

# **EXTERNAL FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION REPORT**

**Hartnell College  
411 Central Avenue  
Salinas, CA 93901**

A confidential report prepared for  
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited  
Hartnell College for an Educational Quality and Institutional  
Effectiveness Review  
April 25, 2014

Jowel C. Laguerre, Ph.D.  
Chair

**VISITING TEAM ROSTER**  
**Hartnell College**

March 18-21, 2014

**Dr. Jowel Laguerre (Chair)**  
**Superintendent/President**  
**Solano Community College**

**Ms. Susan Lamb**  
**Vice Chancellor for Academic**  
**Affairs**  
**City College of San Francisco**

**Ms. Ferdinanda Florence**  
**(Team Assistant**  
**Professor, Art History**  
**Solano Community College**

**Dr. Lynn Wright**  
**Professor, English**  
**Pasadena City College**

**DATE: May 2, 2014**  
**TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges**  
**FROM: Jowel C. Laguerre, Team Chair**  
**SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Hartnell Community College District**

### **Introduction**

Hartnell College was founded in 1920 as Salinas Junior College; the college was renamed Hartnell College in 1948 to honor William Edward Petty Hartnell, California's pioneer educator who founded one of the state's first educational institutions just outside Salinas in 1833. In 1949, the Hartnell Community College District was established. It is one of 112 colleges in the California Community College System, and it offers education that prepares students for transfer to a four-year college or university, provides job and career training skills, and offers basic skills training that prepares students for a college education. It offers associate degrees and certificates of proficiency.

Hartnell College operates three sites in the Salinas Valley: the Main Campus at 411 Central Avenue in Salinas; the Alisal Campus on Alisal Street in East Salinas; and the King City Education Center in King City, southern Monterey County. The Alisal Campus is over 40 years old. The King City Education Center celebrated its 10 year anniversary in 2012. The college also delivers on-site instruction at communities throughout its District.

The Hartnell service area includes the communities of Bradley, Castroville, Chualar, Greenfield, Gonzales, Jolon, King City, Lockwood, Moss Landing, Salinas, San Ardo, San Lucas, Soledad, Spreckels, and adjacent rural areas.

The college employs approximately 90 full-time and 220 part-time faculty, 140 classified employees and 30 administrators/managers who support the college efforts to meet the educational needs of the community.

### **Recent Accreditation History**

As required by the Commission, Hartnell College submitted a follow-up report on March 15, 2014 addressing the twelve recommendations contained in the Commission's Action Letter. The report was followed by a visit on April 25, 2014 by the present evaluation team consisting of Dr. Jowel C. Laguerre (Chair), Ms. Ferdinanda Florence, Ms. Susan Lamb and Dr. Lynn Wright (all members of the March 2013 Team).

Prior to its visit, the evaluation team studied the 2013 Team Report, the Commission's Action Letter, Hartnell College's March 2014 Report to the Commission and the evidence which the college supplied as background to the report including Hartnell's 2013 Self-Study Report. During its visit, the team interviewed or met with approximately fifty (50) members of the college community including administrators, faculty, staff members and students. During its visit, the team also reviewed additional written evidence provided to it by the College.

Hartnell College did an excellent job preparing for our visit. The physical facilities for our visit were excellent. Any request we made was met quickly and completely. We were made to feel totally at home by all those whom we met. The Team was impressed and grateful that so many faculty, students, staff and administrators were on hand to visit with us and to take care of all our needs for a successful visit.

As noted by previous visiting teams, this team found that there is a productive dialogue involving all constituents at the college. We found a college that is confident about its future and mindful of its past. As with previous teams, this evaluation team found that Hartnell College is committed to meeting the Commission's Standards.

Our report speaks to each of the twelve recommendations which resulted from the March 2013 Comprehensive Visit. The Recommendations were:

1. In order for the college to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college develop a process for regular and systemic 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. (I.A.; I.A.3)
2. As previously noted in Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 in the 2007 Comprehensive Team Report and in order to meet the eligibility requirements and the standards, the team recommends that the college develop a comprehensive integrated planning process that includes participatory governance and meets both the strategic and annual needs of the college. The team further recommends that all institutional plans of the College (e.g., budgeting, technology, Student Services) be linked to its planning process and that the outcomes of these processes be regularly communicated to all college constituencies. The team further recommends that budget planning and allocation of resources inform financial projections. (Eligibility Requirement 19, Standards I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.5; II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f; II.B.4; III.C.2; III.D.1; III.D.1.a, d; III.D.2.b; III.D.3)
3. As previously noted in Recommendation 3 in the 2007 Comprehensive Team Report and in order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college develop a regular systematic process for assessing its long term and annual plans, as well as its planning process, to facilitate continuous sustainable institutional improvement. The team further recommends that the college systematically review effectiveness of its evaluation mechanisms. (Standards I.B.6; I.B.7)
4. As previously stated in Recommendation 4 by the 2007 Comprehensive Evaluation Team, to meet Eligibility Requirement 10, and in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the college fully engage in a broad-based dialogue that leads to the identification of Student Learning Outcomes at the course and program levels, and regular assessment of student progress toward achievement of the outcomes. The team further recommends that, in order to meet the standards, the College develop student learning outcomes and assessment that is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement, where student learning improvement

in all disciplines is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college. The team further recommends that training be provided for all personnel in the development and assessment of learning outcomes at the course, program, institution and service levels. The team further recommends that faculty teaching online be evaluated regularly and that assessment of student learning be measured regularly for online students. (Eligibility Requirement 10; Standards II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.g; II.A.2.h; II.A.2.i; II.A.3).

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. (Standards II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f ; II.B.4; II.C;II.C.1; II.C.1.a; II.C.1.c.)

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. (Standard II.C.1.e.)

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

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. (Eligibility Requirement 5; Standards III.A.2.; III.A.6; IV.B)

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

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

10. To fully meet the standard the team recommends that the college develop a process for regular and systemic evaluation of all Human Resources and Business and Fiscal Affairs policies. (Standard III.A.3.a; III.D.).

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

12. In order to meet standards, the team recommends that:

- Each board member adhere to the Governing Board's Ethics policy and that all board members in-coming or existing sign an adherence to the policy;
- The board self-evaluation continue to be done often and with full participation of each board member. (Standards IV.B.1.a-j; IV.B.2.a-e)

## **THIS TEAM'S FINDINGS, ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS REGARDING EACH RECOMMENDATION**

What follows are the Current Team's Findings and the Analysis of those Findings for each recommendation. Where appropriate we have referenced the evidence which we reviewed or interviews which support each finding.

**Recommendation 1: In order for the college to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college develop a process for regular and systemic 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. (I.A.; I.A.3)**

### **Findings and Analysis**

Hartnell College provided an opportunity for employees to respond to each of the College's nine vision statements, mission statement, and values statements. The team reviewed the completed survey, taken by 107 members of the College community (faculty, classified, and administrators), and reviewed the results summary. No students were involved in the survey. The survey was lengthy and each open-ended question seeking detailed responses received about 15 comments, many of them in-depth. Minutes of meetings conducted by the Governance Planning Task Force (GPTF) indicate that the revisions were conducted by subcommittees. Members of the College Planning Council (CPC) noted, in interviews, that the Council discussed the mission statement at length, as well as the mission and values statements. As there are two student members of the CPC, there was an opportunity for students to provide input regarding the revisions, as verified in an interview with a student representative on the CPC. BP 1200 - Vision, Mission, and Values Statements was formally adopted by the Board of Trustees in

February 2014. Minutes from the Board of Trustees meeting indicate that these statements will be reevaluated as part of the strategic plan cycle.

**Conclusion:** The broader Hartnell College community was asked for input early in the process (March 2013), and representatives on the Government Planning Task Force and College Planning Council provided extensive feedback on the revised Vision, Mission, and Values Statements, which is reflected in the final policy approved by the Board of Trustees. The team finds that the institution has fully addressed the recommendation.

Hartnell College meets the standard.

### **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 and that the outcomes of these processes be regularly communicated to all college constituencies. The team further recommends that budget planning and allocation of resources inform financial projections. (Eligibility Requirement 19; Standards I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; 1.B.4; I.B.5; II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f; II.B.4; III.C.2; III.D.1; III.D.1.a,d; III.D.2.b; III.D.3)**

### **Findings and Analysis**

Hartnell College has taken several steps to respond to recommendation 2. Through the 2013 Report and interviews held on site, the Team was able to verify that the college has taken appropriate steps to clarify the planning process and timeline to demonstrate how program review and other planning activities inform the budgeting process.

The College has developed a good planning system to allocate funds, even if they are not clearly available. These decisions are made based on rubrics that clearly tie learning outcomes, program reviews and planning to budgeting. Based on interviews conducted by the Team and materials provided in the report, it is clear that the budget system has greatly improved and that integration of planning and budgeting has occurred at Hartnell College. In conversations with various faculty, staff and students as well as governing board members, it was clear that the College community has a great awareness of the budgeting process and the expectations for funding. This was clear not only for those in instructional, but for all other areas.

### **Conclusion**

It is the opinion of the Team that Hartnell College has embraced the concept of planning tied to budgeting and that elements such as program reviews, Student Learning Outcomes and tactical plans all contribute to the budgeting process. The timing issues between budget deadlines and planning timelines has been resolved, including program review schedules. The Team encourages the College to involve staff at a deeper level in the planning and the development of Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) for the budget process.

Hartnell College partially meets the Standard.

### **Recommendation 3**

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

### **Findings and Analysis**

Hartnell College has taken steps to respond to recommendation 3. Through the 2014 Follow-Up Report and interviews held on site, the Team was able to verify that the college is in the process of developing a process for assessing its long term and annual plans, as well as its planning process, in order to facilitate continuous sustainable institutional improvement.

In its response to recommendation 2, the College has developed a program review and integrated planning and budgeting system. The college is now deep enough into these integrated planning and review processes to begin their assessment. The Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness is very aware of the need to evaluate the college's evaluation processes, such as comprehensive planning and review, and notes that this is an ongoing "work in progress."

### **Conclusions**

It is the opinion of the Team that Hartnell College understands the need for assessing its plans and planning processes, but also knows that it must wait to complete a cycle of the planning process before having plans to assess. A first, expedited cycle has just been completed. A more comprehensive planning and resource allocation cycle is being implemented currently for 2014-15 that will lead to decisions about resource allocation for the 2015-16 fiscal year. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the planning cycle will be completed in 2014-15. The team agrees with the college's findings for Recommendation 3, that it is partially completed. More time is needed to "close the loop" to demonstrate a continuous cycle of improvement. Based on the evidence the team is confident that the College will meet the recommendation.

Hartnell College partially meets the Standard.

### **Recommendation 4**

As previously stated in Recommendation 4 by the 2007 Comprehensive Evaluation Team, to meet Eligibility Requirement 10, and in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the college fully engage in a broad-based dialogue that leads to the identification of Student Learning Outcomes at the course and program levels, and regular assessment of student progress toward achievement of the outcomes.

The team further recommends that, in order to meet the standards, the College develop student learning outcomes and assessment that is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement, where student learning improvement in all disciplines is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.

The team further recommends that training be provided for all personnel in the development and assessment of learning outcomes at the course, program, institution and service levels.

The team further recommends that faculty teaching online be evaluated regularly and that assessment of student learning be measured regularly for online students. (Eligibility Requirement 10; Standards II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.g; II.A.2.h; II.A.2.i; II.A.3).

### **Findings and Analysis**

Since the last comprehensive visit the College hired a Dean of Learning Support and Resources and created a faculty Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator position to support the on-going assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in both instructional and non-instructional areas. The dean and faculty coordinator created the Outcomes and Assessment Action Plan with timelines to address Student Learning issues and activities. The team found that the College has created Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course, program, and institution level. At the course level, faculty have developed and included Student Learning Outcomes on course syllabi. Individual faculty departments have developed course assessment plans on a five year timeline. These plans are not integrated into a College-wide database so each department's plan must be validated individually. The College anticipates integrating their Student Learning Outcomes into an electronic database over the next year so college-wide reporting and tracking are easier to facilitate.

Members of the Outcomes and Assessment Committee verified that the five year cycle is a minimal level and that most course outcomes will need to be assessed more often, especially in core courses and dependent on assessment results. Some departments have already reassessed SLOs in specific courses because of the results of assessments. The departments will re-examine the calendar during 2014 to determine if clarifications or adjustments need to be made. The percentage of courses offered that have been assessed is approximately 71 percent. The team noted that some of the courses that have not been assessed are unable to be assessed because they have not been offered recently in the schedule. Distance education classes have the same Student Learning Outcomes included in their syllabi as face-to-face classes.

Student Learning Outcomes are assessed across all sections of a course inclusive of online sections. A timeline for faculty evaluations was implemented that includes the evaluation of face-to-face and distance education faculty. Evidence suggests that there is dialogue and modifications occurring in regards to Student Learning Outcomes and assessment results at the course level. Course level outcomes have been mapped to program level outcomes, and the impact of course level assessment is being reported and assessed in regards to the overall program outcomes in approximately 75% of programs. These program assessments indicate that faculty in departments are implementing changes and interventions to curriculum as a result of student learning assessments. The college is working to address issues related to the remaining

courses and programs, many of which are areas lacking full-time faculty or that have courses that have not been offered recently in the course schedule and so cannot be assessed.

The College has developed six Institutional Learning Outcomes or Core Competencies, and Student Learning Outcomes at the course-level have been mapped to the Core Competencies. One of the core competencies has had multiple assessments, interventions, and modifications in curriculum to facilitate and improve student learning across the campus. Two core competencies have been assessed directly. The remaining Core Competencies have been assessed in-directly through a self-perception survey conducted as part of the spring graduation rehearsal. In addition, these competencies are included as supplemental self-perception questions in the Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCSSE) survey administered in spring of 2014. College Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) have been developed for all non-instructional areas and one cycle of assessments has occurred. These outcomes are scheduled to be assessed at least once a year. Training for student learning assessment has been led by the Dean of Learning Support and Resources and the faculty Outcomes and Assessment Coordinator. These individuals have met with faculty, in groups and individually, and offered workshops regarding student learning and assessment. Evidence supports that these workshops and meetings had significant numbers of faculty involved and that individuals felt that they were useful; however, faculty also indicated the need for additional assessment training, which was provided.

Dialogue has increased at the college regarding course, program, and institutional student learning and assessment, as demonstrated through departmental course and learning outcomes assessments and interventions, and college meeting minutes. However, broad outcome data (e.g. outcomes across the college being assessed in a given semester), is not readily available since outcomes are only specified in specific program assessments. The college is planning to address the issue of improved assessment tracking and broader accessibility to outcome and assessment data by implementing a learning assessment database and by enhancing its current website by fall of 2014.

### **Conclusions**

The team found that the college has made much progress and has met the previous Recommendation 4 by the 2007 Comprehensive Evaluation Team (inclusive of Eligibility Requirement 10), which recommends 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 found that in both face-to-face and distance education course sections, students were provided with same student learning outcomes (as demonstrated by the syllabi) and assessed and evaluated by the same student learning outcomes regardless of the class modality. In addition, the team found evidence that training was occurring for personnel across the college on the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. 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. The college has been diligent in developing timelines to address specific gaps in their student learning assessments. These timelines associated with training, assessment dialogue, and implementation; need to be integrated into a

yearly calendar if the process is to become sustainable. In addition, the college needs to continue forward with its current student learning outcome planning including the issue of improved assessment tracking and broader accessibility to outcome and assessment data. The team concludes that this recommendation has been partially addressed.

Hartnell College partially meets the standard.

### **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. (Standards II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f ; II.B.4; II.C;II.C.1; II.C.1.a; II.C.1.c.)**

### **Findings and Analysis**

The team found that the library participated in the college-wide program planning and assessment (PPA) process and completed a comprehensive report for 2013-14. This process allowed the library to identify current needs for staff, maintenance, technology, and other resources. These requests were integrated into the college resource allocation process for the 2014-15 budget. The cataloging backlog in Technical Services was evaluated as part of the program planning and assessment process. Due to new processes and staff changes, the backlog has been eliminated and newly processed library materials reach students in a timely manner. To evaluate the impact of library and learning support services at the different campuses, surveys were administered to students at the three locations in the fall of 2013. The students at the King City Center indicated less satisfaction with the learning support services than the college's other locations. The team verified that the King City Center has created quiet study areas, made reserve textbooks and other printed materials available onsite, established carrels with upgraded computers, and expanded online research help, to address student needs. Additional counseling services have also been provided at both Alisal Campus and the King City Education Center.

Hartnell College provides an e-mail service for students who have counseling questions. Student questions can be sent to a specific counselor's e-mail address and are responded to within 24 hours. The college is planning a survey to get input from students who submitted questions online to a counselor. This fall the results are to be compiled and modifications made to counseling services. In addition, Hartnell College will launch a new interactive online orientation program in May 2014 that will provide a comprehensive college orientation for new students. The College anticipates that many of the frequently asked email counseling questions will be addressed by the online orientation. The college is anticipating the implementation of an online chat pilot system in the fall of 2014.

### **Conclusions**

The team recognizes the significant progress that the College has made in evaluating and addressing library and support services and integrating them into the college's program review process. In addition, the college has made significant progress in evaluating the library and support services at the centers and responding to those needs. However, some additional evaluation and student support plans remain to be implemented in the spring and fall semesters to fully address the needs of the students. The team concludes that this recommendation has been partially addressed.

Hartnell College partially meets the Standards.

### **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. (Standard II.C.1.e)

### **Findings and Analysis**

The team found that the college conducted an internal review of the library services outlined in the "Memorandum of Clarification" evaluating the quality of the service, technical issues, costs, and unmet needs. Despite some concerns with the system, the college has determined through the internal survey and external input that the library services currently offered through the partnership are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The evaluation of the "Memorandum of Clarification" is now integrated into the Library Assessment Outcomes Calendar and is scheduled to occur annually every spring semester. The College anticipates changes in the next several years occurring in the library services partnership due to technology advances and more unification within the California State University system. The College plans to continually address the adequacy of these services through the annual spring evaluation and through monthly meetings with the "Memorandum of Clarification" members as part of the Monterey Bay Cooperative Library System (MOBAC) Technology Committee.

### **Conclusion**

The College has developed an annual review process for its collaboration with other institutions for library resources, and has integrated this process into the Library Assessment Calendar. It has documented that formal agreements exist and that the services are adequate for the college's intended purposes, are easily assessable, and are utilized. The team believes that the college has fully met the expectations of the recommendation.

Hartnell College meets the Standard.

**Recommendation 7: In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that evaluation processes and criteria necessary to support the college's mission are in place and are regularly and consistently conducted for all employee groups.**

**The team further recommends that professional learning opportunities be formally and regularly offered to all employee groups to ensure equity in employee development opportunities.**

**The team further recommends that faculty and others responsible for learning have as a component of their evaluation effectiveness in producing those student learning outcomes. Use the results of employee evaluations as a basis for continuous improvement. (Standard III.A.1.b, c; III.A.3.a; III.A.5.a)**

### **Findings and Analysis**

Hartnell College has taken several steps to respond to the three separate components of Recommendation 7.

#### Evaluation Processes

Through the 2013 Report and interviews held on site, the Team was able to verify that the college has taken appropriate steps to standardize processes to ensure that evaluation of all employees occur regularly and consistently. Furthermore, the college has identified and codified evaluation criteria necessary to ensure that the college's mission is appropriately supported. Managers now go through a comprehensive four-part performance evaluation process that includes a goal-setting and self evaluation in addition to evaluation by co-workers and supervisor. Management evaluations have been completed, and a new timeline for regular and continuous evaluation is in place. The process of conducting management evaluations begins in April of each year, for a June 30 completion date. The HR Office notifies the supervisors of management employees to begin the process by e-mail in early April, sets up the peer evaluation electronic surveys, tracks the completion of all evaluations, and records when the next evaluations are due according to the information supplied by the supervisor on the cover sheet of the evaluation.

Evaluation processes and criteria for Classified Staff are outlined in their respective collective bargaining agreements. Added to the CSEA contract is Article 24, permitting requests for job reclassification. To assist in this process, the college has engaged in updating all Classified employment positions. Much progress has been made, but the task is large, so the task is ongoing, with the committee assigned to update job descriptions and consider reclassifications provided with the time to do so. Nearly all of the Classified evaluations are now complete, with the exceptions being two employees who have been out on leave (and therefore not on the job to be evaluated at this time).

Faculty evaluations have presented a more complex situation to address. Evaluation of full-time tenured faculty seems to be back on track as there are now enough administrative personnel to conduct the evaluations; probationary faculty evaluations are also current. In addition to these accomplishments, the college has made great strides with regard to adjunct faculty evaluations and the evaluation of those teaching Distance Education (DE) courses, neither of which was done in prior years. The College has negotiated into the bargaining contract an agreement stipulating that these evaluations take place on a prescribed basis, and has begun implementation, with many evaluations completed to date and progress continuing through the current spring

semester. Because the process is so new and there was such urgency to implement, the process should be evaluated and perhaps revised in the future.

### Professional Learning Opportunities

The newly formed college-wide Professional Development Committee with its newly allotted \$100,000 budget along with the recent hiring of two instructional technologists staffing the Faculty and Staff Resource Center ensure that professional learning opportunities are regularly and formally offered to all employee groups. Targeted trainings are offered to Classified staff as well as faculty via face-to-face and online modalities. Surveys have been conducted to identify needs, and the professional development team is committed to addressing these needs. All activities are evaluated to ensure continuous improvement. In addition to the campus-wide professional development offerings, the Academic Senate has a Faculty Development Committee charged with managing the “Flex” professional development program. This Academic Senate committee has a representative on the overall Professional Development Committee, and further collaboration, along with additional opportunities for professional growth, will be developed this summer and rolled out in the next academic year. For example, a conference travel funding opportunity has just been launched, and the committee plans to offer the opportunity to apply for “innovation grants” in the fall. All of these opportunities are supplemented with other trainings offered by Keenan’s “Safe Colleges” and Leibert, Cassidy, and Whitmore.

### Student Learning Outcomes as a Component of Evaluation

Student learning outcomes were added as a component to Article 13 of the Faculty Association collective bargaining agreement stipulating that through the evaluation process, faculty shall 1) demonstrate knowledge of student learning outcomes (SLOs), 2) include SLOs on the course syllabus, and 3) provide evidence of use of SLOs to improve teaching and learning (Follow-Up Report, 42). With the addition of this to the faculty evaluation process, the recommendation that SLOs become a component of evaluation for continuous improvement is fulfilled.

The college asserts that it is taking a “more aggressive role in notifying managers of evaluations that will become due in their area” (Follow-Up Report, 41). In fact, these duties have been specifically added to a position in which a replacement was recently hired. The college is considering a comprehensive online “talent management” tracking program that will not only help track evaluations but will also enable tracking of professional development opportunities taken by employees as well as employee recruitment statistics. Request for funding of this tracking system will go to the Board shortly.

### **Conclusions**

Team concludes that Hartnell College has demonstrated a serious commitment to enhancing and improving opportunities for all of its personnel. The enormous effort undertaken to address shortcomings with evaluation processes is to be commended, The College is considering a comprehensive online “talent management” tracking program that will not only help track evaluations but will also enable tracking of professional development opportunities taken by employees as well as employee recruitment statistics. Request for funding of this tracking system will go to the Board shortly.

With regard to professional learning, the College has also made great strides with an impressive

financial commitment through the hiring of two personnel and a significant (\$100,000) funding allocation for professional development activities across the campus/for all employee groups.

Hartnell College partially meets the Standards.

**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. (Eligibility Requirement 5; Standards III.A.2; III.A.6; IV.B)**

### **Findings and Analysis**

Hartnell College has taken several steps to respond to recommendation 8. Through the 2013 Report and interviews held on site, the Team was able to verify that the college has taken appropriate steps to stabilize its infrastructure with necessary and sufficient administrative personnel. The college has revised its organizational structure and created (July 1, 2013) eight new administrative positions. These positions include four deans and four director positions across the campus. Since the team's previous site visit, the college has hired three vice presidents (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Administrative Services), five deans (Institutional Planning and Effectiveness, Student Affairs for Student Success; Academic Affairs for Learning Support and Resources; Academic Affairs for Math, Science, and Engineering; and Academic Affairs for Nursing and Allied Health), four directors (Student Life, Communications, Information Technology, and Ag Business and Technology Institute), a Controller, and a Food Services Manager. With these hirings, all of the newly created positions, as well as existing administrative positions, have been filled.

### **Conclusions**

It is the opinion of the Team that Hartnell College understands the critical importance of having sufficient administrative personnel in order to provide a consistent level of services to support its mission and purpose. With a total of 14 new management hires, all administrative positions are currently filled, and the College can move toward providing stability to its students, faculty, staff, and the community and adequately meet its mission and purpose now and in the future.

Hartnell College meets the Standards.

### **Recommendation 9**

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

- **Review and refine its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness;**

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

## **Findings and Analysis**

Hartnell College hired a permanent Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness with the responsibility for coordinating the program review/program planning and assessment (PPA) process for the college. This dean created a comprehensive inventory of designated programs, services and offices that are required to conduct program review. These designated areas are required to complete an annual program review every year and a comprehensive program review at least once every five years. Career Technical Education programs are required to complete a comprehensive review every two years to conform to the California state educational code. Program reviews are scheduled to be completed each spring semester; however, the spring 2013 program review was completed in the fall of 2013 as new processes were being established. The college anticipates that moving forward all program reviews will be completed on the spring timeline.

The new planning and program review process began with the program reviews conducted in the fall of 2013 for integration into the 2014-15 allocation budget. Of the areas scheduled for annual reviews, 58 of 59 areas submitted reviews; and of the areas scheduled for comprehensive reviews, 13 of 17 areas submitted reviews. All program review groups were required to submit and justify an Annual Action Plan leading into the next fiscal year. Program priorities were established initially at the program level. At the Vice President's level, the Academic Affairs Council approved a summary and prioritization list for the Academic Affairs division and the Student Affairs Council approved a summary and prioritization list from the Student Affairs division. Full-time faculty priorities were sent to the Full-Time Faculty (FTF) Hiring Committee for additional college-wide prioritization and recommendation to the President. The summary and prioritization lists from the Vice-Presidents were then forwarded to the College Planning Council for its consideration before final recommendation to the President.

The team verified that these processes occurred and viewed the draft lists that are being developed to recommend to the President for the 2014-15 fiscal year. However, since this resource and budget cycle has not been completed, the team was unable to verify that the actual priorities were funded. Each program review requires that unit planning be tied to the college's current strategic directions. In addition, the Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) report for Academic Affairs includes items addressing course, program, and institutional student learning outcomes (core competencies); and strategies, interventions, and modifications associated with the assessment of those outcomes. The program review also addresses student success across teaching modalities and trends in achievement data.

The Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) report for services, offices and non-instructional programs analyzes patterns and trends in users, needs and usage; service/program modality; and service area outcomes (SAOs). In addition, the Annual Action Plan (required of all units) requires measurable outcomes for new activities, and areas must indicate how such activities support service area outcomes, program level outcomes, course level outcomes, or the college's

strategic directions. The team noted many planning process improvements and changes that have already occurred since the implementation of the new integrated program review and planning model: scheduling of both comprehensive and annual reviews of all services and programs, consistency of program planning across the college, planned linkages between program needs and allocation, alignment of planning and budget requests that are linked to Strategic Directions, and potential linking of student success and achievement to resource allocation. However, until a resource and budget cycle has been completed, the team is unable to verify the effectiveness of the program review process in supporting and improving student achievement and learning outcomes, or if the resource allocations are linked to planning through the program review process.

The college currently does not have a Facilities Master Plan, but has hired consultants to facilitate the development of a facilities plan by the end of the summer. Minutes from the planning meetings indicate that this Master Facilities Plan will be used as a reference document for future program reviews. However, the team was unable to find evidence at this time that the Master Facilities Plan is inclusive of information provided in current program reviews.

In the summer of 2014, the college is planning to evaluate the effectiveness of program review processes in improving student achievement and student learning outcomes and develop recommendations related to process improvement. Current planned improvements include the implementation of a data warehouse for student learning outcomes and PPA reports, more focused justification of budget requests linking to the Strategic Plan, and increased emphasis on student achievement in the review of academic programs. In addition, the college has noted that previous academic program reviews focused primarily on individual instructional disciplines. The college acknowledges that there are several degree programs that are inclusive of multiple disciplines (general studies, liberal arts, social sciences) that will begin an expanded program review process for these areas starting in spring 2014.

**Conclusions:**

The team verified that the college has developed an integrated program review process that is used to assess and improve student learning, and to coordinate institutional planning processes. The college has implemented a program review process that is inclusive of programs, services, and offices throughout the college and of their planning related to student learning, student achievement, service area outcomes, and strategic directions. The team verified that the requests and needs associated with program planning have been summarized and prioritized. However, since a complete cycle of program review and assessment has not occurred, the team was unable to verify that the college's resource allocation is attached to planning, that the process is ongoing and systematic, and the effectiveness of the process in supporting student learning and achievement. The team encourages the college to continue with its current plans related to program review and integrated planning processes so that the final linkages can be verified. The team concludes that this recommendation has been partially addressed.

Hartnell College partially meets the Standard.

## **Recommendation 10**

**To fully meet the standard the team recommends that the college develop a process for regular and systemic evaluation of all Human Resources and Business and Fiscal Affairs policies. (Standard III.A.3.a; III.D.)**

### **Findings and Analysis**

The college developed a process and a list of policies to be reviewed. For the 2013-14 year, there was a calendar for all board policies (BPs) and administrative procedures (APs). While the recommendation alluded to policies specific to Human Resources and Business and Fiscal Affairs, the College has gone one step further to review all board policies and procedures. The College has developed a tracking form to ensure broad feedback to and input into the policy review. Understandably, the college may deviate from the calendar when pressing issues needing a policy reviewed or developed come up.

Each year the President's Cabinet will identify policies to be reviewed. The Follow-up Report estimated five years for all policies to be reviewed.

### **Conclusion**

The team concludes that the College met the recommendation. The team encourages the College to ensure that policies are actually revised within the five-year cycle.

Hartnell College meets the Standard.

## **Recommendation 11**

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

### **Findings and Analysis**

The College held a planning retreat to deal with issues of governance as a way to address the recommendation. The College established a Governance Planning Task Force (GPTF). The task force met during the spring 2013 and developed a model that includes the implementation of several governance councils to carry out planning, decision-making and resource allocation. The revised governance structure was implemented in fall 2013. The action of the activities of the council are posted on the web site "so that all employees, students, and the community has access to council meeting calendars, agendas, actions, and documents," states the 2014 Follow-up Report. In 2013-14 the College Planning Council was established. This council facilitates the planning process and is the ultimate body that recommends actions to the president.

The College responded to the first part of the recommendation by establishing a new governance process that is representative of the constituents. The next step is for the council to be evaluated. Because the council was established in the fall, the next step suggested in the report is for the

evaluation to be completed by the end of the spring semester. The evidence shows that this evaluation is very likely to be done at the end of the academic year since the structure for it is already in place.

### **Conclusion**

The team concludes that this recommendation is partially met and has confidence the rest will be accomplished at the end of the 2013-2014 year.

Hartnell College partially meets the Standard.

### **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 continues to be done with full participation of each board member. (Standards IV.B.1.a-j; IV.B.2.a-e)**

### **Findings and Analysis**

Interviews with trustees and the CEO showed that the board has made great strides in not only meeting the standards, but is moving in a direction to exceed the standards. As reported in the 2014 report, there has not been a violation of the board's code of ethics. Furthermore, divisive issues that plagued the board prior to the last Team visit have been resolved. The board is more focused on planning and student success. One new board member shared that he has been learning his role better and can understand where decisions and views are coming from. His colleagues acknowledged how they have appreciated his inquiries into things that may appear routine to them. The board is engaged in professional development and has a calendar of activities to attend regionally, statewide and nationally.

In the area board self-evaluation, the board has engaged a facilitator to work with it and has revamped the evaluation instrument. All board members participate in the self-evaluation process.

### **Conclusion**

The team concludes that the College has met the recommendation. We commend the board on its progress, especially in board development and evaluation.

Hartnell College meets the standard.