developed and distributed a mixed model quantitative/qualitative survey to students who submitted questions online to a counselor (5.15). The survey was designed to gauge the usefulness of the online counseling service and whether that service effectively answered their questions and prepared them for college success. Results of that survey were compiled and analyzed in fall 2014, and refinements and modifications to the online counseling service were made. Also in spring 2014, a faculty inquiry group of counselors began meeting to research and discuss online counseling models used at other community colleges (5.16). During this time, a team from Hartnell (four counselors, the Director of Information Technology, and the Dean of Student Affairs/Student Success) visited Fresno City College to study its online counseling process (5.17).

As a result of these analyses and feedback, Hartnell is in the process of implementing two types of online counseling: e-mail counseling and online synchronous counseling. E-mail counseling, piloted in fall 2014, allows students to send messages and questions to the Counseling Department (5.18). All counselors will have access to this general email account, but only a pilot group of counselors were responsible for responding to students during the first month of the program. Online synchronous counseling is scheduled to begin in spring 2015. Students will be able to access this option through the PAWS portal, which will allow them to schedule online appointments for online meetings. Both options will be cooperative efforts of the counseling and IT departments. Before they are fully implemented, the college will address important issues of confidentiality, the use of automatic responses, electronic signatures for the general counseling e-mail, expectations and guarantees about response times, record-keeping, and counselor workload.

### **Next Steps**

Librarians will continue to look for new ideas, methods, and opportunities to teach information competency skills and improve outreach to students. Hartnell's Systems/Technology librarian will be testing and implementing the online orientation accessed through Etudes, the college's

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

learning management system, in spring 2015. This will provide access to the library's orientation to our online students as well as to our students attending Hartnell College courses at the Alisal Campus or in South County. In addition, delivery of services to assist students at all three campus, such as online tutoring and counseling, will be assessed and modifications will be made as necessary to improve these services.

**Conclusion**  
Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

- 5.1 [Library Flyer of Remote Services](#)
- 5.2 [Hartnell College e-mail Regarding reference@hartnell.edu](#)
- 5.3 [Hartnell Library Online Orientation](#)  
<https://sites.google.com/a/hartnell.edu/orientation/>
- 5.4 [Student Survey KCC Library Services Narrative](#)
- 5.5 [Student Survey KCC Library Services Data](#)
- 5.6 [Main Campus Library Survey Analysis](#)
- 5.7 [King City Center Survey II Analysis](#)
- 5.8 [Alisal Campus Survey Analysis](#)
- 5.9 [Reading Plus Progress Report Fall 14](#)
- 5.10 [Library PPA Spring 2014](#)
- 5.11 [SAO assessments-Library](#)
- 5.12 [Credo Academic Core Reference Collection](#)
- 5.13 [Reading Plus®List of students who used Reading Plus FALL 2014](#)
- 5.14 [Number of students who used Reading Plus Fall 2014](#)
- 5.15 [Online Counseling Services Student Surveys](#)
- 5.16 [Agenda and Minutes of Online Counseling FIG](#)
- 5.17 [Agenda of Fresno City Visit](#)
- 5.18 [Summary Report on General Counseling Emails](#)

**Recommendation 6**

In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the college regularly evaluate the contracted library services outlined in the "Memorandum of Clarification" finalized in March 2013.

In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 6 was resolved.

## **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 members 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.

## **Resolution and Analysis**

Comprehensive evaluation processes and criteria necessary to improve performance and support the college's mission are in place and are regularly and consistently conducted for all employee groups. For faculty members, those evaluations contain a component concerning the employee's effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. Evaluations of all staff members are used as a basis for continuous improvement.

Professional learning opportunities are formally and regularly offered to all employee groups to ensure equity in employee development opportunities. With two recent hires of full-time employees to staff the Professional Development Center and a college-wide Professional Development Committee engaged in developing programs to support and encourage professional development, the college has signaled that professional development has become part of the culture for all employees. The Committee, comprising representatives from all employee groups, has developed a comprehensive slate of resources and college-wide programs of development to engage the entire campus in professional development, and to ensure that every employee has access to those development opportunities.

## ***Manager Evaluations***

A comprehensive evaluation process for administrators, managers, and supervisors was put in place during the Spring of 2013. It was implemented for the first time in the 2012-13 evaluation period, and has been consistently applied since then. This process, found in Administrative Procedure (AP) 7150 - Evaluation of Management Employees (Administrators, Managers, and Supervisors) ([7.1](#)), provides that management employees will undergo a comprehensive performance evaluation in each of their first two years of employment and every three years thereafter, and that goal-setting and assessment will be conducted annually. Additionally, the superintendent/president may initiate an evaluation at any time.

The comprehensive evaluation process includes several elements: a self-evaluation; a co-workers' assessment that includes input from 10 to 15 peers, faculty members, and staff members; the supervisor's assessment of performance; goal-setting for the next year and assessment of progress toward previous goals; and a summary of the evaluation. The process runs on an academic year cycle, with all evaluations scheduled to be completed and approved by the superintendent/president by June 30 of each year. The evaluation provides the basis for

assessing and improving performance as it relates to the responsibilities of the particular managerial position and the mission and goals of the District, for making decisions on continued employment, and for making decisions on advancement on the salary schedule.

This evaluation process, including the tools and timelines, was introduced to and discussed with all managers at a management meeting on April 3, 2013 (7.2), and this discussion was followed by an e-mail from the president to all management employees that linked to BP 7150 and AP 7150 and requested that all evaluations be concluded by June 30, 2013 (7.3). The Human Resources Office then purchased its own license for a survey tool to be used in administering the co-worker survey assessment, tested the tool, and then delivered the instructions and tools to all supervisors of management employees by e-mail of April 18, 2013 (7.4). This e-mail provided a sample email for them to send to the management employees, to initiate the evaluation process for the managers that they would evaluate.

Evaluations of all managers were completed in 2013 and 2014 using the processes outlined in AP 7150 (7.5).

When management employees are hired, supervisors of those employees are e-mailed to remind them to meet with their new employees to complete the goal-setting part of the evaluation process so that their evaluations at the end of the academic year can include an assessment of their work toward achieving those goals (7.6).

One of the four parts of the manager performance evaluations is the establishment of annual goals for the upcoming period and the assessment of goal attainment for the previous period. Even when management employees have progressed to a three-year evaluation cycle, the goal setting and assessment part of the evaluation process is done on an annual basis. The purpose of this annual cycle is to help the evaluation process serve as a basis for continual improvement.

The goal setting and assessment tool asks the management employee to identify at least three goals, list the tasks involved in accomplishing the goal, set forth a timeline for completing the goals, and list the achievement criteria to determine whether the goal has been met. At the end of the cycle, both the employee and his or her supervisor assess the employee's progress. At the goal assessment meeting, the two begin the process anew for the next year.

All comprehensive management evaluations scheduled to occur during the 2012-13 and 2013-14 academic years were completed, as were all of the annual goal-setting and assessment meetings. (7.5)

### ***Classified Staff Evaluations***

Comprehensive evaluation processes and tools for all classified staff members are written into their collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) or working conditions. For the California School Employees Association (CSEA) member employees, evaluation procedures and rules are contained in article 7 of the collective bargaining agreement (7.7) and the evaluation form is appendix F (7.8). For the Local 39 (L39) member employees, evaluation procedures and rules are contained in article 31 of the collective bargaining agreement (7.9), and for confidential employees, working conditions provide that the evaluation is the basis for decisions about the

employee's eligibility for annual salary increases (7.10). The evaluation tools for CSEA (7.8), L39 (7.11), and confidential (7.12) employees are posted on the Human Resources Office's website (7.13).

The Human Resources Office has been diligent in notifying managers of the evaluations that will become due in their area, and provides assistance for managers to know how and when to conduct those evaluations (7.14). As part of the onboarding process for new employees, managers of new employees are now sent an email within the first week or so of the new employee's employment, with the calendar of due dates for all evaluations due during the first year, the evaluation instrument, and the article of the CBA governing evaluations (7.15).

The college belongs to a training consortium that regularly offers webinars on topics useful to managers. It offered one on managing performance through evaluation in February 2014. As with all of the webinars, that one came with an excellent set of written workbooks and other materials that remain available to all supervisory employees on a shared computer drive. (7.16)

Additionally, the monthly meetings of Hartnell administrators were refocused in the Fall of 2014 to emphasize training and professional development. The administrators' December 3, 2014, meeting consisted of a 3-hour presentation by attorney Marleen L. Sacks of the law firm Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, on the FRISK Documentation Model, Practical Guidelines for Evaluators in Documenting Unsatisfactory Employee Performance. (7.17) Follow-up training in the FRISK Method was given by Associate Vice President of Human Resources Terri Pyer at the administrators' January 2015 meeting. (7.18)

All performance evaluations of classified staff members are up-to-date (7.19).

All classified employee evaluations provide an opportunity for the employee and supervisor to identify goals for the next period and to create a plan of assistance to help them in achieving the goals of this plan (7.13). For L39 and confidential employees, the evaluation always requires the parties to identify these goals and create this plan of assistance for the next review period. For CSEA employees, the improvement plans are mandatory in only three situations: (1) the employee is probationary, (2) the supervisor is new, and (3) the employee received a rating of deficient in any category of performance. The improvement plan is discretionary in other instances, though managers will be encouraged to use this tool for continuous improvement.

### ***Faculty Evaluations***

Evaluation of faculty members is governed by extensive procedures contained in articles 13 (tenured faculty members) (7.20), 14 (probationary faculty members) (7.21), and 21 (adjunct faculty members) (7.22) of the collective bargaining agreement between the Hartnell College Faculty Association (HCFA) and the District. The characteristics of professional competence and conduct that are evaluated provide assurance that satisfactory performance will support the college's mission. Articles 13 and 14 have been in negotiations since the late Spring 2014. Article 21 was negotiated in 2013, and its evaluation provisions were implemented beginning in the Spring semester of 2014.



### ***Full-time Faculty Evaluations***

Probationary faculty members undergo a comprehensive performance review in each of their first four years of employment (7.21). This evaluation includes a peer review, student appraisals, supervisor's review, self-evaluation, and a review of the instructional materials and professional growth and activities reports filed by the faculty member under review. The peer and supervisor reviews include at least six worksite observations. Observation tools are modified for counseling and library faculty members whose primary work is not done in a classroom setting. A process for observing distance education faculty members was added in fall 2013 (7.23), and the article governing distance education, article 22, makes clear that the professional obligations of faculty members contained in articles 13 and 14 pertain to faculty members teaching online to the same extent as if they were teaching face-to-face.(7.24)

Article 14 governing the evaluation of probationary faculty members includes a timeline for these annual reviews, which culminate in a post-evaluation conference involving the probationary faculty member, peer reviewer, and supervisor, prior to December 10. All materials and recommendations from this review are forwarded to the college Tenure Review Committee, which reviews recommendations for all probationary faculty members and makes its own recommendations to the superintendent/president prior to the March meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Evaluations of all probationary faculty members have been routinely conducted on a timely basis, without exception. Moreover, faculty members who have been hired on a full-time temporary basis also participate in the probationary faculty evaluation process.

Tenured faculty members undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least once every three years following the attainment of tenured status (7.20). This evaluation includes a peer review, student appraisals, supervisor's review, self-evaluation, a review of the instructor's classroom materials, and it includes review of a professional growth report and college-related activities report filed by the faculty member under review. The peer and supervisor assessments include at least one worksite observation each. Observation tools are modified for counseling and library faculty members whose primary work is not done in a classroom setting. A process for observing distance education faculty members was added in fall 2013. (7.23)

Article 13 governing the evaluation of tenured faculty members includes a timeline for these annual reviews, which begin with a notification to participating faculty members before September 30, and culminate with a post-evaluation conference among the faculty member, peer reviewer, and supervisor before the end of the academic year. All evaluation reports are scheduled to be given to the faculty member under review prior to April 1.

These evaluations are up-to-date.(7.25) And, while they mostly were done on a timely basis in the past, there were three times during the last seven years when the HCFA and the District negotiated a side letter agreement or adopted a resolution to delay the evaluations of a small group of tenured faculty members for a year or a semester (7.26). This has not occurred during the last two evaluation cycles, and now that the District has been able to stabilize the administrative structure of the college, it does not anticipate delaying required periodic evaluations.

During the 2013 negotiations for a successor collective bargaining agreement between the HCFA and the District, the parties amended the definition of “Professional Competence” in the article on tenured faculty evaluations (Article 13) to include the following:

- “a. Article 13 shall include as an element of “Professional Competence,” the following:
- i. Demonstrates knowledge of student learning outcomes
  - ii. Has included Student Learning Outcomes on course syllabus
  - iii. Provides evidence that the faculty member is using the assessment of SLOs to improve teaching and learning.” (7.20)

This amendment was accomplished in a separate MOU entered into on September 20, 2013, so that faculty members who were scheduled for review during the 2013-14 academic year would have ample notice of the amendment (7.27). Negotiations are continuing on both articles having to do with the evaluation of full-time faculty, articles 13 and 14. The parties anticipate adding a similar requirement to the evaluation of probationary faculty.

The faculty evaluation process is used as the basis for continual improvement. Every year, faculty members must submit their reports of professional growth, and the college’s adoption of the flex calendar was to encourage that its faculty members were always engaged in growth and improvement activities.

#### ***Adjunct Faculty Evaluations***

On September 20, 2013, the District and the HCFA signed an MOU making a newly created adjunct faculty evaluation process, to be effective immediately (7.27; 7.22). The vice presidents of academic affairs and of student affairs promptly held meetings with their deans to review the new process and to begin scheduling evaluations under the new process. In late fall, deans and tenured faculty members began performing evaluations under the new process.

On January 31, a training session for deans and full-time tenured faculty members, who would be conducting peer evaluations, was scheduled to provide guidance on how to conduct observations and evaluations of adjunct faculty members using the new process. The training was jointly conducted by the director for teaching, learning, and assessment at California State University Monterey Bay, Rebecca Rosenberg, and the chair of Hartnell’s Curriculum Committee, psychology instructor Carol Kimbrough (7.28).

In the Spring of 2014, the evaluations of 75 percent of adjunct faculty members were completed (170 of the 228 adjunct faculty members employed during the spring semester). Evaluations of adjunct faculty members continued into the summer and fall. All adjunct faculty members whose evaluations were not completed during the spring of 2014, or who are still in their first year of teaching at Hartnell, are scheduled to be evaluated sometime during or before the spring of 2015. A three-year calendar of evaluations has been created, so that all adjunct evaluations will continue to be timely done. (7.29).

#### ***Professional Learning Opportunities***

The college has taken many positive steps to demonstrate its commitment to professional development for all employees. As part of its strategic planning process, it repurposed its Faculty

Resource Center (FRC), housed in the Library and Learning Resource Center, into a Professional Development Center (PDC), signaling that it views professional development as something important for everyone. It has hired two extremely gifted instructional technologists who staff the center and create learning opportunities for all employees. They work with faculty and staff members to address those employees' instructional and administrative technology needs, and they truly have established the PDC as a hub of innovative teaching and learning activities.

The PDC conducts regular training sessions on many topics, including course development tools and procedures, Drupal (the web page-building tool that Hartnell deployed in the fall of 2014), Etudes (the college's learning management system), communications tools, Google apps, and many others. (See [www.hartnell.edu/pdc](http://www.hartnell.edu/pdc)) (7.30). One recent example of the staff's responsiveness to employees' training needs and interests is their development of an online training course and comprehensive job aid for Drupal, delivered using Etudes, to address the fact that employees have varying work schedules that did not always allow them to attend the many face-to-face trainings that also were offered.

At the start of the 2013-14 academic year, the District announced the formation of a Professional Development Committee (7.31). The committee began meeting in October 2013, targeting the end of the fall semester to have a blueprint for professional development at Hartnell. All agendas, minutes, resources, and calendars for this committee are posted to the governance section of the college's website (7.32).

The Committee's charge is to (1) develop policies and procedures for assuring that all employees have access to professional development opportunities and resources, (2) develop, acquire, and arrange for programs of professional development for all employees, (3) develop criteria, procedures, and forms that assure that professional development funds are expended equitably and serve the college's mission, values, and strategic priorities and plan, and (4) make recommendations on staff, student, and instructional improvement activities based on a comprehensive planning process that includes needs assessment and evaluation (7.33).

Early on in the committee's work, it identified several components as essential for a professional development program:

- 1--Access to travel and training funds on an equal basis for all employees, tied to achievement of student success
- 2--incentives for all employees to develop innovative solutions to enhance student success
- 3--making training accessible for all and making the Professional Development Center (formerly the Faculty Resource Center) the physical home of that training
- 4--supporting activities that create a culture of learning and development, e.g., brown bags, book clubs, sponsoring campus-wide and community-wide events
- 5--creating a unified calendar of development opportunities.
- 6--creating a first-year program for all new employees that includes orientation to community colleges, community college students, and Hartnell specifically (including its culture of learning) (7.34).

The committee distributed a survey to assess interests and access to professional development opportunities across all employee groups (7.35), and has used the results of that survey to build the structure for a robust professional development program. The college provided the committee with an annual budget of \$100,000 to develop and sustain these programs.

A year later, the Committee has developed and launched most of those programs.

The Conference and Travel Program was announced by the Committee in May 2014 (7.36). The program's purpose is to provide Hartnell employees access to outside professional development and training to improve student learning and success. (7.37) Applications are taken four times a year, and awards are made for up to \$1,000 per person per year.(7.38) The first awards were made in June 2014—to a full-time faculty member, a part-time faculty member, and a classified staff member-- and announced to the community in the President's Weekly Report to the Board of Trustees on June 6, 2014 (7.39) In the next two application cycles, awards were made to five additional employees. (7.40)

The Employee Innovation Grant Program was announced to all employees in September 2014. (7.41) This annual program will provide financial assistance to spur innovation to improve student learning. (7.42) Up to five awards will be made each year in an amount not to exceed \$3,500, for projects that demonstrate a link to the college's strategic priorities and goals, and that show how they directly enhance the quality of learning at Hartnell.(7.43) In the first year of this program, applications were due on October 15, but in subsequent years, the grants will run a full academic year, with applications due in the late Spring and announced before June 1. The recipients will present their work at the end of each year in a college-wide forum. (7.42) Five awards were made during the first year, and were announced to the college community in the President's Weekly Report for November 7, 2014 (7.44)

While these other programs were running, the committee received requests from employees to bring speakers or workshops to campus, and so the committee launched a program to provide funds for this. The Speakers, Seminars, and Workshops fund allows any employee to request funds to have professional development activities and programs brought to campus.(7.45) Those who receive funding are asked to evaluate the program and solicit participant feedback of the presentation so that the Committee can assess its usefulness for the college community. A sample participant survey and evaluation form are provided to recipients of funds.(7.46) As of November 2014, this program had funded a four-hour seminar on the Vet Net Ally Program, chronicled in the President's Weekly Report of May 2, 2014 (7.47), and had purchased a subscription to Go2Knowledge, a resource for more than a hundred online, on-demand trainings in six categories appropriate to employees in higher education (7.48). Because of the positive response to the Vet Net Ally Program, the committee voted to fund that program again during the 2014-15 academic year. (7.49)

The Committee also has selected an Educator in Residence for the 2014-15 academic year, Dr. Anne Benvenuti, and has created a calendar of activities that the Educator in Residence will lead for Spring 2015 that will involve employees, students, and the community in a joint learning and exploration experience. (7.50) Two members of the committee met with the College's Director of Communications in mid-November 2014 to plan how to roll out this program, and then Dr.

Benvenuti met with key constituents in early December to launch the program. (7.51) This annual program is designed to bring a scholar of note to campus to engage in a communal, theme-based experience that highlights our shared commitment to teaching and learning. (7.52)

The Committee's annual review connects to the program planning and assessment and budgeting processes that all college areas undertake. One result of the annual review undertaken by the committee at the end of the 2013-14 academic year was a decision to revise the membership of the committee to include as permanent members of the committee the following positions: chair of the Faculty Professional Development Committee, an Academic Senate Committee; the instructional technologists, and the HR Information Systems Specialist. The committee also will have co-chairs rather than a single chair. (7.53)

The Human Resources Office has created a webpage for the Professional Development Program that links to the committee's webpage, and provides an easy place to find the applications, deadlines, and descriptions of the programs that allow employees to access professional development resources. (7.54) There is a prominent link to trainings offered by Keenan SafeColleges program, and a link to the resources and trainings of Hartnell's Professional Development Center. One of the resources that the PDC makes available to employees is the college's recent investment in gotoknowledge.com, which gives all employees on campus access to thousands of tutorial videos on software tools and other work-related skills. These tools are accessible from any computer on campus. (7.55)

Finally, the college is scheduled to deploy the Oracle Taleo talent management system for Human Resources that will include a performance evaluation system that is linked to professional development opportunities and tracking. This system will help each employee take control of their own professional development, and encourage continual dialog linking performance and development to the continuous improvement processes of the college. This is part of a suite of programs that will be implemented during the 2014-15 academic year, beginning with online applications and onboarding, after which point the performance management system will be engaged. (7.56)

### **Next Steps**

The District will continue to evaluate all of its employees in a timely manner and offer professional development opportunities on a regular and equitable basis.

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

- 7.1 [AP 7150 Evaluation of Management Employees](#)
- 7.2 [Agenda for April 2013 managers meeting](#)
- 7.3 [WCL 040313 email to managers reevaluation process](#)
- 7.4 [CHRO email to supervisors of managers 0413](#)
- 7.5 [Management Evaluations Tracking 2014](#)
- 7.6 [TJP 092113 email to supervisors](#)
- 7.7 [CSEA-District CBA, Article 7](#)

- 7.8 [CSEA Evaluation form](#)
- 7.9 [L39-District CBA, Article 31](#)
- 7.10 [Confidential working conditions](#)
- 7.11 [L39 evaluation form](#)
- 7.12 [Confidential evaluation form](#)
- 7.13 [All evaluation tools are linked from the Human Resources website, in the forms section, <http://www.hartnell.edu/forms-and-related-information>](#)
- 7.14 [Email from A Marble to supervisor](#)
- 7.15 [Email from A Marble to supervisor](#)
- 7.16 [Acad and Class Evaluation and Discipline CCD Core Workbook](#)
- 7.17 [FRISK workshop -12-3-14](#)
- 7.18 [Jan 2015 Administrators meeting agenda](#)
- 7.19 [Classified Evals as of December 2014](#)
- 7.20 [HCFA-District CBA, Article 13](#)
- 7.21 [HCFA-District CBA,Article 14](#)
- 7.22 [HCFA-District CBA,Article 21B](#)
- 7.23 [HCFA-District CBA, appendix DE2013, DE eval process](#)
- 7.24 [HCFA-District CBA, article 22 Distance Education](#)
- 7.25 [FT Faculty EVAL 2014-2015](#)
- 7.26 [HCFA MOUs and resolution re evals](#)
- 7.27 [Evaluation MOU Sept 20, 2013](#)
- 7.28 [Agenda for adjunct evaluation training on January 31, 2014](#)
- 7.29 [2014-15 Adjunct evals complete and projected](#)
- 7.30 [PDC Spring 2015 email re training](#)
- 7.31 [Flex Day Presentation 081613](#)
- 7.32 [<http://www.hartnell.edu/agendas-minutes-and-documents-10>](#)
- 7.33 [PD Committee Handbook 2013](#)
- 7.34 [PDC Minutes 12-16-13](#)
- 7.35 [PDC Survey Tool](#)
- 7.36 [Travel and Conference Announcement](#)
- 7.37 [Conference - Travel reimbursement program](#)
- 7.38 [Conference - Travel Application Form](#)
- 7.39 [President's Weekly Report of June 6, 2014](#)
- 7.40 [Sponsored Travel and Conference in 2014-15](#)
- 7.41 [Employee Innovation Grant Announcement](#)
- 7.42 [Innovation Grant Program Description](#)
- 7.43 [Employee innovation grant application 2014-15](#)
- 7.44 [President's Weekly Report of November 7, 2014](#)
- 7.45 [Application for Professional Development Funds](#)
- 7.46 [Speakers, Seminars and workshop funds program](#)
- 7.47 [President's Weekly Report of May 2, 2014](#)
- 7.48 [Go2Knowledge announcement](#)
- 7.49 [Vet Net Ally evaluation summary](#)
- 7.50 [Educator-in-residence calendar of events 2015](#)
- 7.51 [President's Report December 5 2014](#)
- 7.52 [Educator-in-Residence webpage](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

- 7.53 [PDcommittee handbook 2014 revised](#)
- 7.54 [Professional Development Program webpage](#)
- 7.55 [See PDC website at http://www.hartnell.edu/resources](http://www.hartnell.edu/resources)
- 7.56 [Taleo implementation project information can be found at: http://www.hartnell.edu/itr-projects](http://www.hartnell.edu/itr-projects)



### **Recommendation 8**

In order to meet Eligibility Requirement 5, and in order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college establish a stable infrastructure of sufficient administrative personnel to better ensure a consistent level of services to support the institution's mission and purpose. The team further recommends that the college expedite the process to fill vacant and interim positions.

In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 8 was resolved.



## **Recommendation 9**

In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college ensures 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.

## **Resolution and Analysis**

### ***Ensuring that Program Review Processes are Ongoing and Systematic***

Recognizing that in recent years program planning and assessment (PPA) was accomplished through comprehensive reviews undertaken on an inconsistent basis, and limited exclusively to (most) programs within the divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness in fall 2013 constructed (and has been updating for each successive PPA cycle) a comprehensive inventory of designated programs, services, and departments that are required to undergo regular review (9.1). The list is based on the institution's divisional structure encompassing the Office of the Superintendent/President, Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, Advancement and Development/Foundation, Information and Technology Resources, and Student Affairs (9.2). Programs, services, and/or departments that are substantially interdependent may complete one report rather than multiple reports per advance administrative agreement; synergistic efforts, activities, outcomes and planning might otherwise be unrealistically considered and reported. The main exception to the general rule of mandatory review applies to existing grant-funded programs and services that already prepare annual reports for external agencies and other entities, and do not therefore rely on the college's general fund for resources.

At Hartnell, ongoing program review requires that every designated program, service, and department conduct an annual review each spring (9.3), and a comprehensive review at least once every five years, also in the spring (9.4). Career technical education (CTE) programs are required to undertake a comprehensive review every two years for optimal conformance with applicable state education code provisions. The most critical difference between annual and comprehensive review at the college is that, whereas the annual review involves conducting an assessment of (at least) the previous year and planning into the next fiscal year, the comprehensive review involves conducting an assessment of several previous years and planning into the next several years.

The systematic cycle of annual and comprehensive reviews commenced in fall 2013, continued in spring 2014, and will occur each spring through spring 2018 to ensure alignment with the full 2013-2018 period comprising the college's Strategic Plan. The review calendar was created in consultation with all Vice Presidents, to ensure that the important comprehensive review would be undertaken at the most appropriate juncture (9.5). Regardless of whether an annual or comprehensive review is scheduled, all designated programs, services, and offices are required to submit and justify an annual action plan leading into the next applicable fiscal year.

PPA report submissions for fall 2013, the first annual systematic PPA process (delayed from spring 2013), showed great overall success, as 58 of 59 required annual reviews were submitted, and 13 of 17 required comprehensive reviews were submitted, for a grand total of 71 or 93% of the 76 required reviews (9.6). As for non-compliance, one academic program did not submit a minimally acceptable annual review, and one department and three services did not submit acceptable comprehensive reviews. PPA report submissions for spring 2014 also showed good success, as 53 of 59 required annual reviews were submitted, and 16 of 22 required comprehensive reviews were submitted, representing a grand total of 69 or 85% of the 81 required reviews (9.7). Three academic programs, two programs/services, and one department did not submit minimally acceptable annual reviews, and three academic programs and three offices did not submit acceptable comprehensive reviews. Despite a multiple month extension in accepting PPA reports from divisions, the submission rate for the spring 2014 cycle may have been impacted adversely by the requirement that participants submit two reviews within the same academic year. Nonetheless, a report listing participants who contributed to their respective PPA reports shows roughly similar overall participation in fall 2013 and spring 2014 (9.8, 9.9).

***Ensuring that Program Review Processes are used to Assess and Improve Student Learning***

The program review process is used to assess student learning systematically, with the intention of improving student learning. The annual review section of the PPA report template for academic programs includes items on course level student learning outcomes (SLOs), program level SLOs, and core competencies (institutional learning outcomes/ILOs). Specific questions focus on faculty members' engagement, interventions, measurement, changes in courses and programs, and improvements in teaching and student learning. The annual action plan section encompasses items on desired and measurable outcomes for new activities, and how such activities support core competencies, program level outcomes, course level outcomes, program/discipline goals, and/or strategic priorities/goals (9.10).

The program review process supports student achievement and the improvement of student learning outcomes through the reporting and analysis of enrollment and success in courses within the annual review section of the PPA report template for academic programs, including success by teaching modality (distance education courses compared with face-to-face courses), and levels of and trends in achievement data, such as degree and certificate completions/awards (9.10). The first item in the comprehensive review section deals with overall program effectiveness, specifically asking about course sequencing, alignment, and alternative scheduling approaches to meet the needs of students. An item within the CTE programs subsection requests information about levels of and trends in achievement data over the past several years, inclusive of degree/certificate completions (awards) and employment statistics.

Similarly, the annual review section of the PPA report template for services, offices and non-instructional programs provides prompts on target recipients; patterns and trends in users, needs and usage; service/program modality; and service area outcomes (SAOs). The annual action plan section encompasses items on measurable outcomes for new activities, and how such activities support SAOs, program level outcomes, course level outcomes, service/program goals, and/or strategic priorities/goals (9.11)

Participative activities by faculty members, administrators, and governance bodies in both annual and comprehensive program review are designed to ensure that assessment and improvement of student learning are increasingly topics of review and discussion at different organizational levels and with varied groups—all of which/whom are integral components of/participants in the overall review process ([9.3](#), [9.4](#)). Handbooks for governance councils incorporate explicit language concerning responsibilities in program review, inclusive of reviewing reports and recommendations ([9.12](#), [9.13](#), [9.14](#), [9.15](#), [9.16](#), [9.17](#), [9.18](#)). The timeline for the spring 2014 integrated planning process reinforced the roles and responsibilities of key participants in program review ([9.19](#)).

### ***Evaluation of Effectiveness of Program Review Processes in Supporting and Improving Student Achievement and Learning Outcomes***

Given that only two cycles of systematic program review have been experienced thus far, and moreover that the two cycles occurred within one academic year, it is too early in the ongoing cyclical process to evaluate the extent to which program review processes support and improve student achievement and learning outcomes. Additionally, the continued unavailability of software for implementing streamlined and automated processes may hinder the ability to assess potential impact on achievement and learning outcomes.

Nevertheless, manual (template entry) reports—one for academic programs, the other for non-instructional programs—have been produced for selected items in the PPA report template so that responses across programs can be reviewed for a specific item of interest ([9.20](#), [9.21](#)). This represents the first opportunity to gain a broad-based view regarding results found and actions taken across various programs and services. Also, posting submitted program review documents to the college website, starting with 2014 PPA reports in November 2014, allows information to be shared among all programs, divisions and constituent groups ([9.22](#)). In fact, according to the Fall 2013 Information and Technology Resources Annual Action Plan, it was intended that deploying the new website would “provide better... information access” ([9.23](#)); this represents an example of how program/service review has supported the achievement of a service area outcome.

### ***Review and Refinement of Program Review Processes to Improve Institutional Effectiveness***

Program review processes have been reviewed and refined to improve institutional effectiveness. The resulting continuous improvement processes for annual program planning and assessment ([9.3](#)) and comprehensive program review ([9.4](#)) are prominent examples of this new systematic approach. In addition, the recent evaluation of and expectations for integrated planning at the college from 2010 through 2015 provides evidence of enhanced institutional effectiveness in key process features associated with program review ([9.24](#)). Following is a list of specific improvements from 2010 through spring 2014:

- Scheduling of comprehensive reviews
- Scheduling of annual reviews
- Consistency of items across PPA templates
- Incorporation of proposed revisions to ACCJC standards
- Planning horizon for budget requests
- Long term planning linked to PPA process
- Justification for budget requests—link to Strategic Plan

- Completed PPA reports
- Central housing of PPA reports
- Governance role—oversight of results
- Governance role—budget recommendations
- PPA linked to budget development
- Information flow—PPA reports to budget decisions
- PPA process linked to annual budget calendar
- Timeline of activities for complete process

***Use of Program Review Results to Link Institutional Planning Processes to Resource Allocation, including Physical Resources***

Program review results are used to link planning to resource allocation. In FY 2012-13, the former Resource Allocation Committee reviewed capital outlay requests submitted by college programs and departments and approved totaling \$1.9 million (9.25) funding requests. As anticipated, these resources have largely been allocated during FY 2013-14.

Implementation of the new governance and planning model during the 2013-14 academic year was integral to the program planning and assessment (PPA) process. It has provided specific vehicles (governance councils) that help ensure that program, service, and department planning is ultimately tied to budget development, funding decisions, and resource allocation. For example, while planning for budget development for fiscal year 2014-15, the Academic Affairs Council approved a PPA summary and prioritization list for the Academic Affairs division, including full-time faculty priorities, at its meeting on November 13, 2013 (9.26); the summary and prioritization list was then forwarded to the College Planning Council for its consideration. The Student Affairs Council approved the priority faculty and resource requests from the Student Affairs division at its meeting on November 26, 2013 (9.27). The College Planning Council, in turn, voted to recommend approval of prioritized resource allocation requests across all divisions at its April 2, 2014 meeting (9.28, 9.29). These governance activities substantially followed the timeline for the fall 2013 PPA process leading into FY 2014-15 (9.30). The superintendent/president issued a communication following the Governing Board's approval of the 2014-15 budget (9.31)

In another example, at its meeting on October 8, 2014, the Academic Affairs Council approved the PPA resource requests for the Academic Affairs division to be moved forward to the College Planning Council, and full-time faculty priorities to be moved forward to the Academic Senate's Full-Time Faculty Hiring Committee (9.32). The College Planning Council was initially presented with resource allocation requests across all divisions at its November 5, 2014 meeting (9.33, 9.34). These governance activities followed the timeline for the spring 2014 PPA process leading into FY 2015-16 (9.19).

Finally, with respect to facilities planning, review of the Facilities Master Plan at governance meetings represents an opportunity to consider future space/physical needs and incorporate them into the strategic planning process (9.35, 9.36).

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**  
Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

- 9.1 [Inventory of Programs, Services & Offices Designated for Review-Starting Fall 2013 or Later](#)
- 9.2 [Organizational Chart for Hartnell Community College District](#)
- 9.3 [Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 9.4 [Comprehensive Program Review – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 9.5 [Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 Completed Through Spring 2014](#)
- 9.6 [Number of Program Reviews Completed – Fall 2013](#)
- 9.7 [Number of Program Reviews Completed – Spring 2014 \(Revised\)](#)
- 9.8 [Contributors to Academic Program Reviews – Fall 2013 & Spring 2014](#)
- 9.9 [Contributors to Non-Instructional Program Reviews – Fall 2013 & Spring 2014](#)
- 9.10 [Academic PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)
- 9.11 [Non-Instructional PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)
- 9.12 [Academic Affairs Council Handbook](#)
- 9.13 [Administrative Services Council Handbook](#)
- 9.14 [Advancement Council Handbook](#)
- 9.15 [Facilities Development Council Handbook](#)
- 9.16 [Student Affairs Council Handbook](#)
- 9.17 [Technology Development Council Handbook](#)
- 9.18 [College Planning Council Handbook](#)
- 9.19 [Timeline for 2014 PPA Process](#)
- 9.20 [Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014](#)
- 9.21 [Non-Instructional PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014](#)
- 9.22 [Access to 2014 Program Planning and Assessment Reports](#)
- 9.23 [Information and Technology Resources Annual Action Plan - Fall 2013](#)
- 9.24 [Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning 2010-2015](#)
- 9.25 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 6, 2013](#)
- 9.26 [Minutes for Academic Affairs Council Meeting November 13, 2013](#)
- 9.27 [Minutes for Student Affairs Council Meeting November 26, 2013](#)
- 9.28 [Program Review Resource Requests for FY 2014-15](#)
- 9.29 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting April 2, 2014](#)
- 9.30 [Timeline for 2013 PPA Process](#)
- 9.31 [2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent - President September 5, 2014](#)
- 9.32 [Minutes for Academic Affairs Council Meeting October 8, 2014](#)
- 9.33 [Program Review Resource Requests for FY 2015-16](#)
- 9.34 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014](#)
- 9.35 [Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)
- 9.36 [Timeline for Approval of Facilities Master Plan](#)

**Recommendation 10**

To fully meet the standard the team recommends that the college develop a process for regular and systematic evaluation of all Human Resources and Business and Fiscal Affairs policies.

In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 10 was resolved.



## **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.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

An assessment of the college's governance model and structures was completed through a governance planning retreat held on November 19, 2012, that included participation from all constituent groups. A summary report from that retreat was shared with the college community and posted on the college's website ([11.1](#)). The next step in the continued assessment and review of the college's governance model and structures was the formation of a Governance Planning Task Force (GPTF). The task force met during the Spring 2013. Agendas, minutes, and documents of the task force are posted on the governance section of the college website ([11.2](#)). The GPTF reviewed the retreat report and examined other governance models in making recommended changes and improvements to the existing governance model. Near the end of the Spring 2013 semester, the GPTF recommended a revised governance model that is designed to facilitate planning, decision-making, and resource allocation ([11.3](#)). The model includes the implementation of several governance councils to carry out this work. The purpose, membership, and responsibilities of each governance council are found in each council's handbook ([11.4](#)).

The new governance model was shared with the college community at a Town Hall meeting in May 2013 ([11.5](#)).

The revised governance structure was implemented in Fall 2013 ([11.6](#)). A website for all governance councils has been established so that all employees, students, and the community have access to council meeting calendars, agendas, actions, and documents ([11.7](#)). A master meeting calendar of all councils was established to enhance the coordination of the work of these groups ([11.8](#)).

The governance model implemented for 2013-14 included the establishment of the College Planning Council. This council is the highest level governance group that facilitates institutional planning and decision-making and also serves as the college budget committee ([11.9](#)).

The methods and procedures for assessing effectiveness of the governance councils were approved by the College Planning Council at its April 23, 2014, meeting ([11.10](#), [11.11](#)). Additionally, the College Planning Council (CPC) utilized an instrument that captured how its activities aligned with the duties and responsibilities listed in its handbook ([11.12](#)). Lastly, the overall governance system was assessed for effectiveness through a survey sent to members of all councils ([11.13](#)). The following councils conducted an assessment of effectiveness utilizing the instruments previously mentioned. Each council discussed the results of the assessments, and the CPC discussed the results from the overall assessment of governance effectiveness. Each council provided the CPC a summary of that discussion along with recommendations for improving its effectiveness.

Academic Affairs Council ([11.14](#))

Administrative Services Council ([11.15](#))

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

Accreditation Council ([11.16](#))  
Advancement Council ([11.17](#))  
College Planning Council ([11.18](#))  
Facilities Development Council ([11.19](#))  
Student Affairs Council ([11.20](#))  
Technology Development Council ([11.21](#))  
Overall Governance Effectiveness ([11.22](#))

All councils will be reviewing the improvement recommendations during 2014-15, and will consider improvements based on the assessments. Progress toward improvement will become part of the assessment of governance effectiveness when each council conducts its annual assessment at the end of the year. For example, the CPC reviewed results from the assessment of CPC effectiveness and overall governance effectiveness in May 2014 and again in October 2014. Two themes emerged from this review and discussion: communication and attendance. Constituent representatives serving on CPC are well-informed and engaged in governance. However, keeping the college community informed about governance activity and actions remains a challenge. In an effort to improve communication, the CPC approved the broad distribution of a “highlights” report that summarizes CPC activity and actions ([11.35](#)). The highlights documents will be posted to the CPC website and all employees will receive a notice when they are posted ([11.36](#), [11.37](#)). Attendance by representatives at all CPC meetings was identified as needing improvement. Ideas for addressing the issue included modifying quorum rules or establishing alternates. As a result of review and discussion by the CPC, the co-chairs recommended that they reach out to constituent representatives about attendance. After gathering that information, the co-chairs will report back to CPC for continued discussion before possible implementation of actions to improve attendance.

All councils have avenues for meaningful input into the budget development and resource allocation recommendations. At its February 5, 2014, meeting, the CPC approved all of the following documents and processes that guide budget development and resource allocation that are part of the annual integrated planning processes ([11.23](#)).

Timeline for 2013 PPA Process ([11.24](#))  
Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15 ([11.25](#))  
Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes ([11.26](#))  
Timeline for 2014 PPA Process ([11.27](#))  
Annual Budget Development Calendar ([11.28](#))  
Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 ([11.29](#))  
Annual Program Planning & Assessment - Components of Continuous Improvement ([11.30](#))  
Comprehensive Program Review - Components of Continuous Improvement ([11.31](#))  
Integrated Planning Model Diagram ([11.32](#))

Additionally, the Full-Time Faculty Hiring Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, brings forward to the CPC its recommendations on faculty hiring, prioritizing hiring by discipline and suggesting the number to be hired ([11.33](#), [11.23](#)). These recommendations, in turn, are forwarded to the superintendent/president for final decision. The superintendent/president then reports back to the CPC after decisions have been made ([11.34](#)).



Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

- 11.1 [Report from Governance Planning Retreat November 19, 2012](#)
- 11.2 [Agendas Minutes Documents for Gov Planning Task Force](#)
- 11.3 [Governance Model](#)
- 11.4 [Handbooks for Governance Councils](#)
- 11.5 [Town Hall Meeting Presentation May 22, 2013](#)
- 11.6 [Fall Flex Day Presentation August 16, 2013](#)
- 11.7 [Governance Web Site](#)
- 11.8 [Governance Master Meeting Calendar](#)
- 11.9 [CPC Handbook](#)
- 11.10 [Sample of Instrument for Assessing Council Effectiveness](#)
- 11.11 [Minutes of CPC Meeting April 23, 2014](#)
- 11.12 [Inventory of CPC Agenda-Responsibilities 2013-14](#)
- 11.13 [Instrument for Assessing Overall Governance Effectiveness](#)
- 11.14 [Academic Affairs Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.15 [Administrative Services Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.16 [Accreditation Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.17 [Advancement Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.18 [CPC - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.19 [Facilities Development Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.20 [Student Affairs Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.21 [Technology Dev Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.22 [Overall Governance - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.23 [Minutes of CPC Meeting February 5, 2014](#)
- 11.24 [Timeline for 2013 PPA Process](#)
- 11.25 [Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15](#)
- 11.26 [Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes - Modifications Highlighted \(1\)](#)
- 11.27 [Timeline for 2014 PPA Process](#)
- 11.28 [Annual Budget Development Calendar](#)
- 11.29 [Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 - 12-11-13](#)
- 11.30 [Annual Program Planning & Assessment - Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 11.31 [Comprehensive Program Review - Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

- 11.32 [Integrated Planning Model Diagram](#)
- 11.33 [Minutes for CPC Meeting April 2, 2014](#)
- 11.34 [Recommendations from Faculty Hiring Committee for 2014-15](#)
- 11.35 [Minutes of CPC Meeting October 15, 2014](#)
- 11.36 [Highlights of CPC Meeting October 15, 2014](#)
- 11.37 [Communication to Campus - Highlights of October 15, 2014 CPC Meeting](#)

### **Recommendation 12**

In order to meet standards, the team recommends that:

- Each board member adhere to the Governing Board's Ethics policy;
- The board self-evaluation continue to be done with full participation of each board member.

In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 12 was resolved.

## Planning Agenda(s)

### Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

- I.A.3            The Superintendent/President will initiate a review of the mission statement during 2012-13. An outcome of the review will be the development and implementation of a process and schedule for the regular review of the mission statement.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The response to Recommendation 1 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. ([I.A.1](#)) In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 1 had been resolved.

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

See list of supporting evidence in response to Recommendation 1 contained in the follow-up report submitted March 15, 2014.

**I.A.1 [Recommendation 1 Evidence Folder](#)**

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

I.B.2           The dean of institutional planning and effectiveness will lead a strategic planning effort during 2012-13 that will culminate in the development of a strategic plan by the end of the Spring 2013.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

In Spring 2013, the interim dean of institutional planning and effectiveness led a process of working with six Strategic Planning Groups (SPGs). Each SPG was comprised of diverse constituent representatives at the college, focused on one of six institutional priorities, and developed one or more goals, outcomes, and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that were subsequently compiled to form and implement the college's Strategic Plan 2013-2018. The plan was adopted by the Board of Trustees at its regular meeting on October 1, 2013, ([I.B.1](#)).

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

I.B.1 [Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)

I.B.3            The linking of the budget development to the systematic program review process was successful with instructional programs in developing the budget for fiscal year 2012-13. The college Vice Presidents, working within the participatory governance structure, will be responsible for implementing this to all other operational areas of the college in developing the budget for the 2013-14 fiscal year.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. ([I.B.2](#)) ([Response 2](#)) ([I.B.3](#)) ([Response 9](#))

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

I.B.2 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

I.B.3 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

I.B.4            The linking of the budget development to the systematic program review process was successful with instructional programs in developing the budget for fiscal year 2012-13. The college Vice Presidents, working within the participatory governance structure, will be responsible for implementing this to all other operational areas of the college in developing the budget for the 2013-14 fiscal year.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. ([I.B.4](#)) ([Response 2](#)) ([I.B.5](#)) ([Response 9](#))

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

**I.B.4** [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

**I.B.5** [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

I.B.6            The college Vice Presidents, working within the participatory governance structure, will fully implement the integrated planning and resource allocation processes in budgeting for the 2013-14 fiscal year. This will include developing methods for assessing the effectiveness of those processes.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The responses to Recommendations 2, 3 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. ([I.B.6](#))([Response 2](#)) ([I.B.7](#)) ([Response 3](#)) ([I.B.8](#)) ([Response 9](#))

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

I.B.6 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

I.B.7 [Recommendation 3 Evidence Folder](#)

I.B.8 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)



Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

I.B.7 During the 2012-13 academic year the college Vice Presidents, working within the participatory governance structure, will be responsible for more fully developing and implementing procedures for assessing the effectiveness of evaluation mechanisms necessary for improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The responses to Recommendations 3 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. ([I.B.9](#)) ([Response 3](#)) ([I.B.10](#)) ([Response 9](#))

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

I.B.9 [Recommendation 3 Evidence Folder](#)

I.B.10 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

## **Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services**

II.A.1 The Dean of Curriculum and Instructional Support, with the collaboration of the Vice President of Information and Technology Resources and the Curriculum Committee Chair, will evaluate the effectiveness of CurricUNET and improve its functionality or seek other alternatives for course and program management by Spring 2013.

The process for aligning resource allocation through the Program Planning and Assessment Committee that worked for allocating resources to Academic Affairs divisions in 2011-12 will be revised and expanded in 2012-13 to include the identification of resources by program evaluation and assessment in Student Affairs, Information Technology & Library Services, and Support Operations. Full implementation for institutional planning would be completed in the 2013-14 academic year.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

Transition from CurricUNET has been discussed during Committee meetings. As a result of these discussions, the VP of Information and Technology Resources presented information on Kuali and demonstrated curriculum management features at multiple meetings. The Curriculum Committee considered a “sandbox” version of Kuali Student (curriculum management system) and decided against adoption ([II.A.1](#)). Results and comments in the end of year Curriculum Committee self-evaluation survey indicated satisfaction with CurricUNET. Evaluation of CurricUNET will continue as an on-going committee process. ([II.A.2](#))

The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 include the process for aligning resource allocation. ([II.A.3](#)) ([Response 2](#)) ([II.A.4](#)) ([Response 9](#))

### **Next Steps:**

Evaluation of CurricUNET will continue as an on-going committee process.

### **Conclusion:**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

II.A.1 [CC Minutes 12-5-13](#)

II.A.2 [Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013](#)

II.A.3 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

II.A.4 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

II.A.1.a During the 2012-13 academic year, the Superintendent/President, interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness and college planning subcommittees will consider the need for additional research to update the *Salinas Valley Vision 2020 Project* to contribute to an updated *Educational and Facilities Master Plan*.

The Program Planning and Assessment Committee will work collaboratively with internal and Title V grant-funded research analyst support to develop additional research tools, technology and processes to facilitate educational planning and assessment by June 2013.

The interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will lead strategic planning efforts for the college that will result in institutional goals and performance indicators by June 2013.

### **Resolution and Analysis:**

Through a thorough evaluation and planning process, a decision was made not to update the *Salinas Valley Vision 2020 Project* nor the *Education and Facilities Master Plan* (end date was 2011). Instead, starting in Spring 2013, the college embarked on a strategic planning process. The interim dean of institutional planning and effectiveness facilitated the work of six Strategic Planning Groups (SPGs): each SPG was comprised of diverse constituent representatives at the college; focused on one of six institutional priorities; and developed one or more goals, outcomes, and key performance indicators (KPIs) that were subsequently compiled to form the college's Strategic Plan 2013-2018. The plan was adopted by the Board of Trustees at its regular meeting on October 1, 2013, ([II.A.5](#)).

According to the applicable continuous improvement process for community research and environmental scanning, the next appropriate time to conduct comprehensive external research will be in preparation for the development of the next strategic plan, which will occur in 2017-18 parallel to completion of the current strategic plan ([II.A.6](#)). A long-term facilities master plan has already been developed and is being approved in 2014 that includes data on regional demographics and other relevant information ([II.A.7](#)).

To provide ongoing feedback on the current strategic plan (2013-2018), a Strategic Planning Advisory Group (SPAG) has been formed, whose membership consists of representatives from the external community ([II.A.8](#), [II.A.9](#)). This group provides input to the college relevant to the external environment as progress toward the plan's outcomes continues to be measured, assessed, and improved. The SPAG convened its first meeting on April 9, 2014, and its second meeting on December 4, 2014, ([II.A.10](#), [II.A.11](#)). The group will continue to meet twice each year during the remainder of the strategic plan cycle.

In 2014, Title V grant funds enabled the hiring of an institutional data analyst ([II.A.12](#)), in addition to the review and improvement of data to support faculty members in program planning and assessment ([II.A.13](#)). Title V grant funds have also supported the Outcomes & Assessment Committee in the institution's transition from manual to software-driven (eLumen) reporting of SLO assessments; the response to Recommendation 4 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 addresses this planning agenda item. ([II.A.14](#)) ([Response 4](#))

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**Next Steps:**  
None

**Conclusion:**  
Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

**II.A.5 [Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)**

**II.A.6 [Community Research Environmental Scanning - Components of Continuous Improvement](#)**

**II.A.7 [Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)**

**II.A.8 [Strategic Planning Advisory Group Handbook](#)**

**II.A.9 [Strategic Planning Advisory Group Membership December 2014](#)**

**II.A.10 [Notes of Strategic Planning Advisory Group Meeting April 9, 2014](#)**

**II.A.11 [Agenda for Strategic Planning Advisory Group Meeting December 4, 2014](#)**

**II.A.12 [Institutional Data Analyst Job Description](#)**

**II.A.13 [Survey Results on Data Needs for Academic PPA Reports](#)**

**II.A.14 [Recommendation 4 Evidence Folder](#)**

II.A.1.b

College Administration working in collaboration with the Distance Education Committee will take steps to plan and implement student and instructor evaluation procedures for distance education courses during the 2012-13 academic year.

Working collaboratively with the Vice President of Information and Technology Resources, the Distance Education Committee will facilitate training and evaluation of the pending transition of course management delivery software from *eCollege* to *Etudes* during Spring 2013.

The interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will work with faculty members and administration to identify research tools that may be used to determine why success and retention in online courses is lower than the rates in traditional courses in some discipline areas. This data will be integrated into the regular program review of disciplines offering online courses. The process and timeline will be determined during the strategic planning process that will be completed by June 2013.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

All faculty members teaching online courses were evaluated according to the HARTNELL COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT AGREEMENT WITH HCFA/CTA/NEA, 2013-16.

The components of the evaluation process for faculty members teaching online and face-to-face are identical; however, because of the nature of the online environment, observations of faculty members teaching distance education courses are as follows:

The evaluator will evaluate one learning unit of the course, which should be roughly equivalent to the material that would be covered in no more than one week of class. Access would include all materials posted by the instructor and discussion thread posts by both the instructor and students for that learning unit. Access will also include access to documents that apply to the entire course and are outside the unit, including: syllabus, class policies, required class activities, exams, and any current announcements posted for the course ([II.A.15](#)).

To be consistent with materials for face-to-face courses, online course materials are expected to have identical SLOs to the face-to-face course, which are detailed in both the course outline of record file in CurricUNET and course syllabi. A process for observing distance education faculty members was added in fall 2013. ([II.A.17](#))

To sustain this climate of assessment and improvement, workshops addressing assessment and forums for discussion and analysis will be regularly scheduled and ongoing. For example, full-time faculty members teaching online are required to participate in professional development relating to online teaching and learning periodically, at least six (6) of the twelve (12) flex hours per year. A workshop was presented in Spring 2014 to specifically address outcome assessment in DE courses ([II.A.16](#)).

In addition, to provide for consistent and regular student and instructor evaluation procedures for and the effective delivery of distance education courses, the following has been implemented or planned:

- An online template allowing DE students to complete a student appraisal of their course identical to the face-to-face appraisal was developed and implemented for those classes whose instructors were being evaluated, as of spring 2014.
- A student satisfaction survey is being developed by the DE committee. It will guide future decisions for training and technical needs. It will be administered to all on-line students on an annual basis.
- The template surveying DE faculty about questions asked in the annual CCCCO report was developed by the Instructional Technologist and presented to the DE Committee at its November 2014 meeting. It is to be administered to all online instructors on an annual basis.

In Fall 2013, the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness conferred with the VPAA and separately with the Dean of South County Education Services/Distance Education and the Distance Education Committee Chair to discuss the gap in both student success and retention between online (DE) and face-to-face (F2F) courses. It was determined that disaggregated success and retention data for students in DE and F2F classes would be provided to disciplinary faculty for their review, starting in Spring 2014 with the second annual program planning and assessment (PPA) cycle. The data was integrated into the program review process, and the academic PPA template was revised to incorporate items allowing for faculty response to the disaggregated data ([II.A.18](#), [II.A.19](#))

### **Next Steps**

In the “External Follow-up Evaluation Report” from April 2014, the visiting team noted “the college has made great strides with regard to adjunct faculty evaluations and the evaluation of those teaching Distance Education (DE) courses. The District will continue to evaluate all faculty teaching distance education in a timely manner.

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**II.A.15 [HCFA Appendix DE2013\(4.46\)](#)**

**II.A.16 [Hartnell College Mail - Assessment Workshop Using Online Technologies](#)**

**II.A.17 [HCFA-District CBA appendix DE2013, DE eval process](#)**

**II.A.18 [Academic PPA Report Template—Spring 2014](#)**

**II.A.19 [Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014](#)**

II.A.1.c                    The SLO and PPA Committees will evaluate and refine the assessment process and timelines for course-, program-, and institutional-level SLOs during the 2012-13 academic year.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The Student Learning Outcome Assessment (SLO) and Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) committees combined efforts through spring 2013 because of the overlap of processes and committee members. As a result, assessment processes including methodology and timelines were addressed collectively by both committees.

Through fall 2014 as reported, the College has been using an internal shared drive to collect all assessment data. The data have been recorded on Word documents and saved to the R Drive, which limits access and depends on a manual “counting” process to determine the number of courses that have been assessed. It is time consuming and does not provide faculty, staff, and management the opportunity to fully use assessment data for course and program improvement. Therefore, in Fall 2013, it was determined after a thorough vetting process to purchase eLumen software to provide the College with a tool that would allow for the systematic collection and analysis of outcome assessment data needs. By integrating assessment data, eLumen links course learning outcomes to both program learning outcomes and core competencies. Reports with aggregated data can then be used to measure student learning at different levels over time.

The process to transition from the R Drive repository of assessment data to eLumen began in Spring 2014 with the inputting of all outcomes, the mapping of outcomes to program outcomes and core competencies, and developing course groups for both degree and certificate level assessment, which will provide faculty members with more specific data for program analysis. In addition, a pilot group of ten faculty was convened and tasked with learning eLumen, developing training materials, and then actually training faculty and staff to use the software.

The pilot group has been consistently meeting during the fall 2014 semester to develop mastery of eLumen and to create training materials in several modalities ([II.A.23](#), [II.A.25](#), [II.A.26](#), [II.A.27](#), [II.A.28](#)); in addition, this group developed a training schedule with 15 individual time slots for both full-time and adjunct faculty. Implementation began on a small scale in fall 2014 with a wider implementation in spring 2015; in January approximately 10 percent of faculty received training (in addition to pilot faculty), and by February 13, 2015, faculty will have entered assessment results for all courses offered in fall 14 on which assessment was conducted. The College’s goal is for 90 percent of all instructional disciplines to have outcome assessment recorded in eLumen by the end of spring 2015.

Currently, the course and program summary forms remain housed on the internal shared drive ([II.A.20](#)). Faculty members have assessed or reassessed most courses taught in Fall 2013, Spring 2014, and Fall 2014 and have aggregated assessment results from multiple section courses. As a result, the number of active courses assessed has increased from 71 percent to 80 percent. In addition, faculty members have engaged in broad-based discussion to examine results, to discuss potential modifications, and to use course-level assessment data to assess at least one program-level outcome ([II.A.24](#)). Program-level outcomes will again be assessed in spring 2015. Survey results from the Third Annual Student Success Conference Day were analyzed and training

sessions were provided ([II.A.21](#), [II.A.22](#)).

With the hiring of the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (IPE) in Fall 2014, the PPA Committee functions were absorbed by the dean and institutional councils; therefore, program planning and assessment occurs in all instructional and non-instructional areas and is reviewed at several levels as well as by the Dean of IPE. Analysis of plans is used at the discipline/staff level to determine resource requests, which are vetted and ranked at the Council level.

The O&A Committee now focuses on providing support for outcome and assessment development, analysis, and reporting to both instructional and non-instructional areas by developing workshop activities and training. This is a standing subcommittee of the Academic Senate that meets twice a month and includes faculty members as well as non-instructional staff and management. Committee members review assessment processes and documents, develop survey instruments for assessment, plan workshop agendas, work with faculty members and staff individually or in groups, and provide assessment support.

### **Next Steps**

The O&A Committee will continue to work with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to evaluate and refine the assessment process as well as timelines for course and program outcomes and core competencies.

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[II.A.20 Course Outcome Assessment Report Samples](#)

[II.A.21 3rd Annual Student Success Conference \(Flex Day\) Agenda 1.16-17.14](#)

[II.A.22 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation](#)

[II.A.23 Elumen PPT](#)

[II.A.24 Program Outcome Assessment Report Samples](#)

[II.A.25 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 1](#)

[II.A.26 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 2](#)

[II.A.27 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 3](#)

[II.A.28 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 4](#)



II.A.2                   The interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will collaborate with the Student Learning Outcomes and Program Planning and Assessment Committees to review the current assessment processes of all courses and programs, including those courses delivered by Distance Education modalities. This review will identify additional research tools and data that may be integrated into the regular program review of all courses and programs. The process and timeline will be determined during the strategic planning process that will be completed by June 2013.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

In fall 2013, the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness conferred with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and separately with the Dean of South County Education Services/Distance Education and the Distance Education Committee Chair to discuss the gap in both student success and retention between online (DE) and face-to-face (F2F) courses. It was determined that disaggregated success and retention data for students in DE and F2F classes would be provided to discipline faculty members for their review, starting in Spring 2014 with the second annual program planning and assessment (PPA) cycle. The data was integrated into the program review process, and the academic PPA template was revised to incorporate items allowing for faculty members response to the disaggregated data ([II.A.29](#), [II.A.30](#)).

Comprehensive data on enrollment, success and retention rates have been compiled for all online courses taught between Fall 2010 and Spring 2014 and are being analyzed by discipline deans and the newly hired DE Specialist. The communication among adjunct and full-time DE faculty members has been increased through a survey sent out to all on their current practices and information shared on progress made with policies pertaining to DE ([II.A.31](#), [II.A.32](#)).

The newly hired DE Specialist is working with the Dean IPE on aligning the DE Plan with strategic priorities defined by Hartnell College. Minutes of monthly DE meetings are posted and shared on the dedicated DE Committee web page ([II.A.33](#)). The DE Committee now also has a student representative in its membership.

To facilitate the comparison of data between distance education and face-to-face classes offered by academic programs, two key items about teaching modality were added to the annual review section of the Academic Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) report template starting with the spring 2014 PPA cycle.

- Compare student success in the DE teaching environment with success in the face-to-face teaching environment in the same course. Are there differences? To what do you ascribe the differences in your program? Discuss any other relevant factors regarding diverse teaching modalities and environments, such as specific locations.
- Describe the process to change and improve student success in DE courses/sections in your program, and any other relevant factors regarding diverse teaching modalities and environments, such as specific locations.

In addition, DE enrollment, success, and retention data were provided to faculty members.

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**Next Steps**

The DE Specialist will collaborate with and act as a liaison between the DE Committee and the appropriate academic deans. Faculty will respond to the newly added prompts regarding DE as well as analyze and discuss DE enrollment, success, and retention data.

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**II.A.29 [Academic PPA Report Template—Spring 2014](#)**

**II.A.30 [Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014](#)**

**II.A.31 [Current DE Practices Survey](#)**

**II.A.32 [DE Policies Progress](#)**

**II.A.33 [Sample DE Minutes](#)**

- II.A.2.a By Spring 2013, the SLO and PPA Committees will collaborate with the interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness to review the program evaluation process and forms to ensure that program needs are being expressed and supported with sufficient data and evidence to justify budget expenditures.

Working with the PPA Committee, the Financial Information Subcommittee, and Resource Allocation Committee, the interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will establish formal processes and timelines linking comprehensive program review documents to resource allocation and the shared governance process by Spring 2013.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

The responses to Recommendations 2, 9, and 11 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. ([II.A.34](#)) ([Response 2](#)) ([II.A.35](#)) ([Response 9](#)) ([II.A.36](#)) ([Response 11](#))

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

II.A.34 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

II.A.35 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

II.A.36 [Recommendation 11 Evidence Folder](#)

- II.A.2.e The interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will collaborate with the Student Learning Outcomes and Program Planning and Assessment Committees to review the current assessment processes of all courses and programs. This review will identify additional research tools and data that may be integrated into the regular program review of all courses and programs and the college budget and master education/facilities planning process. The process and timeline will be determined during the strategic planning process that will be completed by June 2013.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. ([II.A.37](#)) ([Response 2](#)) ([II.A.38](#)) ([Response 9](#))

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

II.A.37 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

II.A.38 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

II.A.2.f The interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will collaborate with the Student Learning Outcomes and Program Planning and Assessment Committees to review the current assessment processes of all courses and programs. This review will identify additional research tools and data that may be integrated into the regular program review of all courses and programs and the college budget and master education/facilities plans. The process and timeline will be determined during the strategic planning process that will be completed by June 2013.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. ([II.A.39](#)) ([Response 2](#)) ([II.A.40](#)) ([Response 9](#))

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**II.A.39** [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

**II.A.40** [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

II.A.3.a The Curriculum Committee will review procedures and criteria for acceptance of courses into general education by Fall 2013.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The Articulation Officer reviews courses for inclusion into general education categories. BP 4025 (Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education) is pending Board of Trustees review. ([II.A.41](#)) It was discussed during the Curriculum Committee meeting on November 1, 2012, ([II.A.42](#)), and approved by the Academic Senate on February 26, 2013, ([II.A.43](#)).

AP 4025 was developed in October 2014 ([II.A.44](#)), and has moved through the shared governance process and will be submitted for approval by the Board of Trustees with BP 4025.

**Next Steps**

Consider for approval by the Board of Trustees Spring 2015.

**Conclusion**

Partially completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

II.A.41 [BP 4025 \(Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education\)](#)

II.A.42 [Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012](#)

II.A.43 [Senate Minutes Approved 2-26-13](#)

II.A.44 [Draft of AP 4025](#)

II.A.3.c By Spring 2013, the Program Planning and Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes Committees will review the core competencies and their associated performance indicators. The PPA and SLO Committees will collaborate with the interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness to review the current assessment processes of all core competencies; this review will identify additional research tools and data that may be integrated into the systematic review of all core competencies.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

In Fall 2013 the College's governance structure was reorganized and the Program Planning and Assessment Committee was dissolved; program planning and assessment activities are currently overseen by the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (IPE).

In fall 2013, the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee discussed and approved a new name, the Outcomes & Assessment (O&A) Committee ([II.A.48](#)). This new name better reflects the role of the Committee to support outcome development and assessment across the college. This O&A Committee now has the support of two experienced faculty members serving in outcomes and assessments specialist positions, which includes the role of committee chair ([II.A.50](#)). The specialists report to the Dean of Academic Affairs, Languages, Learning Support, and Resources (LLS&R), thus creating a stronger infrastructure to support assessment activities. Both specialists work with faculty members and staff in outcome development and assessment in instructional and non-instructional areas as well as in planning and implementing the transition to eLumen ([II.A.52](#)).

Additionally, in October 2013, the Committee assessed its membership, purpose, and committee responsibilities and made revisions to the *Outcomes & Assessment Handbook* to better align with the College's commitment to involve all constituencies in outcome assessment and improvement ([II.A.51](#)). The Outcomes & Assessment Handbook was approved by the Committee and by the Academic Senate ([II.A.49](#)).

All core competencies (institutional outcomes) were assessed (and some reassessed) in spring 2014. On May 30, 2014, the second Graduation Survey was administered to 260 students at graduation rehearsal. This survey included the original 10 questions from the 2012 Graduation Survey as well as 15 questions that were supplements to the CCSSE survey conducted in Spring 2014 ([II.A.46](#)). Discussion and analysis of results among faculty members occurred during the College's Fall 2014 Convocation in August ([II.A.45](#)). This activity involved small group, across-discipline discussion and analysis of survey results by full-time and part-time faculty members). Each group selected a recorder, who was responsible for entering the group's responses to discussion prompts provided in a Google Document ([II.A.47](#)). These results have discussed in the O&A Committee and will be shared with faculty members during the spring 2015 semester to include in assessment discussions and analysis.

The O&A Committee and chair, the Dean of IPE, and the Dean of LLS&R collaborated on the selection of questions to be included in the Graduation Survey.

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

### **Next Steps**

Now that core competency data has been collected and disseminated, faculty members will examine the findings to determine appropriate interventions. The O&A Committee has discussed the importance and benefit of direct assessment in the written communications area to better determine if interventions such as Reading Apprenticeship strategies or use of turnitin.com have helped students improve their writing skills. The College will continue to collect and analyze data to make improvements to address this issue.

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**II.A.45** [Fall Convocation agenda \(8.15.14\)](#)

**II.A.46** [Core competencies-CCSSE survey results \(convocation f14\)](#)

**II.A.47** [Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation](#)

**II.A.48** [O&A Minutes 11.25.13 - \(O&A Committee Approval\)](#)

**II.A.49** [Academic Senate Minutes](#)

**II.A.50** [Assessment Specialist Position Description](#)

**II.A.51** [Outcomes and Assessment Committee Handbook Template v2](#)

**II.A.52** [O&A Emails to Faculty Members](#)



II.A.4 The Curriculum Committee will encourage the further development of AA-T and AS-T degrees.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The Curriculum Committee Chair and Articulation Officer presented Flex Day activities regarding C-ID descriptors and development of transfer model curricula (TMC) on January 17, 2013. ([II.A.53](#)) Since that date, the Curriculum Committee Chair, Deans of Academic Affairs, and Articulation Officer have engaged in ongoing communication with discipline faculty members concerning specific issues in developing their respective AA-T and AS-T degrees.

During the 2012-13 and 2013-14 academic years, 12 new AA-T and AS-T degrees had been approved by Curriculum Committee, Hartnell College Board of Trustees and the CCC Chancellor's office, including:

- Associate in Science in Administration of Justice for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Science in Business Administration for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Arts in Communication Studies for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Science in Early Childhood Education for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Arts in Elementary Teacher Education for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in English for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Science in Mathematics for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Science in Physics for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Arts in Political Science for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Psychology for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Sociology for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Studio Arts for Transfer Degree (AA-T)

([II.A.54](#)) ([II.A.55](#))

In addition, three more degrees were approved during the Spring 2014 semester:

- Associate in Arts in Kinesiology for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Theatre Arts for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in History for Transfer Degree (AA-T)

([II.A.54](#))([II.A.55](#))([II.A.56](#))([II.A.57](#))([II.A.58](#))([II.A.59](#))

In Fall 2014, the Associate in Arts in History for Transfer Degree (AA-T) and the Associate in Arts in Kinesiology for Transfer Degree (AA-T) were approved by the Chancellor's Office. The Associate in Arts in Spanish for Transfer Degree (AA-T) was approved by the Curriculum committee on October 16, 2014, ([II.A.60](#)) and approved by the Board of Trustees on November 4, 2014 ([II.A.61](#)). The Associate in Arts in Music for Transfer Degree (AA-T) was approved by the Curriculum committee on December 4, 2014, ([II.A.62](#)), and by the Board of Trustees on December 9, 2014. ([II.A.63](#))

The Curriculum Committee and Deans of Academic Affairs continue to encourage further development of AA-T and AS-T degrees. The Articulation Officer is a member of the curriculum committee and will continue working with faculty members to develop additional degrees for transfer.

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

### **Next Steps**

Hartnell College has exceeded its obligation to develop by Fall 2014, to be offered in Fall 2015, 14 AA-T and AS-T degrees (in 100% of the majors offered for which there was an approved Transfer Model Curriculum). The Curriculum Committee and Deans of Academic Affairs continue to encourage further development of AA-T and AS-T degrees in new disciplines for which no associate degrees were offered at Hartnell, including Sociology and Political Science.

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**II.A.53** [Flex Day Agenda for January 17, 2013](#)

**II.A.54** [Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012](#)

**II.A.55** [Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013](#)

**II.A.56** [CC minutes 11-21-13](#)

**II.A.57** [CC minutes 3-6-14 approved](#)

**II.A.58** [CC minutes 5-15-2014](#)

**II.A.59** [Board minutes 6-3-2014](#)

**II.A.60** [Curriculum Committee Meeting minutes 10-16-2014](#)

**II.A.61** [Board minutes 11-4-14](#)

**II.A.62** [CC minutes 12-4-14](#)

**II.A.63** [Board minutes 12-9-14](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

II.A.6.a The Curriculum Committee and Dean of Curriculum and Instructional Support will work with the Articulation Officer and discipline faculty to develop additional degrees for transfer by Spring 2013.

**Resolution and Analysis**

See response to and evidence provided in II.A.4.

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

II.A.64 [Flex Day Agenda for January 17, 2013](#)

II.A.65 [Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012](#)

II.A.66 [Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013](#)

II.A.67 [CC minutes 11-21-13](#)

II.A.68 [CC minutes 3-6-14 approved](#)

II.A.69 [CC minutes 5-15-14](#)

II.A.70 [Board minutes 6-3-2014](#)

II.A.71 [Curriculum Committee Meeting minutes 10-16-2014](#)

II.A.72 [Board minutes 11-4-14](#)

- II.A.6.b The Academic Senate will collaborate with the interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness to review the current discontinuance processes by Spring 2013.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

In AY 2013-14, a task force of three members of the Academic Senate and the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness, led by the Senate Vice President/Curriculum Committee Chair, convened for the purpose of reviewing the college's academic program discontinuance process and developing a more expansive process to encompass the full life cycle of program establishment, revitalization and discontinuance. These meetings resulted in draft documents for BP/AP 4021, Establishing, Revitalizing or Discontinuing Academic Programs, their approval at the College Planning Council meeting on November 5, 2014, and the incorporation of chief components of AP 4021 into an institutional continuous improvement process ([II.A.73](#), [II.A.74](#), [II.A.75](#), [II.A.76](#)).

**Next Steps:**

None

**Conclusion:**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**

II.A.73 [BP 4021 Establishing, Revitalizing, or Discontinuing Academic Programs](#)

II.A.74 [AP 4021 Establishing, Revitalizing, or Discontinuing Academic Programs](#)

II.A.75 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014](#)

II.A.76 [Academic Program Establishment, Revitalization Discontinuance Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

II.A.6.c The Vice President of Information and Technology Resources will implement recommended changes to the college website by Fall 2013.

### **Resolution and Analysis:**

Hartnell initiated a process beginning in Spring 2013 to replace the existing website. A campus wide web steering committee was formed to evaluate the aspects of the website that were critical to keep and what the campus needed from a new web property ([II.A.77](#)). Improvements associated with outdated and ineffective information were identified and made as well as new innovative ways to present services and tools for student orientation, success, and engagement. Additionally, the webmaster worked with various disciplines and areas of the institution to design and implement a new site organization and appearance. The goals were to strengthen the college brands and the college's program visibility, enhance navigation, and provide ways to ensure information remained useful and current.

By October 2011, Hartnell's webmaster had been trained on new content management platform (Drupal) and started coordinating and participating in the significant effort of migrating content from the old website to the new, eliminating outdated content, and creating new content, images and processes for new website. This process of weeding and reconfiguring new ways of providing information and services given the advancement of web tools took over 8 months to complete. There was great consideration that the entire campus was ready to make a transition from the old website to the new including faculty and students. Many meetings of the web site steering committee occurred to determine what features and segments of the website were going to make the cut ([II.A.78](#)). The website design and progress was presented to the Board of Trustees and to multiple shared governance committees ([II.A.79](#), [II.A.80](#)).

With final approval given by the President's cabinet, the new website launched in early October 2014 and has received unanimous accolades as a much better organized face of Hartnell and provides better tools for information management. Users report the user interface is much more efficient and pleasing to visitors and much more engaging of the Hartnell community as many have now been placed in the responsibility of adding their own content. Hartnell views its website as a living, growing resource which needs constant care and feeding. The new Hartnell website paradigm requires many people across campus "own" and maintains their own content areas and keeps them up to date. Hartnell is confident that this new model of distributed content ownership will help the website remain relevant and fresh for visitors and campus constituents' year over year. Hartnell's ongoing website committee which will continue to meet monthly will assist in keeping the website in alignment with the information needs of the college ([II.A.81](#)).

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[II.A.77 Web committee membership](#)

[II.A.78 Web committee spreadsheet for essential features completed for go-live](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**II.A.79 [Board agenda](#)**

**II.A.80 [Shared Governance committee agendas](#)**

**II.A.81 [Concept images/Screen shots](#)**

- II.B.1 The College completed the PEER evaluation of Division of Student Affairs student programs during Fall 2011. Each area within the Division has finalized and staggered the implementation of a consistent student feedback survey form. The college will use the data generated by the evaluation and student feedback forms to improve program performance, support and reinforce those services deemed by students to be particularly helpful, and search for additional external funding opportunities to ensure continued student learning and success.

### **Resolution and Analysis:**

During 2012-13 the Division of Student Affairs used data derived from PEER evaluations and student feedback completed in 2011-12 to enhance program services. In Spring 2013 the former PEER template used for completing Student Affairs program reviews was discontinued. A newly adopted non-instructional program review template was reviewed with the Student Affairs Leadership Team on April 3 and 17, 2013 ([II.B.1](#)). The Student Affairs Leadership Team adopted the template on May 17, 2013 ([II.B.2](#)) along with a summary of division priority needs for 2013-14 derived from program reviews ([II.B.3](#)). The division priority needs identified areas that would promote student learning and success. On September 18, 2013 the Student Affairs Leadership team reviewed and adopted a revised Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews for all division areas ([II.B.4](#)). In Fall 2013 all Student Affairs areas completed and submitted their annual Program Planning and Assessment documents using the new template developed in Spring 2013 as part of the annual program review cycle ([II.B.5](#)). The purpose of Program Planning and Assessment at Hartnell College is to obtain an honest and authentic view of a service/office/program and to assess its strengths, opportunities, needs, and connection to the mission and goals of the college.

The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 also address the integration of resource needs into the college's planning and assessment process. ([II.B.6](#)) ([Response 2](#)) ([II.B.7](#)) ([Response 9](#))

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[II.B.1 SALT Meeting Minutes - April, 2013](#)

[II.B.2 SALT Meeting Minutes - May, 2013](#)

[II.B.3 Student Affairs Summary of Priority Needs, 2013-14](#)

[II.B.4 Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews 2013-18](#)

[II.B.5 List of 2013 Student Affairs Program Planning and Assessment Documents](#)

[II.B.6 Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

[II.B.7 Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

- II.B.3.b Hartnell College will continue to partner with the ASHC and Student Senate to support a full-time Student Life Coordinator that will provide advisory and support services to the ASHC, student government, and student clubs. The college and Coordinator will continually work with student government leaders to identify any additional training these leaders may need in order to continue to develop their leadership skills. The ASHC and Coordinator will work with student senators representing the CAT and the King City Education Center students to ensure that students attending those centers feel connected to student government and have access to those programs that promote personal development.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

Hartnell College fulfilled its commitment to supporting the Associated Students of Hartnell College (ASHC), Student Life and Student Activities by hiring a full-time Director of Student Affairs (Student Life) in August, 2013. Hartnell College and ASHC began cost-sharing the expense of a full-time Program Assistant for Student Life in October, 2013. Both positions in Student Life are permanent. Since August, 2013 the Director has worked with student government leaders to identify training needs ([II.B.8](#)) and recently coordinated a retreat with a professional consultant to teach parliamentary procedures to the new ASHC leaders ([II.B.9](#)). The ASHC leaders and the Director have recruited student senators representing the CAT (Alisal Campus) and the King City Education Center to become active participants in student government.

The Director of Student Affairs-Student Life is committed to the ongoing leadership development of ASHC Officers. Leadership training was developed to introduce new Officers to their roles and responsibilities to include: Hartnell College vision, mission, strategic priorities, participatory governance structure, Ralph M. Brown Act, parliamentary procedures, and additional leadership development topics. In addition, ASHC Officers participated in a parliamentary procedures workshop facilitated by professional parliamentarian Bruce Bishop. AHSC Officers also attend the California Community College Student Affairs Association (CCCSAA) Student Leadership Conferences ([II.B.10](#)) ([II.B.11](#)) offered twice a year, and the Student Senate of the California Community College (SSCCC) General Assembly ([II.B.12](#)) twice a year. These conferences are designed to enhance leadership skills, develop understanding of statewide issues facing community college students, and network with other California Associated Student Government officers ([II.B.13](#)).

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[II.B.8 ASHC Officer Development Training, June 3, 2014](#)

[II.B.9 ASHC Retreat Agenda, Fall 2014](#)

[II.B.10 CCCSAA Fall 2014 Student Leadership Conference Program](#)

[II.B.11 Student Leadership Conference Agenda, Fall 2013](#)



Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**II.B.12 General Assembly Program, Fall 2014**

**II.B.13 Training Program for New and Current Student Senate Members**

II.B.4 During the 2012-13 academic year, Student Affairs personnel will work with other colleagues to look at the feasibility of modifying PlaNET so that the college could transition from the PEER assessment tool to the program review and assessment software system used by the academic services. In addition, the resource needs of Student Affairs will systematically be integrated into the college's planning and assessment process.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

Because faculty in academic programs experienced increasing challenges in implementing the PlaNET module within CurricuNET, the institution initiated Word document reporting templates for program review/program planning and assessment (PPA) until such time that acceptable software can be identified and adopted. It was determined that staff in all non-instructional programs, including those in the Student Affairs division, would complete the same template to ensure consistency in reporting across the institution ([II.B.14](#)).

In Spring 2013 the former PEER template used for completing Student Affairs program reviews was discontinued. A newly adopted non-instructional program review and assessment template was introduced by the Interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness and reviewed with the Student Affairs Leadership Team on April 3 and 17, 2013 ([II.B.15](#)). The Student Affairs Leadership Team adopted the template on May 17, 2013 ([II.B.16](#)). The Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) template continues to be used annually to obtain an honest and authentic view of a service/office/program and to assess its strengths, opportunities, needs, and connection to the mission and goals of the college ([II.B.14](#)).

The resource needs of Student Affairs areas continue to be integrated into the institutional planning and assessment process according to the cycle followed for various departments and grant-funded services. Annual action plans for all areas of Student Affairs continue to be completed on an annual basis ([II.B.17](#)) ([II.B.18](#)). The completed annual action plans are reviewed by members of the Student Affairs Leadership Team and are used as the means to identify program resource needs that are prioritized and forwarded to the Student Affairs Council and later the College Planning Council before being recommended to the Superintendent/President for consideration.

The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 also address the integration of resource needs into the college's planning and assessment process. ([II.B.19](#)) ([Response 2](#)) ([II.B.20](#)) ([Response 9](#))

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[II.B.14 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template - Spring 2014](#)

[II.B.15 SALT Meeting Minutes - April, 2013](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**II.B.16** [SALT Meeting Minutes - May, 2013](#)

**II.B.17** [Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews 2013-18](#)

**II.B.18** [List of 2013 Student Affairs Program Planning and Assessment Documents](#)

**II.B.19** [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)

**II.B.20** [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

- II.C.1 Based on the recommendations in *A Blueprint for Student Success at Hartnell College*, Learning Support Services staff will collaborate with college administration, faculty members and staff to begin planning for a Student Success Center during the 2012-13 academic year.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

A workforce group of faculty members began meeting in fall 2014 to begin planning for the creation of a Student Success Center at Hartnell College. While this work group was composed of faculty members instructing in basic skills areas, the efforts to create a center that provides more academic support are widely supported by faculty members and administration.

The Facilities Master Plan that was adopted by the Board of Trustees at its December 2014 meeting includes repurposing the second floor of the existing science building to be used to provide academic support services for students. In addition, the Board of Trustees at its December 2014 meeting adopted the College's Student Equity Plan (SEP), which includes resource allocation for a Student Success Center ([II.C.1](#)).

### **Next Steps**

Planning for the development of coordinated and centralized academic support activities for students will begin in spring 2015.

### **Conclusion**

Ongoing

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

II.C.1 [Budget 4 Student Equity Plan](#)

- II.C.1.a Library staff members will continue to evaluate its collections, deselecting older materials, and purchasing updated items that meet the curricular needs of students. Electronic publications that can be accessed by distance learning students and students at the other campuses will be given a high priority. Support for faculty members requesting technical assistance will be provided.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

Full-time and adjunct librarians actively evaluate books, periodicals, and databases that meet circulation needs. The Systems/Technology Librarian is a member of the Curriculum Committee and attends meetings regularly. She keeps other discipline selection librarians informed about changes in the curriculum, courses, and programs that may affect purchasing decisions. All materials in the media collection (primarily DVDs and videos) are now RFID tagged.

In the Library's 2013-14 Comprehensive PPA and Action Plan, it was documented that the security "gates" that ensure authorized checkouts of materials were not functioning consistently ([II.C.2](#)). A resource request for replacement gates and necessary personnel to assist in the transition to a new system was vetted through the participative governance process, which resulted in an allocation of funds to replace the security gates. Adjunct librarians are working additional hours to assist in the "weeding" process to ensure that the Library collection does not contain outdated materials; in addition, all materials will need to be tagged with new RFIDs; student workers will be hired to assist with this process. The evaluation of the library's collections is ongoing and a high priority in 2014-15.

Library staff have prepared an implementation plan that documents tasks, persons, and start and completion dates for the following phases: Getting Started, Deselection, Tagging Circulating, Reserve, and Media Collections, and Technical Services Updates Catalog Records and Completes Discarding of Selected Materials ([II.C.3](#)). To prepare for the transition to a new system, quotes were solicited from three RFID vendors. The vendors also conducted on-site demonstrations. The vendors also conducted on-site demonstrations. After a thorough comparison and evaluation, library staff selected a vendor in November 2014 ([II.C.4](#)). Board approval was granted at the January 2015 board meeting, and has begun the contracting process ([II.C.5](#)). Librarians are currently working additional hours deselecting outdated or damaged materials, with completion planned by the spring semester.

### **Next Steps**

Library staff and additional workers will tag all remaining items with new RFID sensors during the spring semester. The security gates and additional equipment will be installed during the semester break and the new system will be live for summer 2015.

### **Conclusion**

Scheduled for completion by summer 2015

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[II.C.2 Library PPA Spring 2014](#)

[II.C.3 RFID Implementation Plan](#)

[II.C.4 RFID - Side by Side Comparison](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**II.C.5 January 2015 Board Minutes**

**II.C.1.b** Librarians will continue to look for new ideas, methods, and opportunities to teach information competency skills. The library faculty members and staff will also continue to encourage implementation of an information competency graduation requirement and inclusion of information competency in the freshman/first year college experience. Filling the vacant Student Services Librarian position is a high priority among library classified staff and library faculty members.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

In recognition of the AA-T and AS-T degrees, the librarians are no longer pursuing implementation of an information competency graduation requirement. Filling the vacant Student Services Librarian position remains a very high staffing priority among library workers.

To address the information competency needs of students, the Library offers three sections of information competency credit courses during the fall and spring semesters, and often offers a summer course. The librarians reached out to faculty members during the Spring 2014 semester ([II.C.6](#)), and as a result, the number of orientations and attending students increased in 2014. Usage is tracked in the Reference Daily Statistics Log on an hourly basis by librarians at the Reference Desk. Since the account was created in December 2013, the number of faculty and students using this service has been increasing. Usually the annual number of library orientations is slightly more than 100. As of November 2014, 120 orientations have been taught. October 2014 was a very busy month, with 22 orientations taught and 516 students attending.

Librarians have created and continue to create LibGuides, which are guides with links to selected library and web content for specific disciplines and topics, such as for Nursing, Administration of Justice, and Early Childhood Education ([II.C.7](#)). The Systems/Technology librarian has developed a LibGuide production schedule and has trained adjunct librarians in the software. As of spring 2015, the Library offers eight LibGuides for student use. New LibGuide creation is on hold pending migration to the current version of this service.

Librarians are “campaigning” to make faculty members and students on all campuses aware of library services. A variety of communication tactics have been used: emails, information on display screens on all three campuses, Library website announcements, and visitations by librarians to classrooms ([II.C.8](#)). The new website includes a “For Faculty” tab, where faculty members can request a library purchase and schedule a library orientation, for example.

Hartnell’s Systems/Technology Librarian created a prototype online orientation in the College’s learning management system (Etudes) is currently working with distance education faculty to pilot/test it in spring 2015. The online orientation will be provided not only to students enrolled in distance education classes but also will be available to all Hartnell students. ([II.C.9](#))

### **Next Steps**

Librarians will continue to look for new ideas, methods, and opportunities to teach information competency skills and improve outreach to students. Hartnell’s Systems/Technology Librarian will be pilot-testing and implementing the online orientation accessed through Etudes, the College’s learning management system, in spring 2015. This will provide access to the Library’s

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

orientation to our online students as well as to our students attending Hartnell College courses at the Alisal Campus or in South County.

### **Conclusion**

Partially completed (Student Services Librarian position continues to be vacant).

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**II.C.6** [Hartnell College e-mail Regarding reference@hartnell.edu](mailto:reference@hartnell.edu)

**II.C.7** [LibGuide Sample Page \(Library Web Page\)](#)

**II.C.8** [Library Flyer of Remote Services](#)

**II.C.9** [Hartnell Library Online Orientation](#)

<https://sites.google.com/a/hartnell.edu/orientation/>



II.C.1.c Library staff and college administration will collaborate to review library staffing including the needs of the education centers for library services by Spring 2013.

Learning Support staff members will collaborate with college administrators, counselors, faculty members and others to secure funding and establish plans for a Student Success Center during the 2012-13 academic year. These plans may include conversion of the current science building (Merrill Hall) upon completion and occupation of a new science building.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The Hartnell Community College District and the California School Employees Association have mutually agreed to address staffing and coverage issues that were identified in the Library's Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) document and to complete a comprehensive staffing analysis for the library that will be completed in Spring 2015.

Drafted in 2014, the Facilities Master Plan includes a Student Success Center as a core theme and a near-term project linked to the planned renovation of Building N, Merrill Hall ([II.C.10](#)). Potential sources of funding include funds remaining in the bond measure and available in the property acquisition fund ([II.C.11](#)).

**Next Steps**

Planning for the Student Success Center on the main campus will begin in Spring 2015.

**Conclusion**

The District's library staff--including the dean, faculty, and classified staff--will conduct a comprehensive staffing review and report its recommendations to the District and the CSEA by June 2015.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**II.C.10 [Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)**

**II.C.11 [Financial Statements of District Funds September 30, 2014](#)**

II.C.1.d Library staff will work to raise awareness of library building security issues among other college departments and personnel.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

Building security issues with Library doors not locking/alarming consistently that were included in the Library's 2014-15 PPA document have been resolved. Library security cameras have been inspected and are being checked on a monthly basis to ensure continuous operation.

Staff from Hartnell College Campus Security is regularly present in the Library to conduct a "walk-through" at ten minutes prior to closing times on all days during which the Library is open.

To prepare for the transition to a new materials security system, quotes were solicited from three RFID vendors. The vendors also conducted on-site demonstrations. After a thorough comparison and evaluation, library staff selected a vendor in November 2014 (Board approval was granted at the January 2015 board meeting), and have begun the contracting process ([II.C.12](#)). Librarians are currently working additional hours deselecting outdated or damaged materials, with completion planned by the spring semester.

### **Next Steps**

Library staff and additional workers will tag all remaining items with new RFID sensors during the spring semester. The security gates and additional equipment will be installed during the semester break and the new system will be live for summer 2015.

### **Conclusion**

Will be completed in June 2015

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

II.C.12 [January 2015 Board Minutes](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

II.C.1.e Library staff will continue to work towards finalizing the Voyager agreement between CSUMB-Community College Library Voyager/ExLibris consortium members by Fall 2013.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The response to Recommendation 6 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. ([II.C.13](#)) In its action letter dated July 3, 2014 the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 8 had been resolved.

The response to Recommendation 7 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 addresses the timely evaluation processes for managers and part-time faculty members. ([II.C.14](#)) ([Response 7](#))

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

See list of supporting evidence in response to Recommendation 6 contained in the follow-up report submitted March 15, 2014.

**II.C.13** [Recommendation 6 Evidence Folder](#)

**II.C.14** [Recommendation 7 Evidence Folder](#)

### **Standard III: Resources**

III.A.1.b      The college has developed a recruitment calendar to stabilize the organizational structure, and replace interim appointments with regular hires. The college will address timely evaluation processes for managers and part-time faculty members.

#### **Resolution and Analysis:**

The response to Recommendation 8 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. ([III.A.1](#)) In its action letter dated July 3, 2014 the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 8 had been resolved.

The response to Recommendation 7 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 addresses the timely evaluation processes for managers and part-time faculty members. ([III.A.2](#)) ([Response 7](#))

#### **Next Steps**

None

#### **Conclusion**

Completed

#### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

See list of supporting evidence in response to Recommendation 8 contained in the follow-up report submitted March 15, 2014.

**III.A.1** [Recommendation 8 Evidence Folder](#)

**III.A.2** [Recommendation 7 Evidence Folder](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

III.A.5.a The College's strategic plan will address the development of its employees. The college will continue to seek funding for such a program.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

Strategic Priority 3 of the college's Strategic Plan focuses on employee diversity and development, and Goal 3B in particular states ([III.A.3](#)):

*To attract and retain highly qualified employees, Hartnell College is committed to providing and supporting relevant, substantial professional development activities.*

Funding (\$80,000) for employee professional development activities for FY 2014-15 has been available through the Human Resources Office and the work of the recently established Professional Development Committee ([III.A.4](#)).

The response to Recommendation 7 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 also addresses professional development of college employees. ([III.A.5](#)) ([Response 7](#))

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[III.A.3 Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)

[III.A.4 Budget for Employee Professional Development FY 2014-15](#)

[III.A.5 Recommendation 7 Evidence Folder](#)

- III.C.1 The Technology Task Force needs to establish regular surveys of faculty members, staff and students as a primary means of identifying their satisfaction level with its array of technology services and functions.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

Starting in March 2013, Faculty and Administration surveys were drafted, finalized, and administered ([III.C.1](#)) ([III.C.2](#)) during the Fall 2013 semester and remained open until a month after the beginning of Spring 2014 semester. The next set of surveys was created in Fall 2014 term in preparation for Spring 2015 delivery.

A new student survey was prepared and delivered at the beginning of Spring 2014. ([III.C.3](#)) Results were collected after 6 weeks and assessed to plan for Fall adjustments or initiatives. ITR continuously gathers survey information via our help desk system, iSupport to understand how we can improve our service and technology support. ([III.C.4](#))

Surveys for all three groups are set for early Spring 2015. This cycle of regular surveys for students and for faculty members has been established.

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

III.C.1 [2013 Faculty Members IT Surveys Administrators](#)

III.C.2 [2014 Faculty Members IT Surveys Staff](#)

III.C.3 [2013 Student IT Survey](#)

III.C.4 [IT iSupport Survey Feedback](#)

- III.C.1.a The Technology Task Force will conduct regular surveys to further integrate resource and technology prioritization with goals and objectives and program review. Additionally, plans for future leveraging of technology to optimize and automate specific business processes and operations of the college need to be integrated with the larger college planning process.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

Starting in March 2013, surveys were drafted, finalized ([III.C.5](#)) ([III.C.7](#)), and administered during the Fall semester and remained open until a month after the beginning of Spring semester. The next set of surveys was issued in Fall 2014 term in preparation for Spring 2015.

A student survey was prepared and delivered at the beginning of Fall 2014. ([III.C.6](#)) Results were collected after 6 weeks and assessed to plan for Spring adjustments or initiatives. This cycle of Fall Survey for students and Spring Survey for faculty members will be repeated annually. The findings from this survey informed the planning, improvements, and initiatives of the PPA process for 2014/15. A 2015 survey for all groups will be administered in Spring. The results will inform the planning, improvements, and initiatives of the PPA process for 2015/16 process.

ITR continuously gathers survey information via our help desk system, iSupport to understand how we can improve our service and technology support. ([III.C.8](#))

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[III.C.5 2013 Faculty Members IT Surveys Administrators](#)

[III.C.6 2013 Student IT Surveys](#)

[III.C.7 2014 Faculty Members IT Surveys Staff](#)

[III.C.8 IT iSupport Survey Feedback](#)

III.C.1.b The Faculty Resource Center will continue to develop varied and helpful training options for the staff members on relevant tools and technologies. The IT organization will conduct a needs assessment in Spring 2013 via a survey in order to determine specific educational technology training needs. Upon completion of the needs assessment and, in coordination with the Learning Resource and Faculty Resource Centers, training plans will be adjusted and augmented to prioritize and address the various areas of need.

### **Resolution and Analysis**

An important step in completing this task was to budget for and hire a new Instructional Technologist. An Instructional Technologist position was opened and a new Instructional Technologist was in place by mid- to late March 2013. ([III.C.12](#))

The Instructional Technologist quickly evaluated technologies being used on campus and planned, and queried the campus community for their opinion about which areas of faculty educational training and professional development needs remained unfulfilled. Based on the combined feedback and discovery, the Instructional Technologist developed training and published a regular delivery schedule in coordination with Academic Affairs, Academic Senate, and the VP of Information and Technology Resources.

The Instructional Technologist quickly provided direct support to faculty members and staff members regarding use of our campus LMS - *Etudes* - for instruction and campus collaboration. The Instructional Technologist delivered weekly training sessions on *Etudes*, Google Apps, (our communication and collaboration toolset), and Ellucian Colleague (our Student System), in the Faculty Resource Center (FRC). These sessions were offered face-to-face and online for adjunct faculty members who are not on campus ([III.C.13](#)). The calendar is always posted in the FRC and online ([III.C.11](#)). Training sessions are held often and regularly and *Etudes* tips and procedures have been posted to easily access and review or download. These training sessions match the requested courses from the different campus constituents through ad hoc surveys and email notifications. ([III.C.9](#))

In May 2014, Hartnell College hired an additional Instructional Technologist and, consequently, has been able to develop a coordinated and robust professional development center facility (PDC).([III.C.12](#)) The PDC offers a wide variety of tools, support services and training offerings to support instruction and professional development.([III.C.10](#)) The response to the PDC personnel regarding the facility and the quality of help and support is overwhelmingly positive. The Instructional Technologists coordinate face-to-face, off-line computer based guided and fully online weekly training session on software and instructional techniques including Drupal, Microsoft Office, Smartsheet, *Etudes*, Google Apps (our communication and collaboration toolset), and Ellucian Colleague (our Student System), in the Professional Development Center (PDC)

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**



Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**III.C.9 [Cumulative Customer Satisfaction Exit Survey Results](#)**

**III.C.10 [List of Supported Applications](#)**

**III.C.11 [Calendar of training classes](#)**

**III.C.12 [PDC Staff Bios](#)**

**III.C.13 <http://www.hartnell.edu/pdc>**

- III.D.2.a Update the health benefits actuarial report every two years as required by GASB. The District has contributed approximately 85% of the funding requirements as of June 30, 2011.

Develop strong modeling tools for the monthly calculation of the college's performance on the 50% law. This will provide timely data to management to respond quickly to any negative trend in the 50% requirement.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The latest actuarial study of Retiree Health Liabilities as of November 1, 2012 was completed on January 18, 2013. The report shows that the District's Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) is \$4.2 million. The remaining unamortized balance of the initial unfunded AAL (UAAL) is \$4,930,939. This leaves a "residual" AAL of negative \$775,462 ([III.D.1](#)). The District has designated \$4.3 million for this purpose by placing the funds in a Retiree Health Benefits Fund within the District's account with the Monterey County Treasury. The District is considering placing a portion of the \$4.3 million in an irrevocable trust.

The Controller created a 50% calculation template that is used to monitor the status of compliance with the 50% law ([III.D.2](#)). It was determined that a monthly calculation within the first six months of the fiscal year would provide little value due to the disproportionate allocation of labor costs during that time. Instead, it was determined that monthly reports would be provided to the Executive Cabinet and the Board of Trustees from February through the end of the fiscal year.

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Complete

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

[III.D.1 Projection Worksheet](#)

[III.D.2 PowerPoint Presentation](#)

III.D.3.f Complete the comprehensive student financial aid procedures manual, which will include the default management program.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The financial aid staff continues to keep their financial aid manuals up-to-date annually as both federal and state mandates are issued.([III.D.5](#), [III.D.8](#), [III.D.9](#), [III.D.10](#), [III.D.11](#), [III.D.12](#), [III.D.15](#), [III.D.16](#)) A broader group of College personnel – the Default Prevention Task Force – is addressing issues of student default.([III.D.3](#)) The default management program manual has been completed.

Financial Aid staff continues to update student financial aid policies as required by the Department of Education on an annual basis.

On November 8, 2013, the Default Prevention Task Force met to review the Default Prevention & Management Plan. ([III.D.13](#)) Activity assignments were made to Task Force members. The Task Force has met monthly for several months to check in to ensure that activities are occurring. ([III.D.6](#), [III.D.7](#), [III.D.14](#)) The Task Force will move to once a quarter to ensure that we remain in compliance with the plan.

A final Default Prevention & Management Plan was submitted to the Department of Education on December 20, 2013. ([III.D.17](#)) The College received official notification from the Department of Education that the College’s Default Prevention & Management Plan was approved as submitted in early April 2014. We have also been working with Parker, Pierson and Associates who the Chancellor’s Office has contracted with to help all Community Colleges manage their default rate. The Consultants made presentations to both the College’s Executive Management Team as well as the Default Prevention Task Force in March and April 2014.

Starting in the summer 2014 semester, work will continue with Parker, Pierson & Associates, the Default Prevention Task Force, and the financial aid staff to work with those students that have been identified as going into repayment or into default status.

On September 22, 2014, the College received the final FY 2011 cohort default rate which is at 28.9%.([III.D.4](#)) According to the Department of Education regulations, the College will not have to submit a Default Prevention & Management Plan this year as we were able to lower our cohort default rate below the 30% requirement. In conclusion, the College currently is in compliance with the Department of Education’s Federal Financial Aid regulations.

The College will continue to work with the resources that the California Community College Chancellor’s Office is providing regarding default management. The College will continue to pay close attention to the 3-year default rate, and will make every effort to continue to lower our rate below the 30% requirement for future years.

The College will continue to annually review and update all required federal and state financial aid policies and procedures.

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**Next Steps**  
None

**Conclusion**  
Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

- III.D.3 [FY10 Meets the Requirement letter \(year 1\) Hartnell Community College 00120900 4-17-14](#)
- III.D.4 [Final Default Cohort Rate for 2011 as of 9-22-14](#)
- III.D.5 [2014-2015 FA required](#)
- III.D.6 [Default Management Task Force Minutes 4-25-14](#)
- III.D.7 [Default Management Task Force Agenda 4-25-14](#)
- III.D.8 [Reporting Verification Tracking Flags V4 and V5](#)
- III.D.9 [14-15 policies and procedures section 3.6 verif \(2\)](#)
- III.D.10 [Ability to benefit \(1\) 9-5-13 jbt](#)
- III.D.11 [New Financial Aid disbursements in numerical order as of 2-28-14with Higher One](#)
- III.D.12 [Employing Federal Work Study Student Workers Handbook 2014-2015](#)
- III.D.13 [Default Management Task Force Agenda 11-8-13](#)
- III.D.14 [Default Management Task Force Agenda 3-14-14](#)
- III.D.15 [SAP Policy 2014-2015 as of 4-23-14](#)
- III.D.16 [SAP Policy final 2013-2014 12-19-14](#)
- III.D.17 [HCC Default Mgm Final to DOE 12-19-13](#)

- III.D.3.h Establish Administrative Services evaluation survey to be provided to college community. The survey will request input from staff and faculty members on how business services can improve in generating access to financial information, training in use of financial systems and participation in budget process.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

Multiple surveys across Administrative Services areas have been developed and implemented, including human resources, facilities and maintenance, campus security, and food services, in addition to surveys focused on student satisfaction with business services and employee satisfaction with workshops provided by business services. Survey results have been compiled and reviewed ([III.D.18](#)) ([III.D.19](#))

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Complete

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

III.D.18 [Budget Worksheets](#)

III.D.19 [Surveys Admin Sys evidence response to accreditation](#)

## **Standard IV: Leadership and Governance**

- IV.A.1        The new Superintendent/President will lead a collegial review during the 2012-2013 academic year of the administrative structure to support the District's infrastructure and sustain its commitments.

### **Resolution and Analysis:**

The response to Recommendation 8 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. ([IV.A.1](#)) In its action letter dated July 3, 2014 the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 8 had been resolved.

### **Next Steps**

None

### **Conclusion**

Completed

### **Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

See list of supporting evidence in response to Recommendation 8 contained in the follow-up report submitted March 15, 2014.

### **IV.A.1 [Recommendation 8 Evidence Folder](#)**

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

IV.A.2.a Review and implement recommendations from the committee self-evaluations. A shared governance retreat is planned for November 2012 with participation from faculty members, classified staff, students, and administrators. The recent history of the shared governance structure and its implementation, its assessment, and the roles of shared governance and administrative procedures will be addressed.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

See response to Recommendation 11 regarding the development and implementation of the new governance system/model. ([IV.A.2](#)) ([Response 11](#))

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

IV.A.2 [Recommendation 11 Evidence Folder](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

IV.A.3            Review the results of the self-evaluation of shared governance committees and make recommendations for populating and/or re organizing committees.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

See response to Recommendation 11 regarding the development and implementation of the new governance system/model. ([IV.A.3](#)) ([Response 11](#))

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

IV.A.3 [Recommendation 11 Evidence Folder](#)



Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

IV.B.1           The Board will continue its comprehensive update of Board Policies, and establish a regular schedule of review thereafter.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The response to Recommendation 10 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. ([IV.B.1](#)) In its action letter dated July 3, 2014 the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 10 had been resolved.

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

See list of supporting evidence in response to Recommendation 10 contained in the follow-up report submitted March 15, 2014.

IV.B.1 [Recommendation 10 Evidence Folder](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

IV.B.1.g The Board will assess its self-evaluation instrument and encourage participation by all Board members in the self-evaluation in November 2012.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The response to Recommendation 12 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. ([IV.B.2](#)) In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 12 had been resolved.

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

See list of supporting evidence in response to Recommendation 12 contained in the follow-up report submitted March 15, 2014.

**IV.B.2 [Recommendation 12 Evidence Folder](#)**

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

IV.B.2.a During the 2012-13 academic year, the new Superintendent/President will create an administrative structure in an inclusive planning process that recognizes the continuing fiscal challenges.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

The response to Recommendation 8 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. [\(IV.B.3\)](#) In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 8 had been resolved.

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

**IV.B.3 [Recommendation 8 Evidence Folder](#)**

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

IV.B.2.b Evaluate the decision-making model integrating program review, budget, and resource allocation, and revise as necessary.

**Resolution and Analysis:**

See response to Recommendation 11 in the March 2015, Follow-up Report regarding the *Annual Integrated Planning Processes*. ([IV.B.4](#)) ([Response 11](#))

**Next Steps**

None

**Conclusion**

Completed

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

IV.B.4 [Recommendation 11 Evidence Folder](#)

## Appendix A: Master List of Recommendation Evidence

### Recommendation 2

- 2.1 [Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement](#)
- 2.2 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting September 17, 2014](#)
- 2.3 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting February 5, 2014](#)
- 2.4 [Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 2.5 [Timeline for Fall 2013 PPA Process](#)
- 2.6 [Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15](#)
- 2.7 [Timeline for 2014 PPA Process](#)
- 2.8 [Annual Budget Development Calendar](#)
- 2.9 [Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes](#)
- 2.10 [Governance & Planning Model](#)
- 2.11 [Academic Affairs Council Handbook](#)
- 2.12 [Administrative Services Council Handbook](#)
- 2.13 [Advancement Council Handbook](#)
- 2.14 [Student Affairs Council Handbook](#)
- 2.15 [Technology Development Council Handbook](#)
- 2.16 [College Planning Council Handbook](#)
- 2.17 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting April 2, 2014](#)
- 2.18 [Timeline for Deliverables of 3 Major Plans](#)
- 2.19 [2014-15 Master Meeting Calendar](#)
- 2.20 [Academic and Governance Calendar](#)
- 2.21 [Inventory of Long Term Plans with Leads FY 2014-15](#)
- 2.22 [Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)
- 2.23 [Technology Master Plan 2011-2021](#)
- 2.24 [Technology Plan 2011-2018](#)
- 2.25 [President’s Task Force Funding Plan 2012-2017](#)
- 2.26 [Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018 7-1-14](#)
- 2.27 [Student Success and Support Program Plan](#)
- 2.28 [Student Equity Plan](#)
- 2.29 [Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)
- 2.30 [Internal & External Communications – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 2.31 [Highlights of Board of Trustees Meeting February 4, 2014](#)
- 2.32 [Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014](#)
- 2.33 [Actions from Academic Senate Meetings September 23 & October 14, 2014](#)
- 2.34 [Access to Minutes of Governance Council Meetings](#)
- 2.35 [2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent - President September 5, 2014](#)
- 2.36 [President’s Forum April 11, 2014](#)
- 2.37 [Administration Meeting Agenda September 3, 2014](#)
- 2.38 [President’s Corner - Presentations, Communications and Reports](#)
- 2.39 [Financial Projections Worksheet](#)
- 2.40 [Hartnell Budget Presentation Tentative budget 2013-14](#)

[2.41 Hartnell Budget Presentation Tentative budget 2014-15](#)

[2.42 Budget Worksheet](#)

### **Recommendation 3**

[3.1 Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)

[3.2 Strategic Plan Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.3 Strategic Plan Progress Report - Student Access and Student Success](#)

[3.4 Long Term Institutional Plans – Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.5 Assessment of Technology Plan FY 2013-14](#)

[3.6 Assessment of President's Task Force Funding Plan FY 2013-14](#)

[3.7 Comprehensive Program Review – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.8 Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.9 Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 Completed Through Spring 2014](#)

[3.10 Academic PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)

[3.11 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)

[3.12 Annual SLO Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.13 Chemistry Program Annual Review – Spring 2014](#)

[3.14 Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Comprehensive Review – Spring 2014](#)

[3.15 Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement](#)

[3.16 Governance System – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.17 Mission, Vision & Values Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.18 Budget Development & Resource Allocation – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.19 Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning 2010-2015](#)

[3.20 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting September 17, 2014](#)

[3.21 Continuous Improvement Committee Handbook](#)

[3.22 Review of Evaluation Mechanisms – Fall 2013](#)

[3.23 Template – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)

[3.24 Inventory of Continuous Improvement Processes](#)

[3.25 Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018](#)

[3.26 Handbook of Continuous Improvement Processes 2013-2018 11-14-14](#)

[3.27 Overview – Key Components of Continuous Improvement Processes](#)

[3.28 CCLC 2014 Annual Convention Program](#)

[3.29 2015 ACCCA Conference Session Selection Notification](#)

#### **Recommendation 4**

- [4.1 Core Competencies \(Catalog\)](#)
- [4.2 O&A Webpage \(Core Competencies\)](#)
- [4.3 Degree Samples with SLOs in Catalog](#)
- [4.4 O&A Webpage \(PLOs\)](#)
- [4.5 Sample Syllabi](#)
- [4.6 O&A Webpage \(SLOs\)](#)
- [4.7 O&A Webpage \(SAOs\)](#)
- [4.8 Assessment Discussion Samples](#)
- [4.9 Hartnell College Mail -ECE Retreat for SLO Discussion](#)
- [4.10 Graduation Survey Group Activity Results \(8.25.14\)](#)
- [4.11 Fall Convocation agenda \(8.15.14\)](#)
- [4.12 Elumen Training Flyer](#)
- [4.13 SLO revision instructions \(10/2014\)](#)
- [4.14 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 1](#)
- [4.15 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 2](#)
- [4.16 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 3](#)
- [4.17 Sample Spreadsheet for SLO Verification-CHM Spr 15 SLOs](#)
- [4.18 Instructions for SLO From Phase II](#)
- [4.19 BIO-SLO-PLO Mapping and Calendar](#)
- [4.20 Course SLO Assessment Schedule Samples](#)
- [4.21 Course Outcome Assessment Report Samples](#)
- [4.22 Hartnell College Mail - Plan to Assess Course SLOs for Fall 2013, Mandatory Meetings Schedule](#)
- [4.23 3rd Annual Student Success Conference \(Flex Day\) Agenda 1.16-17.14](#)
- [4.24 Core competencies-CCSSE survey results \(convocation f14\)](#)
- [4.25 Graduation Survey 2014](#)
- [4.26 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation](#)
- [4.27 Hartnell College Mail - NOT URGENT -- YET!! \(SLO S14 Assessment Due Date\)](#)
- [4.28 2015 4th Annual Success Conference agendas](#)
- [4.29 Elumen Training Calendar \(2/2015\)](#)
- [4.30 Elumen PPT](#)
- [4.31 Program Outcome Assessment Report Samples](#)
- [4.32 Establishing, Revitalizing, and Discontinuing Academic Programs \(AP 4021\)](#)
- [4.33 HR SAO 1](#)
- [4.34 Service Area Outcome Report Samples](#)
- [4.35 Presentation to the Board \(2\)](#)
- [4.36 CPC Presentation](#)
- [4.37 Presentation--orientation](#)
- [4.38 Service Area Outcome-Assessment Summary Form \(instructions\)](#)
- [4.39 SAO summary Report Form and Path](#)
- [4.40 Assessment Activities PowerPoint \(1/2014\)](#)
- [4.41 Checklist for Flex Day Assessment Activities](#)
- [4.42 ACCJC SLO Workshop Handout](#)
- [4.43 Hartnell College Mail - April Outcomes Assessment Workshop](#)

- [4.44 Hartnell College Mail - Outcome and Assessment Workshop](#)
- [4.45 Assessment Specialist Position Description](#)
- [4.46 HDFA Appendix DE2013](#)
- [4.47 Hartnell College Mail - Assessment Workshop Using Online Technologies](#)
- [4.48 Data Needs Survey \(11/2014\)](#)
- [4.49 Alignment & Integration of Assessment Strategies PowerPoint](#)
- [4.50 Instructions for Core Competency Survey Activity \(8.14\)](#)
- [4.51 SLO Management-Assessment Software - Side by Side Comparison](#)
- [4.52 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 1](#)
- [4.53 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 2](#)
- [4.54 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 3](#)
- [4.55 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 4](#)
- [4.56 Distance Ed Committee Meeting 10-14-14](#)
- [4.57 External Follow up Evaluation Report](#)

#### **Recommendation 5**

- [5.1 Library Flyer of Remote Services](#)
- [5.2 Hartnell College e-mail Regarding reference@hartnell.edu](#)
- [5.3 Hartnell Library Online Orientation](#)  
<https://sites.google.com/a/hartnell.edu/orientation/>
- [5.4 Student Survey KCC Library Services Narrative](#)
- [5.5 Student Survey KCC Library Services Data](#)
- [5.6 Main Campus Library Survey Analysis](#)
- [5.7 King City Center Survey II Analysis](#)
- [5.8 Alisal Campus Survey Analysis](#)
- [5.9 Reading Plus Progress Report Fall 14](#)
- [5.10 Library PPA Spring 2014](#)
- [5.11 SAO assessments-Library](#)
- [5.12 Credo Academic Core Reference Collection](#)
- [5.13 Reading Plus®List of students who used Reading Plus FALL 2014](#)
- [5.14 Number of students who used Reading Plus Fall 2014](#)
- [5.15 Online Counseling Services Student Surveys](#)
- [5.16 Agenda and Minutes of Online Counseling FIG](#)
- [5.17 Agenda of Fresno City Visit](#)
- [5.18 Summary Report on General Counseling Emails](#)

#### **Recommendation 7**

- [7.1 AP 7150 Evaluation of Management Employees](#)
- [7.2 Agenda for April 2013 managers meeting](#)
- [7.3 WCL 040313 email to managers re evaluation process](#)
- [7.4 CHRO email to supervisors of managers 0413](#)
- [7.5 Management Evaluations Tracking 2014](#)
- [7.6 TJP 092113 email to supervisors](#)
- [7.7 CSEA-District CBA, Article 7](#)
- [7.8 CSEA Evaluation form](#)
- [7.9 L39-District CBA, Article 31](#)



- 7.10 [Confidential working conditions](#)
- 7.11 [L39 evaluation form](#)
- 7.12 [Confidential evaluation form](#)
- 7.13 [All evaluation tools are linked from the Human Resources website, in the forms section, <http://www.hartnell.edu/forms-and-related-information>](#)
- 7.14 [Email from A Marble to supervisor](#)
- 7.15 [Email from A Marble to supervisor](#)
- 7.16 [Acad and Class Evaluation and Discipline CCD Core Workbook](#)
- 7.17 [FRISK workshop -12-3-14](#)
- 7.18 [Jan 2015 Administrators meeting agenda](#)
- 7.19 [Classified Evals as of December 2014](#)
- 7.20 [HCFA-District CBA, Article 13](#)
- 7.21 [HCFA-District CBA, Article 14](#)
- 7.22 [HCFA-District CBA, Article 21B](#)
- 7.23 [HCFA-District CBA, appendix DE2013, DE eval process](#)
- 7.24 [HCFA-District CBA, article 22 Distance Education](#)
- 7.25 [FT Faculty EVAL 2014-2015](#)
- 7.26 [HCFA MOUs and resolution re evals](#)
- 7.27 [Evaluation MOU Sept 20, 2013](#)
- 7.28 [Agenda for adjunct evaluation training on January 31, 2014](#)
- 7.29 [2014-15 Adjunct evals complete and projected](#)
- 7.30 [PDC Spring 2015 email re training](#)
- 7.31 [Flex Day Presentation 081613](#)
- 7.32 [<http://www.hartnell.edu/agendas-minutes-and-documents-10>](#)
- 7.33 [PD Committee Handbook 2013](#)
- 7.34 [PDC Minutes 12-16-13](#)
- 7.35 [PDC Survey Tool](#)
- 7.36 [Travel and Conference Announcement](#)
- 7.37 [Conference - Travel reimbursement program](#)
- 7.38 [Conference - Travel Application Form](#)
- 7.39 [President's Weekly Report of June 6, 2014](#)
- 7.40 [Sponsored Travel and Conference in 2014-15](#)
- 7.41 [Employee Innovation Grant Announcement](#)
- 7.42 [Innovation Grant Program Description](#)
- 7.43 [Employee innovation grant application 2014-15](#)
- 7.44 [President's Weekly Report of November 7, 2014](#)
- 7.45 [Application for Professional Development Funds](#)
- 7.46 [Speakers, Seminars and workshop funds program](#)
- 7.47 [President's Weekly Report of May 2, 2014](#)
- 7.48 [Go2Knowledge announcement](#)
- 7.49 [Vet Net Ally evaluation summary](#)
- 7.50 [Educator-in-residence calendar of events 2015](#)
- 7.51 [President's Report December 5 2014](#)
- 7.52 [Educator-in-Residence webpage](#)
- 7.53 [PDcommittee handbook 2014 revised](#)
- 7.54 [Professional Development Program webpage](#)

- 7.55 [See PDC website at http://www.hartnell.edu/resources](http://www.hartnell.edu/resources)  
7.56 [Taleo implementation project information can be found at: http://www.hartnell.edu/itr-projects](http://www.hartnell.edu/itr-projects)

## **Recommendation 9**

- 9.1 [Inventory of Programs, Services & Offices Designated for Review-Starting Fall 2013 or Later](#)  
9.2 [Organizational Chart for Hartnell Community College District](#)  
9.3 [Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)  
9.4 [Comprehensive Program Review – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)  
9.5 [Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 Completed Through Spring 2014](#)  
9.6 [Number of Program Reviews Completed – Fall 2013](#)  
9.7 [Number of Program Reviews Completed – Spring 2014 \(Revised\)](#)  
9.8 [Contributors to Academic Program Reviews – Fall 2013 & Spring 2014](#)  
9.9 [Contributors to Non-Instructional Program Reviews – Fall 2013 & Spring 2014](#)  
9.10 [Academic PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)  
9.11 [Non-Instructional PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)  
9.12 [Academic Affairs Council Handbook](#)  
9.13 [Administrative Services Council Handbook](#)  
9.14 [Advancement Council Handbook](#)  
9.15 [Facilities Development Council Handbook](#)  
9.16 [Student Affairs Council Handbook](#)  
9.17 [Technology Development Council Handbook](#)  
9.18 [College Planning Council Handbook](#)  
9.19 [Timeline for 2014 PPA Process](#)  
9.20 [Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014](#)  
9.21 [Non-Instructional PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014](#)  
9.22 [Access to 2014 Program Planning and Assessment Reports](#)  
9.23 [Information and Technology Resources Annual Action Plan - Fall 2013](#)  
9.24 [Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning 2010-2015](#)  
9.25 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 6, 2013](#)  
9.26 [Minutes for Academic Affairs Council Meeting November 13, 2013](#)  
9.27 [Minutes for Student Affairs Council Meeting November 26, 2013](#)  
9.28 [Program Review Resource Requests for FY 2014-15](#)  
9.29 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting April 2, 2014](#)  
9.30 [Timeline for 2013 PPA Process](#)  
9.31 [2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent - President September 5, 2014](#)  
9.32 [Minutes for Academic Affairs Council Meeting October 8, 2014](#)  
9.33 [Program Review Resource Requests for FY 2015-16](#)  
9.34 [Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014](#)  
9.35 [Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)  
9.36 [Timeline for Approval of Facilities Master Plan](#)

## **Recommendation 11**

- 11.1 [Report from Governance Planning Retreat November 19, 2012](#)
- 11.2 [Agendas Minutes Documents for Gov Planning Task Force](#)
- 11.3 [Governance Model](#)
- 11.4 [Handbooks for Governance Councils](#)
- 11.5 [Town Hall Meeting Presentation May 22, 2013](#)
- 11.6 [Fall Flex Day Presentation August 16, 2013](#)
- 11.7 [Governance Web Site](#)
- 11.8 [Governance Master Meeting Calendar](#)
- 11.9 [CPC Handbook](#)
- 11.10 [Sample of Instrument for Assessing Council Effectiveness](#)
- 11.11 [Minutes of CPC Meeting April 23, 2014](#)
- 11.12 [Inventory of CPC Agenda-Responsibilities 2013-14](#)
- 11.13 [Instrument for Assessing Overall Governance Effectiveness](#)
- 11.14 [Academic Affairs Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.15 [Administrative Services Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.16 [Accreditation Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.17 [Advancement Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.18 [CPC - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.19 [Facilities Development Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.20 [Student Affairs Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.21 [Technology Dev Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.22 [Overall Governance - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness](#)
- 11.23 [Minutes of CPC Meeting February 5, 2014](#)
- 11.24 [Timeline for 2013 PPA Process](#)
- 11.25 [Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15](#)
- 11.26 [Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes - Modifications Highlighted \(1\)](#)
- 11.27 [Timeline for 2014 PPA Process](#)
- 11.28 [Annual Budget Development Calendar](#)
- 11.29 [Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 - 12-11-13](#)
- 11.30 [Annual Program Planning & Assessment - Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 11.31 [Comprehensive Program Review - Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- 11.32 [Integrated Planning Model Diagram](#)
- 11.33 [Minutes for CPC Meeting April 2, 2014](#)
- 11.34 [Recommendations from Faculty Hiring Committee for 2014-15](#)
- 11.35 [Minutes of CPC Meeting October 15, 2014](#)
- 11.36 [Highlights of CPC Meeting October 15, 2014](#)
- 11.37 [Communication to Campus - Highlights of October 15, 2014 CPC Meeting](#)

## Appendix B: Master List of Planning Agenda Evidence

### Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

- I.A.1 [Recommendation 1 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.1 [Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)
- I.B.2 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.3 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.4 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.5 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.6 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.7 [Recommendation 3 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.8 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.9 [Recommendation 3 Evidence Folder](#)
- I.B.10 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)

### Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

- II.A.1 [CC Minutes 12-5-13](#)
- II.A.2 [Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013](#)
- II.A.3 [Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- II.A.4 [Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
- II.A.5 [Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)
- II.A.6 [Community Research Environmental Scanning - Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- II.A.7 [Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)
- II.A.8 [Strategic Planning Advisory Group Handbook](#)
- II.A.9 [Strategic Planning Advisory Group Membership December 2014](#)
- II.A.10 [Notes of Strategic Planning Advisory Group Meeting April 9, 2014](#)
- II.A.11 [Agenda for Strategic Planning Advisory Group Meeting December 4, 2014](#)
- II.A.12 [Institutional Data Analyst Job Description](#)
- II.A.13 [Survey Results on Data Needs for Academic PPA Reports](#)
- II.A.14 [Recommendation 4 Evidence Folder](#)
- II.A.15 [HCFA Appendix DE2013\(4.46\)](#)
- II.A.16 [Hartnell College Mail - Assessment Workshop Using Online Technologies](#)
- II.A.17 [HCFA-District CBA appendix DE2013, DE eval process](#)
- II.A.18 [Academic PPA Report Template—Spring 2014](#)
- II.A.19 [Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014](#)
- II.A.20 [Course Outcome Assessment Report Samples](#)
- II.A.21 [3rd Annual Student Success Conference \(Flex Day\) Agenda 1.16-17.14](#)
- II.A.22 [Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation](#)
- II.A.23 [Elumen PPT](#)
- II.A.24 [Program Outcome Assessment Report Samples](#)
- II.A.25 [Adding an SLO Assessment Part 1](#)
- II.A.26 [Adding an SLO Assessment Part 2](#)
- II.A.27 [Adding an SLO Assessment Part 3](#)
- II.A.28 [Adding an SLO Assessment Part 4](#)
- II.A.29 [Academic PPA Report Template—Spring 2014](#)

- [II.A.30 Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014](#)
- [II.A.31 Current DE Practices Survey](#)
- [II.A.32 DE Policies Progress](#)
- [II.A.33 Sample DE Minutes](#)
- [II.A.34 Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.A.35 Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.A.36 Recommendation 11 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.A.37 Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.A.38 Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.A.39 Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.A.40 Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.A.41 BP 4025 \(Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education\)](#)
- [II.A.42 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012](#)
- [II.A.43 Senate Minutes Approved 2-26-13](#)
- [II.A.44 Draft of AP 4025](#)
- [II.A.45 Fall Convocation agenda \(8.15.14\)](#)
- [II.A.46 Core competencies-CCSSE survey results \(convocation f14\)](#)
- [II.A.47 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation](#)
- [II.A.48 O&A Minutes 11.25.13 - \(O&A Committee Approval\)](#)
- [II.A.49 Academic Senate Minutes](#)
- [II.A.50 Assessment Specialist Position Description](#)
- [II.A.51 Outcomes and Assessment Committee Handbook Template v2](#)
- [II.A.52 O&A Emails to Faculty Members](#)
- [II.A.53 Flex Day Agenda for January 17, 2013](#)
- [II.A.54 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012](#)
- [II.A.55 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013](#)
- [II.A.56 CC minutes 11-21-13](#)
- [II.A.57 CC minutes 3-6-14 approved](#)
- [II.A.58 CC minutes 5-15-2014](#)
- [II.A.59 Board minutes 6-3-2014](#)
- [II.A.60 Curriculum Committee Meeting minutes 10-16-2014](#)
- [II.A.61 Board minutes 11-4-14](#)
- [II.A.62 CC minutes 12-4-14](#)
- [II.A.63 Board minutes 12-9-14](#)
- [II.A.64 Flex Day Agenda for January 17, 2013](#)
- [II.A.65 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012](#)
- [II.A.66 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013](#)
- [II.A.67 CC minutes 11-21-13](#)
- [II.A.68 CC minutes 3-6-14 approved](#)
- [II.A.69 CC minutes 5-15-14](#)
- [II.A.70 Board minutes 6-3-2014](#)
- [II.A.71 Curriculum Committee Meeting minutes 10-16-2014](#)
- [II.A.72 Board minutes 11-4-14](#)
- [II.A.73 BP 4021 Establishing, Revitalizing, or Discontinuing Academic Programs](#)
- [II.A.74 AP 4021 Establishing, Revitalizing, or Discontinuing Academic Programs](#)
- [II.A.75 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014](#)

- [II.A.76 Academic Program Establishment, Revitalization Discontinuance Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
- [II.A.77 Web committee membership](#)
- [II.A.78 Web committee spreadsheet for essential features completed for go-live](#)
- [II.A.79 Board agenda](#)
- [II.A.80 Shared Governance committee agendas](#)
- [II.A.81 Concept images/Screen shots](#)
  
- [II.B.1 SALT Meeting Minutes - April, 2013](#)
- [II.B.2 SALT Meeting Minutes - May, 2013](#)
- [II.B.3 Student Affairs Summary of Priority Needs, 2013-14](#)
- [II.B.4 Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews 2013-18](#)
- [II.B.5 List of 2013 Student Affairs Program Planning and Assessment Documents](#)
- [II.B.6 Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.B.7 Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.B.8 ASHC Officer Development Training, June 3, 2014](#)
- [II.B.9 ASHC Retreat Agenda, Fall 2014](#)
- [II.B.10 CCCSAA Fall 2014 Student Leadership Conference Program](#)
- [II.B.11 Student Leadership Conference Agenda, Fall 2013](#)
- [II.B.12 General Assembly Program, Fall 2014](#)
- [II.B.13 Training Program for New and Current Student Senate Members](#)
- [II.B.14 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template - Spring 2014](#)
- [II.B.15 SALT Meeting Minutes - April, 2013](#)
- [II.B.16 SALT Meeting Minutes - May, 2013](#)
- [II.B.17 Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews 2013-18](#)
- [II.B.18 List of 2013 Student Affairs Program Planning and Assessment Documents](#)
- [II.B.19 Recommendation 2 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.B.20 Recommendation 9 Evidence Folder](#)
  
- [II.C.1 Budget 4 Student Equity Plan](#)
- [II.C.2 Library PPA Spring 2014](#)
- [II.C.3 RFID Implementation Plan](#)
- [II.C.4 RFID - Side by Side Comparison](#)
- [II.C.5 January 2015 Board Minutes](#)
- [II.C.6 Hartnell College e-mail Regarding reference@hartnell.edu](#)
- [II.C.7 LibGuide Sample Page \(Library Web Page\)](#)
- [II.C.8 Library Flyer of Remote Services](#)
- [II.C.9 Hartnell Library Online Orientation](#)  
<https://sites.google.com/a/hartnell.edu/orientation/>
- [II.C.10 Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)
- [II.C.11 Financial Statements of District Funds September 30, 2014](#)
- [II.C.12 January 2015 Board Minutes](#)
- [II.C.13 Recommendation 6 Evidence Folder](#)
- [II.C.14 Recommendation 7 Evidence Folder](#)



**Standard III: Resources**

- III.A.1 [Recommendation 8 Evidence Folder](#)
- III.A.2 [Recommendation 7 Evidence Folder](#)
- III.A.3 [Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)
- III.A.4 [Budget for Employee Professional Development FY 2014-15](#)
- III.A.5 [Recommendation 7 Evidence Folder](#)
  
- III.C.1 [2013 Faculty Members IT Surveys Administrators](#)
- III.C.2 [2014 Faculty Members IT Surveys Staff](#)
- III.C.3 [2013 Student IT Survey](#)
- III.C.4 [IT iSupport Survey Feedback](#)
- III.C.5 [2013 Faculty Members IT Surveys Administrators](#)
- III.C.6 [2013 Student IT Surveys](#)
- III.C.7 [2014 Faculty Members IT Surveys Staff](#)
- III.C.8 [IT iSupport Survey Feedback](#)
- III.C.9 [Cumulative Customer Satisfaction Exit Survey Results](#)
- III.C.10 [List of Supported Applications](#)
- III.C.11 [Calendar of training classes](#)
- III.C.12 [PDC Staff Bios](#)
- III.C.13 <http://www.hartnell.edu/pdc>
  
- III.D.1 [Projection Worksheet](#)
- III.D.2 [PowerPoint Presentation](#)
- III.D.3 [FY10 Meets the Requirement letter \(year 1\) Hartnell Community College 00120900 4-17-14](#)
- III.D.4 [Final Default Cohort Rate for 2011 as of 9-22-14](#)
- III.D.5 [2014-2015 FA required](#)
- III.D.6 [Default Management Task Force Minutes 4-25-14](#)
- III.D.7 [Default Management Task Force Agenda 4-25-14](#)
- III.D.8 [Reporting Verification Tracking Flags V4 and V5](#)
- III.D.9 [14-15 policies and procedures section 3.6 verif \(2\)](#)
- III.D.10 [Ability to benefit \(1\) 9-5-13 jbt](#)
- III.D.11 [New Financial Aid disbursements in numerical order as of 2-28-14with Higher One](#)
- III.D.12 [Employing Federal Work Study Student Workers Handbook 2014-2015](#)
- III.D.13 [Default Management Task Force Agenda 11-8-13](#)
- III.D.14 [Default Management Task Force Agenda 3-14-14](#)
- III.D.15 [SAP Policy 2014-2015 as of 4-23-14](#)
- III.D.16 [SAP Policy final 2013-2014 12-19-14](#)
- III.D.17 [HCC Default Mgm Final to DOE 12-19-13](#)
- III.D.18 [Budget Worksheets](#)
- III.D.19 [Surveys Admin Svs evidence response to accreditation](#)

**Standard IV: Leadership and Governance**

- IV.A.1 [Recommendation 8 Evidence Folder](#)

Follow-Up Report  
March 15, 2015

**[IV.A.2 Recommendation 11 Evidence Folder](#)**  
**[IV.A.3 Recommendation 11 Evidence Folder](#)**

**[IV.B.1 Recommendation 10 Evidence Folder](#)**  
**[IV.B.2 Recommendation 12 Evidence Folder](#)**  
**[IV.B.3 Recommendation 8 Evidence Folder](#)**  
**[IV.B.4 Recommendation 11 Evidence Folder](#)**