

EXTERNAL 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
March 18-21, 2013

Jowel C. Laguerre, Ph.D.
Chair

VISITING TEAM ROSTER
Hartnell College

March 18-21, 2013

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

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

Dr. Sharon Adams
Dean of Student Services
Sierra College

Mr. Steven Crow
Vice President, for Business and
Financial Affairs
Southwestern Community
College District

Ms. Virginia Findley
Cuesta College, Business
Education Division
(Retired)

Dr. Marlon Hall
Superintendent/President
Lassen Community College

Ms. Susan Lamb
Vice President Academic Affairs
Diablo Valley College

Dr. Bobbi Villalobos
Dean of Academic Affairs
Los Angeles Harbor College

Dr. Lynn Wright
Professor, English
Pasadena City College

Dr. Daniel Walden
Vice President Academic Affairs
Los Angeles City College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Hartnell College
DATES OF VISIT: March 18-21, 2013
TEAM CHAIR: Jowel C. Laguerre, Ph.D.

Summary

The visiting team observed a college that has a dedicated cadre of faculty, staff and students who believe strongly in their mission and in the value of student learning. Those beliefs were evident to the team members as they observed the daily operations of the College and listened to the employee and student comments during discussions, meetings, and forums.

Commendations

The team noted the following commendations:

1. The team commends the president for assessing and recognizing the challenges of the institution upon his arrival in 2012. The team further commends the president for his leadership in facilitating the processes by which these challenges can be addressed in a timely fashion.
2. The team commends the college for its collaborative and unified efforts to initiate change and support the institutional improvements currently underway at the college.
3. The college is to be commended for offering unique and innovative programs to address the variety of community needs, such as those in Student Affairs, as well as the Academy for College Excellence, the Math Academy, the New Media Center, and the various STEM partnerships and programs.
4. The College is commended for creating an architecturally inviting learning space for students in the Library and Learning Resources facility, which creates a productive and creative atmosphere conducive to student success.
5. The College is commended for the innovative use of physical resources in the development of the King City Education Center and the Alisal Campus that meets the needs of a historically-underserved student population.

Recommendations

After carefully reading the Self Evaluation Report, examining evidence, interviewing college personnel and students, and discussing the findings in light of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges 2002 Standards, the team offers the following recommendations to Hartnell College. The recommendations are based on specific standards cited in parentheses following each component of the 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)
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. (Standards 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;
- The board self-evaluation continue to be done with full participation of each board member. (Standards IV.B.1.a-j; IV.B.2.a-e)

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 site on Alisal Street in East Salinas; and the King City Education Center in King City, southern Monterey County. The Alisal Campus is over two 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

Hartnell submitted its most recent previous Self Evaluation Report in the fall of 2006. A visit occurred in March 2007. The Commission imposed probation on in June 2007. The college filed a follow-up report and received a focused visit on October 7, 2007. The Commission removed probation and issued a warning to the College in February 2008. The college received a visit in March 2008, and in June 2008, the warning was removed and accreditation reaffirmed. In June 2009, the College received a letter from the Commission acknowledging that all issues had been resolved.

A ten-member accreditation team visited Hartnell College from March 18 through March 21, 2013, for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Accrediting Commission Standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, the team members attended an all-day training session on November 4, 2013, conducted by the ACCJC, and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read carefully the College's Self Evaluation Report, including its response to the recommendations from the 2007 accreditation visiting team, and assessed the evidence provided electronically by the College.

Prior to the visit team members completed written evaluations of the Self Evaluation Report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the on-site visit began, the team members spent the afternoon discussing the written materials provided by the college, and reviewing evidence provided by the college and other materials submitted to the Commission since the college's last comprehensive visit.

During the visit, the team met with over 300 (duplicated headcount) faculty, staff, administrators, members of the Board of Trustees, and students. Additionally, various team members met with over a dozen committees and groups representing a broad spectrum of the college community constituents. The team chair met with members of the Board of Trustees, the president of the college and various administrators. In addition, team members visited the Alisal Campus and the King City Education Center. The team also attended five open meetings to receive comments from any member of the college or local community.

The team felt that the Self Evaluation Report was well organized and the format was easy to follow. College staff members were very accommodating to team members and available for interviews and follow-up conversations. The College was well prepared and ready for the team's visit. However, there were conclusions in the Self Evaluation Report that were not supported by facts, evidence or demonstrated actions. It is the team's opinion that such conclusions could be misleading to the college at large and to other readers.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Following the October 2007 comprehensive site visit, the college received seven recommendations and two concerns. In its October 2007 report Hartnell satisfactorily addressed Recommendation 7 and Concern 1. The Commission removed Hartnell from probation and issued a warning status in its action letter dated January 2008. The college then continued to address Recommendations 2-6 and Concern 2 over the next two years. The college was removed from warning, and was found to have addressed these remaining issues.

Certification of Continued Compliance with Commission Policies

The ACCJC *Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation* provided instructions to the college that the Self Evaluation Report should include analysis and evidentiary information demonstrating the institution complies with Commission Policies. Specifically, Appendix A lists six policies which must be addressed in a separate section of the Report. On page 52 of the Self Evaluation Report the institution provided an incomplete section addressing these six policies. Therefore, the team concluded that the college did not follow the directive in that it did not include analysis and evidentiary information demonstrating the institution complied with the Commission Policies.

Evaluation of 2009 Recommendations Regarding Eligibility Requirements

The 2011 Self Evaluation Report did not comment separately on the Eligibility Requirement concerns noted in 2009. The college relied on the conclusions of the follow-up visiting teams to

establish compliance with the Eligibility Requirements. The 2011 visiting team had commented on the continuing compliance of the college with Eligibility Requirements within its report.

Eligibility Requirement #2: Mission

The team found that the mission statement needed to be reviewed in light of the many changes in the college environment, especially with new emphases in the State of California and to emphasize student learning.

Eligibility Requirement #5: Administrative Capacity

The college has had excessive turnover in administration in the last several years, and many of the current positions are filled with interim personnel; through the team interviews, several committee members and individuals expressed that the administrative void and /or lack of administrative overall planning and evaluation process has inordinately frustrated the college personnel and produced a void in leadership and planning. The team concludes that the college does not meet this eligibility requirement.

Eligibility Requirement #10: Student Learning and Achievement

The previous team found that: “The college has in place a variety of methods to assess SLOs at every level and has completed assessments for two core competencies (institutional ILOs), communications and information competency, as well as for a number of individual courses. The infrastructure is in place to assess SLOs on a regular basis.” The current team found that the institution has not demonstrated that it is conducting regular and systematic evaluation of SLOs at the course and program levels and therefore cannot demonstrate “*that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve these outcomes.*”

Eligibility Requirement #19: Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The team did not find that the college had a systematic process of planning and evaluation. The institution was not able to provide evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes; and the institution has not assessed its progress toward achieving its stated goals and make decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. Further, the team found that the college was only in the development stages of assessing student learning outcomes. Therefore, the team concludes that the college does not meet this eligibility requirement.

I. Responses to the Previous Team’s Recommendations

Recommendation 1.

The team recommends that the college develop a professional ethics code for all personnel and use it as a foundation for conducting an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes, including the governance process. (Standards I.B.1; III.A.1.d; IV.A.1)

While the college initially appeared to have met this recommendation in 2008, the current evidence does not support that the college has continued using the ethics statement in *ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes, including the governance process. (Standard III.A.1.d)*

While the 2009 Midterm Team determined that the deficiencies in Recommendation 1, to develop a Professional Ethics Code for all personnel (III.A.1.d), had been resolved through the completion and Board of Trustees approval of a Professional Code of Ethics, the current team found that the essential tasks of the code to encourage dialogue “self-reflective dialogue” for the improvement of “student learning and institutional processes” is not occurring. This is epitomized in the breakdown of assessment and planning as outcomes of productive dialogue.

The college has not sustained its efforts to meet the standard.

Recommendation 2

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that college constituencies agree upon and implement an ongoing, systematic, integrated process for program review, planning, budgeting and hiring, and that a means be developed to communicate decisions made in those arenas back to the campus at large. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.5; III.A.6; III.B.2.b; III.C.2; III.D.1.a; III.D.2; III.D.2.b)

Previous recommendations pertinent to Standard III.A include Recommendation 1, Recommendation 2 (Standard III.A.6), and Recommendation 3 (Standards III.A.2 & III.A.6).

The 2009 Midterm Team determined that the deficiencies in Recommendation 2, to develop and implement an agreed-upon ongoing, systematic, and integrated program review process that incorporates planning, budgeting, and hiring (III.A.6), had been resolved, citing a Master Plan that ended in 2011. A new Master or Strategic Plan has not been developed yet to take its place; therefore, Recommendation 2 is no longer met. Also, the program review for the Administrative Services area, under which Human Resources falls, has not been undertaken, even though the college’s Self Evaluation Report asserts that it was to occur in the Fall 2012.

The 2009 Midterm Team determined that the deficiencies in Recommendation 3, to complete a planning process that addresses staffing and maintenance needs for new buildings and technology support for both new and existing buildings (III.A.2 & III.A.6), had been fulfilled. To some degree, technology staffing has been addressed with the recent hire of a VP of Technology. However, since the college still lacks a current Master or Strategic Plan and there is no program review for the Administrative Services (including Human Resources) area, neither a comprehensive and integrated plan to staff the new buildings nor a plan for technology support for both the new and old buildings exists. Therefore, Recommendation 3 is no longer met.

While the Library created and implemented a program planning and assessment process, it is a stand-alone process unique to the Library and is not submitted to a campus-wide planning body. The librarians reported that the study yields useful information and an insight into what students need, and that additions to the reserve section of the library were made based on the assessment. However, significant ties from this assessment to planning and budgeting, even within the Library unit, are not evident based on discussions with library staff.

After reviewing the evidence provided and conducting campus interviews, the team concludes that the college has not implemented and followed a *systematic integrated process for program reviews*

planning and budgeting and hiring, and that a means was developed to communicate decisions made in those arenas back to the campus at large. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.5)

The college has not sustained its compliance with the standard.

Recommendation 3

Recommendation 3: The team recommends that a planning process be completed that will address the needs for staffing and maintenance in new buildings and for technology support in both new and existing buildings. (Standards I.B.3; I.B.4; I.B.6, III.A.2; III.A.6; III.B.1.a; III.B.1.b; III.B.2; III.B.2.a; III.B.2.b; III.C.1.c; III.C.2.)

Although the college completed a 2008-2011 Educational and Facilities Master Plan following the 2007 Self Evaluation Report, the 2013 visiting team did not find evidence that the college had developed an ongoing planning and evaluation process to address the ongoing needs *for staffing and maintenance in new buildings and for technology support in both new and existing buildings.* (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4, and I.B.6)

Hartnell College created a 2008-2011 Facilities Master Plan where facilities/space-oriented projects were proposed, goals and strategies were detailed with future planning for educational facilities and a structure for addressing them. While this Plan was closely followed and the goals achieved, no evidence can be found where the Plan was continued past 2011. Further, the current Technology Master Plan is not incorporated into a broader, institutional planning process.

The college has not sustained its compliance with the standards.

.

Recommendation 4

Recommendation 4: The team recommends that the college engages 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. (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)

The college has identified student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. Evidence associated with course and program level assessments is limited since the college does not have timelines or institutional tracking of SLO assessments. The majority of assessments completed at the course level do not distinguish between student learning and student achievement outcomes. In addition, there is no evidence that course level student learning outcomes have been consistently and systematically mapped to program level outcomes, or that the program level outcomes have been assessed. The college was unable to provide evidence that the on-going assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level have led to significant improvements to courses and programs.

The college has not sustained its compliance with the standards.

.

Recommendation 5

Recommendation 5: The team recommends that the college complete the review and revision of all course outlines and ensure that the catalog information regarding currently offered courses and programs is accurate. (Standard II.A.2.c; II.A.6.c)

The April 2008 Evaluation Team report concluded that the college resolved Recommendation 5 by completing review and revision of all course outlines and updating the catalog appropriately. Ongoing actions related to Recommendation 5: There is ongoing revision of course outlines, and catalog information is kept up-to-date. Early drafts are reviewed by faculty, administrators, and classified by departments and divisions to ensure accuracy. CurricUNET remains a tool to track curriculum updates and to maintain easy access to the most current course outline.

The college has not sustained its compliance with the standards.

Recommendation 6.

Recommendation 6: The team recommends the creation of an enhanced long range fiscal stability/enrollment management effort, which utilizes the services of the Offices of Business and Finance, Office of Instruction, Admissions and Records, Student Services, Outreach Services and other appropriate college resources. (Standards III.D.1.a; III.D.1.b; III.D.1.c; III.D.2.c)

In October 2007, the Commission visiting team noted that the college made first steps toward resolution by recommending a financial plan that included an ongoing funding stream for technology, rebuilding reserves by increasing revenue and decreasing spending, seeking recommendations for public and private grants to support the college mission, and preparing for negotiations with all groups. The Evaluation Team report dated April 29-30, 2008, concluded that Recommendation 2 and 3 were partially addressed but not fully resolved and that Recommendation 6 was fully resolved. An evaluation team visit dated April 21-22, 2009 determined that Recommendations 2 and 3 had fully been resolved.

The College submitted a midterm report March 11, 2010 that referenced a “continuous improvement model.” The College sited progress through the use of the Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) its Finance Information Subcommittee (FIS). The report refers to “a concerted effort” to develop a clearer system-wide understanding of the college’s finances and budget processes, specifically how they are tied to enrollment management.

The midterm report gives specific examples of how the Board of Trustees has formed an ad-hoc sub-committee to meet with auditors twice each year to review quarterly finance reports in detail. The report states that this has broadened the understanding of the governing body.

Despite these efforts, the instability of the staffing in these positions and the lack of integrated planning hindered the continuity of the progress the previous teams noted.

The college has not sustained its compliance with the standards.

Recommendation 7

Recommendation 7: The team recommends that the Board of Trustees completes their Ethics Policy by developing procedures for sanctioning those who commit ethical violations, and that they develop a comprehensive trustee development plan that provides training focused upon appropriate Board behavior, roles and responsibilities. (Standards IV.B.1.a; IV.B.1.e; IV.B.1.f; IV.B.1.g;IV.B.1.h)

Resolution of Recommendation 7: It was stated in the report to the commission dated October 9, 2008, “At its September 13, 2007, meeting, the Board of Trustees unanimously adopted an ethics policy that includes procedures for sanctioning members who violate those policies.”

Board development meetings continued from 2007 to present, scheduled at least 6 times a year, with meeting minutes posted on the website for review. At the March 15, 2011 meeting, the development activity focus was that there was an ethics training session in 2012 that was open to the Board and all college constituents. This was well attended. New Board members are provided training material from the Community College League of California (CCLC) and they attend training conferences elsewhere. The Board conducted a self-evaluation in November 2011 as part of its ongoing improvement plan. There is ongoing demonstrated commitment to evaluation and development. At that time three from the seven-member board did not participate in the survey. Current evidence shows that the evaluation is now taking place more often.

The College is going through an evaluation process that includes program reviews and ongoing dialogue in the various participatory governance committees and sub-committees. This process has provided an institutional distribution of information with constant review, evaluation and modification that is designed to improve institutional effectiveness and efficiency. Through this process, the College has made the enhancement of student achievement and learning a priority.

As discussed further in the team report on Standard IV, the current Self Evaluation Report has revealed a number of “holes” or “gaps” where improvement can be achieved in the planning processes, board development, and evaluation of the shared governance committees.

However, the college has addressed the previous recommendation and has sustained its compliance with the standard.

Hartnell College

Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

The team reviewed the college's compliance with eligibility requirements and found by and large that Hartnell College complies with the requirements.

1. Authority

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College is a public community college that operates under the authority of the state of California and the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. This authority is noted on the title page of the college Catalog and on the college website." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

2. Mission

Hartnell's mission statement is appropriate for a higher education institution. As such it complies with the eligibility requirement. Nevertheless, Hartnell College should conduct a review of its mission statement in light of a changing financial and demographic environment and commitment to student learning.

3. Governing Board

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College is a single college district with seven trustees, each elected for four-year terms from one of the seven sub-districts in Monterey County (and a small piece of San Benito County), and one student trustee elected by the students to a one-year term. Trustee elections are held in odd numbered years, and the terms are staggered to provide continuity of service; four were elected in 2011 and three seats will be up for election again in 2013. The Board is an independent policymaking body that holds monthly meetings open to the public, with widely-published notices and agendas posted in advance. All senates and employee groups are invited to provide monthly reports to the Board." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

4. Chief Executive Officer

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "The Hartnell College Board, through its policies, delegates the operations of the college to the Superintendent/President who is held accountable for its effectiveness (BP 1050)...A new Superintendent/President...assumed office July 1, 2012, following a national search and appointment by the Board of Trustees. The Commission has been notified of the change in CEO." As determined by the team, the board supports the president and it is following his leadership. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

5. Administrative Capacity

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College's administration is adequate in number, experience, and qualifications to provide appropriate oversight. The college is administered by the Superintendent/President, four Vice-Presidents, an Associate Vice-President,

an Executive Director, seven Deans, and several Managers. The Deans' positions are: Instruction, Curriculum, Nursing and Health Sciences, Student Affairs (currently filled by two interim managers), South County Education Services, Advanced Technology, and Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (new). Three Vice Presidents and three Deans are currently interim appointments, and one Dean has announced her intention to retire. (An additional Dean position is filled by interim Managers, but only until the actual Dean returns from being the interim VP of Student Affairs). Recruitments for two of the Vice President positions and the retiring Dean's position were opened in October. The remaining management interim positions will begin recruitment in January." The team concludes that Hartnell is not in compliance with this eligibility requirement (see this team's Recommendation 8).

6. Operational Status

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College is fully operational and has been in continuous service since 1920. Its students are actively pursuing its degree programs for transfer and/or careers, certificates of proficiency, and skills acquisition." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

7. Degrees

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Nearly all of Hartnell College's educational offerings are programs that lead to degrees. In fact, more than 98% of its FTES are generated in degree and/or certificate applicable and/or prerequisite courses. The college assists and evaluates students' educational goals to ensure that they achieve course and program objectives and degree requirements as stated in the Catalog." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

8. Educational Programs

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "The college's degree programs are congruent with its mission. They are based on recognized higher education fields of study and identified vocational opportunities important in our service area. Programs are of sufficient content and length, and are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate to the degrees offered. Students are required to show evidence of identified achievement outcomes to complete degrees and certificates. All associate degrees require the completion of at least sixty (60) units." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

9. Academic Credit

Hartnell College awards academic credits based on Carnegie units of instruction. As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell does not offer any clock hour programs. As a public institution, Hartnell College provides appropriate information about the awarding of credits in its Catalog, in other publications, and on its website." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

10. Student Learning and Achievement

The Self Evaluation Report states, "As indicated in the college Catalog, each course and program includes explicit student learning outcomes which have been approved by the discipline, the Curriculum Committee, and ratified by the Board. The college has developed an assessment

calendar and analyzes achievement data and assessment results to identify and address any disparities that might exist. The college uses these results as it aims to achieve stated student outcomes regardless of time of day, location, or modality of instruction. In addition, demographic and achievement data are used to assess how well the college is meeting its mission to serve the District and to guide the development of Board Goals." The team found that there was confusion regarding student achievement versus student learning and that there was no systematic assessment of student learning outcomes that demonstrated that "*students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve these outcomes.*" The team concludes that Hartnell is not in compliance with this eligibility requirement (see this team's Recommendation 4).

11. General Education

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "The college has identified and offers courses that meet CSU and UC General Education requirements. Hartnell College defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component includes demonstrated competence in writing, computational skills, and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. The general education component includes comprehensive learning outcomes for those who complete it. In addition to the recent statewide creation of Transfer Ready Degrees and Certificates for the CSU system, Hartnell College offers three possible patterns of General Education requirements. They are:

- A. Associate Degree General Education – the minimum of 21 units is available online.
- B. Certified completion of the California State University General Education (CSU-GE) Breadth Pattern – requirements vary up to a maximum of 39 units.
- C. Certified completion of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) requires up to 37 units."

The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

12. Academic Freedom

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "The college embraces academic freedom. Board Policy 4030 states, in part:

'Hartnell Community College District is committed to the principle that the free expression of ideas is essential to the education of its students and to the effective governance of its colleges... Academic freedom shall be guaranteed to all academic employees. No special limitations shall be placed upon study, investigation, presentation, and interpretation of facts and ideas concerning human society, the physical and biological world, and other branches of learning, subject to accepted standards of professional responsibility...'

The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

13. Faculty

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College has a substantial core of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution, sufficient to support the college's educational programs. The collective bargaining agreement for faculty clearly states the responsibilities of faculty members, to include the development and upgrading of curriculum and student learning outcomes, and assessing student learning. All faculty hold credentials from

regionally accredited institutions that meet or exceed the credentials required to teach their discipline. Faculty professional development is provided in a variety of ways, including individual and group flex days and online activities." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report, with the exception that professional development opportunities do not appear to be equitable (see this team's Recommendation 7). Further, the College has not consistently evaluated the faculty. The team found the college to be out of compliance with this eligibility requirement.

14. Student Services

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College provides a comprehensive range of student services that support student development and learning within the context of the college's mission. Student support services are regularly assessed and improved to meet the needs of all students. Student services, including library and tutorial services, are available to the entire Hartnell community, including online students, through the college's website and in person." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report in part. In order for the College to comply with this eligibility requirement, it needs to address the services necessary at the Alisal Campus and the King City Education Center.

15. Admissions

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission and Title 5 regulations. These policies, printed in the college Catalog and available online, specify the qualifications appropriate for the college's instructional programs." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

16. Information and Learning Resources

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "The college provides students access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and instructional programs. These resources and services are provided and delivered in a variety of formats, by a variety of disciplines and departments. Most are concentrated in and administered by the Library and Learning Resource Center and the technical staff of the college. The college provides in-person and online access to state-of-the-art library resources, including interlibrary loans, scholarly online databases, and academic and student services to support student success." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report, with the exception that student support services do not appear to be equitable across the entire Hartnell community (see this team's Recommendation 5). The College does not comply with this eligibility requirement.

17. Financial Resources

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability. Despite repeated state revenue reductions, the college has stabilized enrollments, increased efficiencies in course offerings, and reduced energy and contractual costs. As a result, the institution has developed a restricted reserve sufficient to support long term liabilities and infrastructure replacement, as well as an operating reserve sufficient to manage cash flow and supplement anticipated revenue declines for the short term. Numerous Town Hall meetings for the college, Board development workshops, and presentations to civic groups are used to create

understanding of the college's finances. Restricted funds from grants and private donations are used to enhance funds otherwise available in the general fund and further support the mission and goals of the college." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

18. Financial Accountability

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College relies on a broad-based planning process that ties resource allocation to priorities. Although the college community is struggling with budget cuts, the institution has used a vigorous shared governance process and continuous improvement cycle to establish priorities for the distribution of resources. In addition, the college annually undergoes and makes available to the public an external financial audit conducted by an independent audit firm according to standards applicable to financial audits contained in the *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller of the United States." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College is committed to improving student learning and believes that progress must be documented...." However, the team, through the analysis of the evidence, found that Hartnell College was not in compliance with ER#19 (see this team's Recommendation 2). The college is not in compliance with this eligibility requirement.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College provides a catalog for its constituents in print (limited) and online formats. General information, academic and financial aid requirements, fees, degree and certificate information, student policies, and Board policies are contained in this catalog and in schedules of classes, and are available in print and online. These documents are reviewed for accuracy and updated regularly." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

21. Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission

As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, "Hartnell College adheres to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards and policies of the Commission, describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. It has timely submitted all required reports, including substantive change requests, as it has expanded both the location and the delivery format of services." The findings of the team support the statements of the Self Evaluation Report. The College complies with this eligibility requirement.

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard I.A: Institutional Mission

General Observations

The college asserts that the requirements of this standard are contained in its mission statement, which states that the college “provides the leadership and resources to ensure that all students shall have equal access to a quality education and the opportunity to pursue and achieve their goals. We are responsive to the learning needs of our community and dedicated to a diverse educational and cultural campus environment that prepares students for productive participation in a changing world.” The mission statement is supplemented by an approved list of nine vision statements supporting the college’s stated purpose. These vision statements include such statements as providing its diverse communities and student population with equal opportunities for educational access and success; implementing programs and services that recognize its culturally diverse community; actively recruiting, supporting and retaining the best personnel; seeking resources to be a technologically advanced institution; supporting a learning environment that rewards creativity, innovation, and risk-taking; anticipating and responding to change; being a valuable resource and facilitator of change for its communities; enhancing its local and global community partnerships and outreach activities; and excelling the recruitment, retention, and placement of students.

In regard to the broad educational purpose and intended student population, the statement says the college is responsive to the learning needs of the community but does not specify the targeted population. In regard to student learning, the statement is indirect and does not specifically address student learning. .

The college asserts that it has established learning programs that address the specific learning needs of a majority of the local community, particularly in regard to the need for support of basic skills, advancing career technical education, and providing both face-to-face and distance learning instructional modalities. The college used a series of discussions around ensuring relevance to the local community throughout the Salinas valley to ensure alignment of programs and services with its purposes. In addition, the college has placed a special emphasis on distance education to better enable the college to reach potential students throughout the valley, which is 30 miles wide and 100 miles long.

The college offers diverse and comprehensive programs and services to meet the needs of students. For example, in 2007, the college conducted an extensive needs assessment that resulted in the Salinas Valley Vision 2020 reports. The results of the above-mentioned report were used to develop the *2008 Educational and Facilities Master Plan*. The college is a Hispanic Serving Institution. Further, in order to improve student success, the college developed an extensive report *A Blueprint for Student Success at Hartnell College*.

The mission statement was approved by the board in 1998 and reaffirmed as part of the 2008 Educational and Facilities Master Plan for the 2008 – 2011 period. The mission statement is published in the college catalog, Educational and Facilities Master Plan, schedule of classes and on the college website. In addition, it is referenced on various documents, e.g. Board of Trustee’s agendas and forms filled out for Program Planning and Assessment.

The college states that the mission statement was last reaffirmed in 2008. The team has found that regular review of the mission statement was not comprehensive or systematic. The college plans to review the mission statement during 2012-2013 year.

As part of program review, all programs are asked to “Describe your program or service, the program’s mission and how the program relates to the mission of the college.” During the 2011 Board of Trustees retreat, the board used the mission statement to help prioritize the needs of the college. The mission statement was used to develop the 2008-2011 Educational and Facilities Master Plan. In 2009, following a reduction in state appropriations, the college used its mission statement to prioritize and structure classes, which resulted in 90 courses being dropped and 30 courses being added.

Findings and Evidence

The Review of the Self Evaluation Report and interviews with college personnel and students show that the college makes good attempts to meet its mission. However, the most prominent issue throughout Standard I is the lack of consistency and systematic processes that address mission and institutional *effectiveness*. Furthermore, the team did not find evidence that there exists a systematic planning process. Even though the college used its mission statement in its planning processes in above examples, the team did not find evidence of continuous and sustained efforts in this regard.

Conclusions

The Self Evaluation Report provides information on the mission of the college and documented how Hartnell College is working to meet its mission. Throughout the report, the College provided evidence of activities it conducts to serve its community and its students. The various sites it uses throughout the community are meant to meet the needs of its vast area of service. The mission statement, should, however reflect not only the area, but the environment and circumstances affecting the effectiveness of the college and its ability to serve students. The team agrees that a more timely review of the mission statement would allow the college to focus more on its mission.

Recommendations

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)

Standard I.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The Self Evaluation Report states that dialogue about improvement of student learning and institutional processes takes place in various venues, e.g. governance committees; 2009 college meetings; the Student Success Committee; Town Hall meetings; Flex days; and a three-day retreat at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey in September of 2008. The college reorganized its administrative structure three times: faculty took leadership as "pod leaders;" the Vice President of Instruction then took over mid-level duties and faculty resigned their positions; and finally deans were placed with those responsibilities after the VP was dismissed by the outgoing president. This instability in organization has impacted the present administration, which has several key positions either vacant or filled by personnel serving on an interim basis. Student learning and institutional processes are debated openly in informal venues and discussed formally in focused, goal-oriented ways through the college's governance structure.

The college asserts its "semantic difference between goal and objective is not always strictly observed" but the "movement from broader aspirations to measurable outcomes is consistent." The college articulates its goals and objectives in each of its courses and claims to articulate the institution-wide goals and objectives in its 2008-2011 Educational and Facilities Master Plan. In addition, each program is asked to articulate its goals and measurable outcomes in its program review. Further, the Board of Trustees adopted six strategic priorities at its meeting on October 2, 2012.

It is evident with the hiring of a new president/superintendent in summer 2012, the Board of Trustees adoption of strategic priorities in fall 2012, and the college's plan to hire a Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness that the college is seeking to remedy these deficiencies. Nevertheless, the college does not meet this standard.

The college asserts that it measures attainment of its stated goals through data collection of participation rates, enrollments, retention, persistence, successful course completion rates, success in basic skills, awards of degrees and certificates, and transfer rates. For the first time, the college used program review results from 2011-2012 to generate budget recommendations for the 2012-2013 year. In 2007, the college created the Program Planning and Assessment committee to create a formative and cyclical assessment process by which the college could analyze data and prepare annual plans. The college claims that general education programs conduct a review every five years and vocational programs conduct reviews every two years. The 2008 Educational and Facilities Plan was used to apply for several grants that were used to implement the goals and objectives of the plan.

The college asserts that its planning process is broad-based. The current shared governance structure was created in 2007, and at the center of the governance structure is the Resource Allocation Committee (RAC). Planning for the 2008 Educational and Facilities Master Plan was based on data collected in the 2008 Salinas Valley Vision 2020; this report, along with the *Blueprint for Student Success at Hartnell College*, were to be used as tools in broad-based planning. However, no indication of an actual strategic plan was in evidence or mentioned in the report, nor was there any mention of its implementation or analysis.

There is a lack of clarity in regard to how planning is integrated and how budgeting links with planning. Furthermore, it is unclear how all these processes lead to institutional improvement, especially since the college claimed to only link budget to planning on one occasion. The college does not make a solid case, with adequate evidence, that it meets this standard. Indeed, according to the Self Evaluation Report, the college claims to only partially meet the standard.

The college eliminated its Director of Institutional Research in 2008 and moved to distributing research tasks throughout the college. Since then, it has decided to refill the position with a Dean of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. The Student Success Center, funded by Title V, provides an opportunity for the members to have robust discussion around campus, and the college won an award for promising outcomes work and exemplary research in 2011. Further, the college is the beneficiary of over sixty grants which directly improve instruction and each of these grants is assessed.

Even though the college has created the Student Success Center in 2009 and its work appears to have at least continued through 2011, but it is unclear as to the extent of the assessment results as well as to the extent of the constituencies to which those results were communicated. It is also not clear as to the recentness of these grants, and there was no evidence provided as to the results of these assessments and how these assessments were used to improve instruction. As a result, the team concludes that the college only partially meets this standard.

In 2008, the college created the Resource Allocation Committee (RAC). RAC was created in order to more effectively link planning and resource allocation. RAC is a participatory governance committee and meets monthly. The report states that all shared governance bodies report to RAC. RAC receives request from various campus committees, analyzes the requests and makes resource allocation recommendations to the Board of Trustees. However, in a meeting with the RAC and the president it was clarified that RAC actually makes recommendations directly to the president. The team suggests that the college update its RAC operational agreement to reflect the reality of its reporting structure. RAC conducted an evaluation of the college's governance structure in fall 2011. It is unclear as to exactly what changes were recommended as a result of the above-mentioned evaluation. and whether they were actually implemented and evaluated as to their effectiveness. Subsequently, a campus retreat, which included the RAC, faculty, staff, administrators, and student representatives, was conducted in fall 2012 to discuss governance structures and timely communication about the college's efforts and outcomes.

Even though the college has conducted retreats and evaluations of planning and resource allocation processes in 2008, 2011, and 2012, the extent of these efforts, the analysis of their effectiveness, and the documentation of improvements made as a result of these analyses, are unclear in the Self Evaluation Report. More importantly, the college does not appear to have a *systematic* process to review and modify all parts of the cycle. It appears that work was done following the college being placed on probation in 2007 and then started up again as the college prepared for this Self Evaluation Report.

The college states that its mechanisms for program review are done through the Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) Committee. Furthermore, the college states that the "assessment of the effectiveness of these evaluation mechanisms requires further development." Though the program review process is currently under review with revisions, there have not been any changes to the program review evaluation process implemented since 2007.

The college presented no evidence that it conducts a systematic review of its program evaluation mechanisms. It is important for the institution to evaluate the process and ensure its full implementation.

Findings and evidence

The team finds that this section of the report lacks coherency, clarity, and completeness; the standard is not addressed adequately, and the evidence is insufficient to substantiate the claims. The team finds that the college's primary claim on meeting this standard is founded in its outdated and expired 2008 Educational and Facilities Master Plan. There are several concerns in regard to this claim:

- The plan covered the years from 2008-2011 and has not been replaced.
- It is not clear as to the extent this plan was implemented and its goals and objectives completed.
- The plan was not assessed as to its efficacy and consequently lacks plans for improving student learning and institutional effectiveness.

The team found that the college does not have an integrated, college-wide strategic (long range) plan or an integrated college-wide annual plan.

Conclusions

It was difficult to connect the evidence with the claims. The on-campus meetings and interviews validated these findings. Finally, much of the College's self-evaluation for these standards relied upon anecdotal reports with little or no supporting evidence.

The college's claims to use the data found in participation rates, persistence, etc. do not meet the criteria for fully assessing the 2008 Educational and Facilities Plan. The college stated it had used program reviews to guide the allocation of resources, for the first time, in the development of the 2012-2013 budget. The team concludes that the college lacks a sustainable, systematic process for assessing its integrated planning and budgeting process.

Recommendations

Recommendation #2

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

Recommendation #3

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

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIA. Instructional Programs

General Observations

Hartnell College offers instructional programs in both traditional classroom and online settings. The college has a wide range of degree and certificate programs as well as “transfer pathways” for students who wish to transfer to a four-year university. The college catalog and schedule of classes list 45 associate degree programs (A.A. and A.S.) and 30 certificate programs. Hartnell College has a diverse curriculum and offers courses in numerous formats in order to meet the needs of students. The college has an active Curriculum Committee that is primarily composed of faculty members. The committee approves courses and programs recommended by faculty in specific disciplines and reviews student learning outcomes for inclusion in the course outlines of record. The college has committed itself to an expansion of its online program in recent years.

Hartnell College has revised its program review process to review all instructional programs on a five-year cycle with Career Technical Education programs reviewed every two years; however, program review has not been consistent or integrated into a college-wide process, and has not been based on student learning and achievement.

Information about courses, programs, certificates, and other relevant information is available in numerous formats: the college catalog, class schedules, and the college website.

Findings and Evidence

The college demonstrates that all instructional programs and courses, regardless of location, align with the mission of the college and contain common course content. The college Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves individual courses and their place within academic programs. However, the quality and integrity of degree, certificate, and transfer programs cannot be validated due to the lack of an on-going and systematic program review based on student achievement and learning. Because the college does not evaluate distance education instructors or measure student achievement and outcomes consistently, the college cannot validate that the same level of rigor and learning occurs regardless of location, time of day, or modality.

The college uses a district-wide environmental scan from 2007, feedback from employer organizations, advisory councils, assessment results, California Community College system data, and student completion data to identify student needs. The college has developed a tracking system with Title V funds that have been used to follow student persistence and success within small cohorts of students and to identify student needs primarily in the areas of English language skills, information competency, and computer literacy. Because of the lack of integrated student learning outcomes assessment at the course and program levels and the lack of distinction

between student learning and student achievement at the course level, the college cannot determine if the students are achieving stated learning outcomes.

The Curriculum Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, reviews and approves the delivery systems and modes of instruction proposed for all curriculum. Criteria used in this review include representative instructors, acceptance of courses for credit at transfer institutions, and content integrity. Hartnell College offers traditional, hybrid, and online courses. The college uses an external vendor, Etudes, as its course management system for distance education. The college has submitted a substantive change to ACCJC and been approved to offer fifteen degrees and five certificates at 50% or more via distance education or electronic delivery. The college has seen an increase in online course offerings; however, the retention and success rates of these students are significantly below face-to-face students. Because the college does not evaluate distance education instructors or measure student achievement and outcomes consistently, the college cannot validate that the same level of rigor and learning occurs regardless of location, time of day, or modality.

The college has identified student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. Evidence associated with course and program level assessments is limited since the college does not have timelines or institutional tracking of SLO assessments. The majority of assessments completed at the course level do not distinguish between student learning and student achievement outcomes. In addition, there is no evidence that course level student learning outcomes have been consistently and systematically mapped to program level outcomes, or that the program level outcomes have been assessed. The college was unable to provide evidence that the on-going assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level have led to significant improvements. The college has developed and begun assessment of its institutional-level learning outcomes, also known as Core Competencies. Initial assessment of these outcomes began in 2008 and is on-going using a variety of assessment tools. Results of these assessments have led to increased dialogue across the campus.

The college assures the high quality of all its courses and programs through college curriculum review processes which include an examination of the type of credit awarded, course content, instructional methodologies, methods of evaluation, delivery methods, and link to college mission. The Curriculum Committee has a five-year course outline review cycle and insures that all new courses include the development of appropriate course-level student learning outcomes. The college offers instructional courses and programs at the developmental, pre-collegiate, and collegiate levels. In addition, the college offers multiple short-term and accelerated training programs to allow individuals to obtain certificates and degrees, and provides one study abroad experience for students. The college has seen an increase in online course offerings; however, the retention and success rates of these students are significantly below face-to-face students. Because the college does not evaluate distance education instructors, does not consistently measure student learning outcomes, and does not have an on-going and integrated instructional program review process, the college cannot assure the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution.

The Curriculum Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, is responsible for evaluating and reviewing new and revised courses and programs. Each program review committee and annual unit plan committee is composed primarily of faculty members from the

individual program areas. Faculty members have primary roles in strengthening and developing instructional programs and courses including the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes have been developed at the course, program, degree, and certificate level. Evidence associated with course and program level assessments is limited since the college does not have timelines or institutional tracking of SLO assessments. The majority of assessments completed at the course level do not distinguish between student learning and student achievement outcomes. In addition, there is no evidence that course level student learning outcomes have been consistently and systematically mapped to program level outcomes, or that the program level outcomes have been assessed. Because the college does not systematically assess course and program student learning outcomes and because there is confusion regarding student learning and student achievement, the college cannot evaluate overall student learning and program and improvements at the course and program levels.

The college relies on faculty expertise and advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. The college has limited evidence of assessment related to course-level student learning outcomes and has not systematically mapped these assessments to program-level outcomes. The college's institutional SLOs were created from core competencies associated with students graduating from Hartnell with an AA or AS degree. The college has evidence of college-wide assessments and dialogue related to institutional level student learning outcomes.

The Curriculum Committee uses a variety of measures for deciding the breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning for their courses and programs. The Curriculum Committee reviews course sequencing and total number of units to ensure that students can attain their educational goals in a timely manner. Departmental faculty collaborate with area deans to insure scheduling needs are addressed for timely completion.

The college offers a variety of instructional delivery modes including lecture, online, labs, hybrid, web-enhanced, and learning communities. The college offers several unique and innovative programs to address the needs of diverse learners and needs within the community. Faculty members within a specific discipline determine the appropriateness of a delivery mode and make proposals to the Curriculum Committee for a course to be offered as an online or hybrid class. It behooves the college, however, to pay particular attention to the comparable level of achievement between online and face to face students as it decides whether an online course or the students who take it allow the institution to meet the standard.

The Curriculum Committee reviews courses and programs through an established five-year cycle. The college has identified student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. Evidence associated with course and program level assessments is limited since the college does not have timelines or institutional tracking of SLO assessments. The majority of assessments completed at the course level do not distinguish between student learning and student achievement outcomes. In addition, there is no evidence that course level student learning outcomes have been consistently and systematically mapped to program level outcomes, or that the program level outcomes have been assessed. The college was unable to provide evidence that the on-going assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level have led to significant improvements to courses and programs. -In 2007, Hartnell College developed a revised instructional program review process to evaluate all instructional

programs on a comprehensive five-year cycle with Career Technical Education programs evaluated every two years. In addition, programs were to submit an annual plan to be integrated into the yearly budget process. Forty-nine instructional programs conducted a program review during the 2010-2012 academic years. These instructional program reviews were submitted to the area deans who provided resource allocations. Eight of fifty-seven instructional programs have not conducted a program review since the last site visit. Annual plans were repeatedly postponed. Until 2010, the college did not have a definitive schedule for program review and the current schedule is not inclusive of the additional eight new programs reported in the college's SLO Proficiency Report. The instructional program review process is not integrated into a comprehensive college-wide process to address accountability, validation, and to assess improvements in student learning and achievement in courses and programs.

Faculty members within programs develop course-level student learning outcomes and the means of assessment. Program, certificate, and degree level outcomes have been developed but have not been mapped to course level SLOs or assessed. Since there is no institutional tracking or timelines associated with assessment of course or program level SLOs, the college has limited evidence regarding which courses and outcomes have been assessed or when a course or outcome is scheduled to be assessed. Some units have not completed a comprehensive program review and annual reviews have been postponed leading to an inconsistent and fragmented program review process. In addition, the process has no comprehensive review to address accountability, validation, and to assess improvements in student learning and achievement in courses and programs. As a result, the college does not systematically strive to improve outcomes and is unable to make the results available to appropriate constituencies.

Hartnell does not use departmental course or program examinations.

The college aligns its practice of awarding credit with the Carnegie Unit and with those of other systems of public higher education in California as determined through the examination of course outlines, syllabi, and the class schedule. The college does not offer classes that convert clock hours to credit hours. The majority of course syllabi reviewed for evidence did not include course-level student learning outcomes. The majority of assessments completed at the course level do not distinguish between student learning and student achievement outcomes. Since there is no institutional tracking or timelines associated with assessment of course level SLOs, the college has limited evidence to demonstrate that award of credit is based on student achievement of the course level student learning outcomes.

The college developed and published in the college catalog and on the college website student learning outcomes for degrees and certificates. The majority of assessments completed at the course level do not distinguish between student learning and student achievement outcomes. In addition, there is no evidence that course level student learning outcomes have been consistently and systematically mapped to program level outcomes, that program level outcomes have been assessed, or that assessments lead to significant improvements to courses or programs. The college has developed and begun assessment of its institutional-level learning outcomes, also known as Core Competencies. These Core Competencies are based on outcomes expected from students graduating with an AA or AS degree. Initial assessment of these outcomes began in 2008 and is on-going using a variety of assessment tools. Results of these assessments have led to increased dialogue across the campus. Evaluation of course-level SLOs is supposed to

determine student achievement through which the institution awards degrees and certificates. Degrees and certificates are awarded based upon successful completion of a series of courses within a specific area or major and courses from general education. Since there is minimal evidence regarding the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level, the team could not determine that the college awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement.

The college catalog and the class schedules specify the general education requirements to obtain an associate's degree or to transfer to a California State University (CSU) or a University of California (UC) campus. The inclusion of a class on the list of general education courses is determined by the curriculum process, which is faculty-driven. The college has a general education philosophy that is stated in the catalog.

According to the college catalog and class schedule, all degree and transfer programs require students to take courses in the natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, language and rationality, and ethnic groups in the United States. The college's institutional SLOs address the topics of communication; cognition (critical thinking); informational competency; aesthetic appreciation; the ability to demonstrate the ability to be an ethical human being and effective citizen (global awareness); the ability to demonstrate sensitivity to and respect for others and participate actively in group decision-making; and the ability to demonstrate self-management, maturity, and growth through practices that promote physical, mental, and emotional well-being (personal growth and responsibility). The college meets these standards.

Hartnell College offers 26 Associate of Arts (AA) and 18 (Associate of Science) degree programs. The curriculum committee review process ensures that all degree programs focus on an area of inquiry or have an interdisciplinary core. According to the catalog, degree programs at Hartnell College require at least 18 units of study within a specific discipline or, in the case of an established interdisciplinary core, 18 units within the areas of specific interdisciplinary emphasis such as Anthology, Art and Design, Communication, Social Science. Many programs require more than 18 units within a particular major.

Vocational degree and certificate programs are developed using standards that ensure the scope and content of courses will provide students with the framework and knowledge necessary to effectively prepare them for career placement, external licensure, and certification. Accrediting and certification agencies, advisory committees, discipline faculty members, and the curriculum committee provide oversight and guidance to ensure quality.

The college assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information regarding its courses, programs, and transfer policies in the college catalog, class schedule, handouts, and website. The accuracy is insured by the articulation officer. Student learning outcomes for the institution and programs are available on the website and in the catalog. Course-level student learning outcomes are listed on some of the course syllabi.

Hartnell's college catalogue includes policies on credit from other colleges, advanced placement exams, College Level Examination Program, International Baccalaureate, and military service credit. The college catalog and the class schedule list courses that are accepted for transfer to California State University and the University of California. In addition, the college has

developed numerous Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) degrees to facilitate student transferring to the California State University system. The college articulation officer works with discipline faculty, the Curriculum Committee, and area deans to facilitate articulation.

Board Policy 4025 details the procedure for eliminating programs. The institution identifies students affected by the discontinuance decision and allows appropriate time for completion of courses. The policy was used in eliminating programs during the recent budget reductions.

The college reviews and updates the college catalog every year and publishes a catalog addendum to insure relevance. A printed schedule is created each semester with an online version that is revised with new information and class offerings. The college website provides current and perspective students with information, including application resources, and copies of the catalogue and schedule. The college website is reviewed for accuracy and updated by the college webmaster, and the catalogue is reviewed by the Curriculum Committee. The college meets the standard.

Board Policy 4030, Board Policy 5500, and the Academic Senate's Statement on Professional Ethics state the college's commitment to academic freedom and responsibility. The student Code of Conduct and Policy on Cheating are clearly addressed in the college catalog and in the "Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook." These publications specify student conduct including academic honesty.

Hartnell College does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct, nor does it attempt to instill specific beliefs or worldviews.

Hartnell College does not offer classes in foreign locations. (IIA.8).

Conclusions

Hartnell College has expanded access by offering courses in a variety of formats and options. In particular, the college has done a substantial amount of work in expanding its online course and program offerings; however, the retention and success rates of these students are significantly below face-to-face students. Because the college does not evaluate distance education instructors or measure student achievement and outcomes consistently, the college cannot validate that the same level of rigor and learning occurs regardless of location, time of day, or modality.

The college has identified student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. Evidence associated with course and program level assessments is limited since the college does not have timelines or institutional tracking of SLO assessments. The majority of assessments completed at the course level do not distinguish between student learning and student achievement outcomes. In addition, there is no evidence that course level student learning outcomes have been consistently and systematically mapped to program level outcomes, or that the program level outcomes have been assessed. The college was unable to provide evidence that the on-going assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program level have led to significant improvements to courses and programs.

In 2007, Hartnell College developed a revised instructional program review process to evaluate all instructional programs on a comprehensive five-year cycle with Career Technical Education programs evaluated every two years. In addition, programs were to submit an annual plan to be integrated into the yearly budget process. Forty-nine instructional programs conducted a program review during the 2010-2012 academic years. These instructional program reviews were submitted to the area deans who provided resource allocations. Eight of fifty-seven instructional programs have not conducted a program review since the last site visit. Annual plans were repeatedly postponed leading to an inconsistent and fragmented program review process. Until 2010, the college did not have a definitive schedule for program review and the current schedule is not inclusive of the additional eight new programs reported in the college's SLO Proficiency Report. The instructional program review process is not integrated into a comprehensive college-wide process to address accountability, validation, and to assess improvements in student learning and achievement in courses and programs.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #2 above

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).

Standard II.B: Student Support Services

General Observations

Hartnell College offers a variety of support services that promote, support and enhance student learning to a largely diverse student body and community. There is an impressive effort on the part of the College to provide adequate services to each of its centers through the provision of extended evening and weekend support services to students (II.B.1, II.B.3.a).

The College's support services are comprehensive in nature and address the academic needs of students from various socio-economic, ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Findings and Evidence

The college recruits and admits a diverse group of students consistent with its mission. Student services provide early readiness to high schools, middle schools and outreach to elementary schools through the K-16 Bridge program (II.B.3.d and II.B).

The college provides an annual published catalog with accurate and current information. The catalog is also available on the college website which is updated as changes are made. Updates are also printed in a catalog addendum. The catalog is comprehensive and includes general information, requirements for admission, financial aid, student fees, and academic information and major policies etc. (II.B.2).

Based on a review of written evidence, it appears that the institution engages in several initiatives that foster personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development. Examples of these initiatives include: student participation on college shared governance committees; political, social and academic clubs; an active theater arts program (The Western Stage); and numerous art gallery shows and musical performances (II.B.3.b).

The College's Self Evaluation Report states that the Counseling department provides online counseling to students. The online service provided, however, is simply a response to students' questions and requests via email. The team suggests that the college implement a more robust and comprehensive online counseling service to fully assist students – particularly, students enrolled primarily in Distance Education programs and courses (II.B.3.c).

There is consistent evidence of equitable access to students, through the provision of reliable services regardless of service locations or delivery method; although the online services in counseling are at a minimum at best. The college provides evening and weekend services at its centers; staff at the centers are “generalists” who are able to provide admissions, financial aid, and assessment services. Bilingual staff and counselors are available on the main campus and at each of the sites. Bilingual assessment technicians are also located at all three sites, allowing students to obtain assessment and placement services at the site of their choice (II.B.1)

The College has a well-developed website, which allows students to apply online and complete financial aid and many other essential student services activities (II.B.3.a).

The Student Affairs Division has completed student learning outcomes for nine (9) of its thirteen (13) programs and services. The Division has engaged in extensive comprehensive reviews of each of its programs and services utilizing the Productivity Effectiveness Efficiency Responsiveness (PEER) instrument. In 2007/2008, the Division participated in the Salinas Valley Vision 2020 study. In 2007/2008, management and staff conducted a review of the Division's processes, services and outcomes in order to create a narrative for the Educational and Facilities Master Plan. Again in 2008, the college employed the Monterey Institute for Social Architecture (MISA) to conduct an external review of Enrollment Services. (Admissions, Financial Aid, Counseling and Assessment)

In 2011/2012, the Division conducted an assessment of its services utilizing the PEER assessment instrument. In addition, Division management worked with staff to develop a student feedback survey. Service areas also included service/program specific questions in the surveys. The Self Evaluation Report states that the point-of-service surveys are being utilized to gather data for planning, review, and reporting purposes (II B.1. and II.B.4).

While it is clear that the Division engages in on-going assessments, collects surveys and encourages student feedback, its primary program review and assessment instrument, Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Responsiveness (PEER), does not inter-face with the college's primary program review instrument in PlaNET. There is evidence that the Division uses the results of the evaluations as the basis for improvement, but the results are not widely discussed and the decisions regarding allocation of funds are not consistently directed through the Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) or the Program Planning and Assessment Committee (PPA). The college acknowledges in its Self Evaluation Report that this is a challenge, and states that its intention is to have student services transition to the College's primary program review instrument (pg. 154). (II.B.4).

The Counseling department developed a training program for both full and part-time counselors. The training is offered in fall and spring semesters to assist counselors in maintaining current in research, transfer requirements, best practices, success data and other related topics. Full-time counselors receive on-going training during regularly-scheduled in-service trainings (II.B.3.c).

Hartnell College has been designated as a Hispanic Serving institution by the Department of Education, but the service area and the campus are richly populated with a diverse population of peoples and cultures which include Mexican Indians, Japanese, Filipino, Black, Asian, Armenian, American Indian, and other cultural groups. In addition to clear policies and a mission statement that supports and encourages diversity, the college has several programs and activities that demonstrate its commitment to diversity. ASHC and the Inter-Tribal Council support activities such as Cinco de Mayo, 16 of September, Black History Month, Inter-Tribal Cultural Events and Asian American Heritage Month. In addition, the college supports numerous special programs that seek to assist students from underrepresented groups. Such programs include EOPS, TRIO, Gear UP, High School Equivalency (HEP). The college also supports Hartnell Pride, Kwanzaa, international dinners and several other events and programs (II.B.3.d).

The College's admission and financial aid applications are available online and in a printed version, and are accessible to students with disabilities. The printed version of the admission

application may be submitted in person, by mail or fax to the main campus or to either the Alisal Campus or King City Education Center. The college maintains a bank of computers, located in the lobby of the CALL center (a “one-stop” center) to ensure computer accessibility to students. Student ambassadors are also present to assist students with questions. The college application for admission form and all instructions are available in Spanish (II.B.3.a and e).

Accuplacer is used for placement in Mathematics, English and ESL. All assessments have been validated and approved for use by the Chancellor’s Office. Assessment technicians coordinate with DSPS to assist students needing special accommodations. In addition to being offered at the main campus and at each of the sites, assessments are made available to students at the local high schools. (II.B.1, II.B.3.a and IIB.3.e).

The Counseling center’s student check-in system is insufficient in maintaining secure and confidential student records. Students' names, time of check in and purpose of the students' visits are improperly stored on the check-in counter in clear view of the general public. The College partially meets this section of the standard (11.B.3.f).

Conclusions

Overall, Hartnell College appears to address the identified needs of students. The College provides innovative programs geared toward students with the greatest need for an enhanced supportive learning environment. The College has demonstrated a commitment to creating student learning environments at each of its locations throughout the District (II.B.3).

The quality of student services is assessed and improved through faculty, staff and student input provided by Departmental reviews and multiple survey instruments. The student services planning and assessment, however, do not interface with the process that was developed by the College’s models for measuring institutional effectiveness. It does appear that the surveys and other assessments have led to limited dialogue about how to best serve the various needs of the College’s ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse students (II.B.1, 3 and 4).

The college partially meets Standard II.B: Student Support Services. To fully meet this standard, the Division should transition to the College adopted model for systematic planning, assessment and review.

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.)

Standard II.C: Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

Hartnell College provides support for college instructional programs through its college library, tutoring, learning center, and computer labs. The library holds 64,000 volumes with an additional 25,000 electronic books available to students. The library subscribes to numerous periodicals, databases, and newspapers. The College recently finalized a contractual agreement with CSU Monterey Bay, Monterey Bay Peninsula College, and Galivan College to provide library resources to support its mission and instructional programs as required in Eligibility Requirement 16.

A variety of learning support services are offered to students, including tutoring, supplemental instruction, directed learning activities for English, and math activities. The Tutorial Center offers various methods of assistance, including one-on-one tutoring, supplemental instruction, workshops, and online learning assistance videos and tutorials. Recent changes in the student learning support services area have led to discussions regarding the need to centralize the services in a “success center” (see *Blueprint for Student Success June 2011*). It is, however, important that the college ensure that equitable services are provided for students who primarily attend Alisal Campus, King City Education Center and online.

Findings and Evidence

Librarians at Hartnell are assigned specific disciplines to facilitate library acquisitions. Recent book and media purchases were distributed across a variety of disciplines. In addition, any faculty or staff member can submit an electronic request to suggest an acquisition purchase. The cataloging process is heavily backlogged, with hundreds of volumes, some acquired in December 2011, still awaiting placement into circulation. To meet Standard C.1, a system for the placement of acquisitions into circulation in a timely manner needs to be established by the library staff.

The Librarians offer library orientation that are well utilized by the faculty, with a total of 2,478 students from courses such as biology, English, nursing, political science, psychology, and computer systems and information literacy attending an orientation in 2010-2011.

While Hartnell College does not have an information competency graduation requirement, the librarians teach credit courses in information competency that offer students the opportunity to hone their skills, including discipline-specific courses: information competency for social sciences, literature and fine arts, and sciences and applied technology. Enrollment in the library courses is increasing. The librarians also offer orientations, workshops, tours, and 22 database and software library tutorials available online, covering such topics as internet search basics, CQ Researcher, ProQuest, researching online sources, and IDM Dreamweaver (II.C.1.b). An information competency graduation requirement is not in place at the College despite a 2007 resolution by the Academic Senate approving General Education/Institutional Outcomes that include information skills and a 2010 Academic Senate Information Competency subcommittee recommendation to create a path to implement information competency. The Team suggests that the College follow-up on the actions taken thus far regarding information competency for students.

The Library regularly evaluates services and programs and its collections via student and faculty surveys, usage statistics, student learning outcomes, and other measures. Since 2009, the librarians have followed a calendar of assessments—one per semester—for library orientations, reference services, circulation services (reserves), computer and media services, subscription databases, and print resources. This assessment, however, is not integrated into college program review process.(II.C.2). The evaluation report states that data from the reviews, based on faculty and student surveys and pre/post testing, is used to make decisions regarding purchases, services, and policies for the library. While learning support services staff conduct various assessments such as SI student surveys and a Faculty Inquiry Group Survey (dated Spring 2011), a formalized learning support services program review and/or assessment is not conducted to gather data for use in making decisions regarding the programs offered to students (II.C). Formal service unit outcomes for the library and for learning support services (tutoring, SI) were not discussed in the evaluation report.

Reductions in the Academic Learning Center and tutorial budgets from academic year 2007-08 to 2011-12 have negatively affected the providing of adequate staffing, resources, and learning support experiences for students at Hartnell College. The budget cuts have resulted in staffing shortages including the non-replacement of the student services librarian.

Particularly underserved are the students attending the King City Education Center and the Alisal Campus, where library, tutoring, and supplemental instruction are extremely limited or non-existent. While the library offers an array of electronic databases, periodicals, etc., four hours per week of in-person library services at King City Education Center is insufficient for the number of students in need, the number of GE sections (approximately 41 of 44 sections in spring 2013) offered at the Center, and the fact that students can earn a degree attending only that site. The 2010 Midterm Report indicated as a “next step” providing “library services at the Alisal Campus;” however, no library space exists at that campus and no library services beyond online resources are available to those students, although math, English, and other general education courses are offered at the site. While the Alisal Campus and the main campus are close in location, and a shuttle service is provided between the two sites, the standard requires that “adequate access to the library” be provided, “regardless of their location or means of delivery. A spring 2010 Circulation Services/Reserves assessment noted that 80% of students indicated “having access to the textbook on reserve was ‘very important’ for their success in class.” However, students at the Alisal Campus have no access to textbooks on reserve.

The Tutor Coordinator has created a model tutor and supplemental instruction (SI) leader training and development program that is offered to those working in the Academic Learning Center as well as in other student programs such as ACCESS, MESA, GEAR-UP, and HEP. Accurate job descriptions are in place and the college clearly differentiates between types of tutors (drop-in lab, group, SI). The credit Tutor Training course (INS 250) includes appropriate student learning outcomes.

Tutoring schedules found on the website indicate such services are offered primarily on the main campus. The supplemental learning schedule indicates that SI is predominately offered at the main campus. Evidence also shows that the SI program is entirely grant funded. The Writing Workshop Schedule shows an adequate number of workshops; however, they are offered only

from 12 to 1 p.m. on Wednesdays and Thursdays and only at the main campus. Evening students and those at the King City Education Center and the Alisal Campus are likely not able to use this service.

In the Spring 2013 Self-Evaluation, the section on Learning Support Services (as part of Standard II.C) does not indicate where the services discussed (tutoring, supplemental instruction) are available to students (the assumption is the main campus) except that the King City Education Center and Alisal Campus offer proctoring of exams. (II.C.1.c) The library and tutoring websites also focus primarily on services offered at the main campus. Such services are not mentioned on the Alisal Campus website, and the King City Education Center site dropdown for “Library Resources for South County Students” takes students directly to the online library resources page (II.C.1.c.) Numerous learning support resources are available online for students, including 100 YouTube videos for assistance in various math levels.

The college offers a successful SI program on the main campus that results in substantially higher success rates for students who participate compared to those who do not. Other learning opportunities offered include English workshops; conversation groups; tutoring; online resources such as self-guided PowerPoint presentations and practice quizzes; exam proctoring; English directed learning activities; the Math L-Series, which provides students with learning experiences via a computer lab and instructor; and MESA support services such as a Study Center, Academic Excellence Workshops, job fairs, and industry mentors.

Effective maintenance and security of the library facility, including technology (Checkpoint Systems Radio Frequency Identification tags) for checking out materials and for alerting staff when items leave the library without proper check out, are in place (II.C.1.d). However, the librarians indicate the Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system used to alert staff when library materials are taken from the Library without proper check-out is more than seven years old and is unreliable.

The Library also collaborates with other college libraries and shares the CSU Monterey Bay integrated library system, Voyager/ExLibris via an informal agreement. A formal, written agreement—a “Memorandum of Clarification”—for collaboration between Hartnell College and public and academic libraries (Monterey Bay Cooperative Library System and Monterey Peninsula College and CSU Monterey Bay Library) is now in place as recommended by the 2007 Evaluation Team Report and the Hartnell College 2010 Midterm Report (ER 16). To fully meet the Standard, the College now needs to establish a method to evaluate the contracted services.

Conclusions

While the library has good resources to support student learning, access to the resources is limited whether by distance as it relates to Alisal Campus or King City Education Center because of location or by a lack of organization for access to acquisitions. Students need to be provided adequate opportunities to reach levels information literacy that enhance student success, that library and learning support services are adequately available to all students, that funding resources responsive to planning are available to maintain library and learning support services and that they are sufficient to facilitate education offerings. It is also important the library

determine an evaluation plan for the “Memorandum of Clarification” documented the contracted services the college has with institutions it collaborates with in providing services. While the library does some planning, it is not, however tied to a college planning process.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #5 above

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.)

STANDARD III

Resources

Standard III.A: Human Resources

General Observations

The Self Evaluation Report for Standard IIIA (Human Resources) shows a dedicated concern for the campus as well as the greater local community and a desire to assess, and then address, the college's staffing needs with appropriate, well-qualified employees. California's budget crisis has clearly had a negative impact on staffing; the Self Evaluation Report notes that the new president (arriving in July 2012) had to "carry out a few key staffing decisions that were unpopular but were necessitated by budget concerns, the 50% law, and the faculty obligation number" (213). In addition, the instability of key administrative personnel positions is troublesome and accounts for some of the deficiencies witnessed in this standard. Position reductions necessitated by budget cuts and the significant number of key positions currently filled by interim personnel have led to the collapsing of more and more duties and responsibilities onto fewer and fewer people. Administrators and managers, especially, have had their duties increased beyond their areas and find that their job duties do not fit the original job descriptions, making these positions difficult to appropriately evaluate and compensate. This is in sharp contrast with the need to have sufficient capacity to meet the learning needs of students.

Hiring policies and procedures generally are sound, and new hires (probationary positions for both full-time faculty and classified staff) receive requisite evaluations. Evaluation of permanent full-time faculty and staffing, however, is inconsistent and incomplete. For example, administrative shortages in the Fall 2012 semester meant that only the full-time probationary faculty received employment evaluations; evaluation of the permanent full-time faculty who were up for review this year have been delayed to next year. In addition, adjunct faculty members for the most part are not being reviewed in a regular, systematic manner.

Professional learning opportunities exist primarily through five dedicated professional development days (known as "Flex Days"), some of which include all campus employees and others devoted exclusively to faculty. Other more compliance-related trainings are fulfilled by outside contractors. While some excellent home-grown professional learning has been offered, the college admits that a lack of funds as well as the lack of a college-wide professional development committee between 2008 and 2012 has meant that some people have been—and will continue to be—left out. The expectation of the standards is that planning and resource allocations be tied. The institution has not stayed this course over the past few years. The inclusion, based on a process, may help employees feel like they are an integral part of process and not left out.

Findings and Evidence

The college posts personnel position criteria, qualifications, and procedures and fills the personnel positions with appropriately qualified personnel. Decisions regarding personnel needs

are driven by the college mission; for example, a new dean of institutional research was recently hired to ensure that the college continues to fulfill its mission to be “responsive to learning needs of our community.” Personnel decision-making is also a participatory process. A Faculty Hiring Committee (under the purview of the Academic Senate) has developed a protocol for analyzing data regarding full-time faculty position needs for the college, and the administration respects this process; this year only one alteration was made to the faculty committee’s full-time faculty hire recommendation list. Faculty members also play a primary and integral role in the selection of full- and part-time faculty, ensuring that qualified people with the appropriate discipline-based knowledge, skills, and credentials are hired. The development of job descriptions; advertisement of these positions; and recruitment, screening, and selection processes follow expected policies and procedures. Employment announcements for full-time faculty are clear and consistent among academic disciplines, and the information is broadly disseminated in order to attract a well-qualified and diverse pool of candidates.

A recent review of the part-time faculty hiring process revealed that there were some discrepancies in the Equivalency procedure, and a subsequent review of adjunct hires revealed that some adjunct faculty did not meet Equivalency requirements; as a result, those who were found deficient were not rehired. The Faculty Hiring Committee and the vice president of Human Resources collaborated to create a more clearly articulated protocol for reviewing Equivalency requests and applying the criteria consistency. Faculty credentials are published annually in the college catalog.

Evaluation processes exist, including criteria, processes, and procedures, for full-time faculty and classified staff. However, criteria and processes are not established for adjunct faculty, managers, and for those who teach Distance Education classes. Of particular concern is the admission within the Self Evaluation Report that “[i]nstability of the organizational structure has challenged the college in achieving its goal of regular assessment of staff, particularly the part-time faculty and the managers themselves”, followed by a self-determined “partially meets” for this Standard subsection. The shortcomings in this area have been verified and are substantial, heavily impacting the effectiveness of student learning given the significant role that adjunct faculty and managers play, as well as the growing demand for effective Distance Education classes. It is also of concern that some classified staff members have not received their scheduled evaluations, as revealed through a review of the evaluation cycle roster.

While the college is making efforts to ensure that one group in particular, probationary full-time faculty members, is evaluated annually in order to comply with the contractual tenure review process, the Self Study states that “SLO success is not a component of faculty evaluations” (206), and the lack of an ongoing assessment cycle of SLOs as well as a comprehensive and integrated program review process makes it difficult to validate this standard subsection’s requirement that faculty have “effectiveness in producing . . . learning outcomes” as a component of their evaluation.

As mentioned in the response to Recommendation 1 (above), the college does have a board-approved code of professional ethics that emphasizes the principles of excellence, fairness, and transparency. The code has formally been introduced to college employees through dedicated professional development (Flex) days although the college’s own self-evaluation admits that “[m]ore could be done to encourage widespread discussions about ethics for its employees”

(209). The Team concurs that the college could do more to demonstrate that the college is living out its core principles and to make all college constituents more aware of this ethics code.

Achieving and maintaining a sufficient number of qualified full-time faculty, staff, and in particular administrators necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes is a challenge that the college acknowledges. Full-time faculty numbers have decreased by about 10% since 2007 (from 102 to 92), management has decreased by more than 20% (from 34 to 27), and the staffing ranks have seen a reduction of approximately 7% over the last 6 years. Added to this challenge is the lack of integrated and holistic program review tied to planning, budgeting, and hiring, which makes it difficult to determine exactly what is the "sufficient number" needed to achieve the college's mission and learning outcomes for its students. The inconsistency of employee evaluations can be attributed in large part to an insufficient number of administrators to supervise and/or evaluate employees. In some cases, employees have no direct supervisor because the administrative or supervisory position is unfilled or has been added to the responsibilities of already overburdened administrators who find themselves overseeing areas that were not originally assigned to them.

The college policies with regard to ensuring fairness in all employment procedures are published on the college website, and government employment regulations are posted in the Human Resources office. All college policies currently are undergoing a review process. During this review process, the college should verify that its policies and procedures related to the entire Human Resources area are sufficient to ensure quality, fairness, and equity.

The CSEA (union) leadership meets monthly with the new college president and sets regular appointments with the vice president of Human Resources. A more casual arrangement exists for meetings between administrative leaders and the leadership of other constituency groups (i.e., the L-39 union). The team's findings, however, that some full-time employees are not receiving regular and timely evaluation (e.g., one full-time employee noted that his only evaluation in his eight years at the college was during his probationary period in his first year of employment) calls into question "fairness". The Human Resources office, currently in a trailer apart from the central area of the campus, seems to have the appropriate locks on the personnel files as well as the exterior and interior doors, and other security measures are in place to keep the physical personnel records confidential. The Information Technology Services staff members keep the Human Resources electronic data secure with a firewall and password protection.

The college works to attract diverse personnel and monitors the diversity ratio between the number of applicants for a position and those interviewed. A review of some of these documents shows that the college is mindful of diversity hiring and is making progress toward it although achieving ethnic and other diversity equity continues to be a challenge. Comparison of employee ethnicity from 2007 to 2011 shows gains in Latino employees which is appropriate given the community demographics. Additionally, all applicants for employment are required to provide a diversity statement as a part of the application process, and both the Human Resources office and the Faculty Development Committee sponsor various trainings that address diversity. Managers receive diversity training primarily through webinars with approximately two to three of the ten annual trainings focused on diversity issues. Finally, the college hosts celebrations on campus to honor diversity, e.g., Black History, Women's History, etc. As evidence that the college demonstrates integrity in its treatment of all constituent groups, it provides a lengthy example of

how it handled the 2009 budget crisis and the ensuing negotiations over health and welfare benefits. The process was cited repeatedly by numerous people on campus, verifying that it was an inclusive process that garnered collegial respect among the college's employee groups and between these groups and the college administration.

The college has done some excellent "home grown" professional development, much of it targeted at the whole college. For example, two Student Success Conference showcasing the innovative work being accomplished through the college's many grant programs have been offered recently as part of the "Flex Program" professional development days. The Flex Program consists of five calendar days annually devoted to professional learning—three as dedicated in-service faculty days, with one of these three including classified and administrative staff; the other two of the five days allow for individualized professional growth plans for faculty. To date, 90 faculty members have gone through the Academy for College Excellence (ACE) institute, and a day-long Agriculture Tour for faculty and staff was recently offered. A standing Faculty Development Committee exists under Academic Senate. A college-wide staff development committee ceased in 2008, but this lack has been identified, and a new shared governance Staff Development Committee has just been re-established (Fall 2012). There is dedicated space for faculty development in the Faculty Resource Center and a fairly new faculty and staff lounge for other workshops. All professional learning events have embedded surveys. These surveys focus on how people perceive the workshop just attended. It is recommended that those responsible for providing professional learning opportunities should also consider assessing for effectiveness in the workplace or classroom, tying the professional development efforts to student, program, and institutional outcomes achievement. The college should work toward this through its integrated Human Resources Program Review.

At this point, Human Resource planning is not integrated with institutional planning and assessment. Human Resources staff members meet with various committees and the Executive Cabinet to identify needs and concerns, but the college admits that "some decisions were not the result of planning" and that "ad lib" decisions have been made. Program Review for the Administrative Services area, under which Human Resources falls, has not been undertaken, even though the college's Self Evaluation Report asserts that it was to occur in Fall 2012.

Conclusions

The Human Resources area of the college with regard to hiring, retaining, and training employees has good intentions, but exhibits deficiencies impacting the college's achievement of successful student learning. Employee evaluation criteria and processes need to be in place and consistently applied to all employee groups. Fairness in treatment to all employee groups is an issue because employees do not all evenly and equitably receive the benefit or regular evaluation reviews nor are they evenly and equitably provided with professional development opportunities to enhance their skills and ability to effectively do their jobs. Furthermore, staffing, especially in the administrative area, exhibits a state of constant flux, leaving the college with insufficient leadership to ensure the timely evaluation of employees and support the institution's mission and purposes. Finally, lack of a specific Human Resources (as an area under Administrative Services) program review that is integrated with institutional planning, budgeting, and hiring precludes the systematic assessment of human resources and therefore the inability to acquire evaluation results to use as a basis for improvement.

Recommendations

Recommendation #7

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

Recommendation #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.).

Standard III.B: Physical Resources

General Observations

The college uses the 2008 Educational Facilities Master Plan (June 2008) to guide personnel through their planning and coordinated development activities. The 2008 Educational and Facilities Master Plan ensures the link between physical resource planning and institutional planning. Measure H monies were prioritized and subcommittees were formed to provide leadership for these building projects. Currently, the last of Measure H funds is being used to build the new science building.

Findings and Evidence

The Business Office, Human Resources, and Facilities Departments are in the process of building a comprehensive review to be finalized in May 2013.

The majority of the Measure H money was allocated to the Alisal Campus, the Library, and Admissions & Records. The Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) is an advisory committee consisting of seven members, both management and classified. The RAC's objective is to make recommendations regarding resource allocations for the upcoming year, utilizing data from the Salinas Valley Vision 2020 Project, high school enrollments, educational master plan, and program and services assessment to develop annual goals/outcomes. It is RAC's responsibility to assess goals and to put that information into what will be the final budget, making decisions based on the priorities of shared governance committee work; implemented through the shared governance system; and submitted to the Governing Board.

RAC works closely with the Financial Information Subcommittee, where fiscal information is shared. The Financial Information Subcommittee creates and maintains the financial transparency of the college, communicates all financial information on campus, reviews financial data and recommends resource allocation to the Institutional Action & Resource Committee, and evaluates budget spending variances on an ongoing basis.

Using the Salinas Valley Vision 2020 Project report as a guiding tool, the college uses one-time funds—either spent or saved—only for that purpose. If monies are not earned, then nothing is spent. The college continues to grow programs in addition to maintaining a reserve, and this is informed through an annual internal report of program data and a five-year cycle of in-depth program review. Programs have successfully completed the five-year report at least once; however, there is no evidence indicating reviews beyond the first five-year cycle.

The college continues to look at community needs through the Salinas Valley Vision 2020 Project, adds or enhances programs to meet those needs, and seeks funding to support goals (based on data from program success).

The college has a Facilities Master Plan that was developed in 2008 as a foundational facilities planning tool for all educational sites and campuses within the district. The plan carried through 2011 and since that time, there is no evidence of an extension of that plan or a new plan.

The purchasing order process is complete and thorough, running purchase orders through an electronic mode (Mercury Commerce) for one-time purchases and written hard copy forms for open recurring purchase orders (Datatel). Both processes also manage certain approved vendors. There are existing contracts with some vendors. This process has successfully been used for five years. Both systems interface, therefore, there is sequential numbering for all purchase orders regardless of whether they are electronic or hard copy.

The Facilities, Operations and Asset Management Department is responsible for all aspects of maintenance and operations of the college's physical environment. There is a great need for more support staff. Facilities coordination is done with the RAC.

The institution has been constructing new facilities with bond funding. The Alisal Campus is mainly used for career technical training and has state-of-the art equipment, facilities and programs that reach out to the community at large and to students-at-risk. This showcase of equipment, classrooms, labs, offices, and buildings was made possible with monies from Measure H, VTEA funding, and generous donations from community members and businesses. Students at this campus have access to counseling, a cafeteria, Records & Admissions and some general education classes. Hartnell ensures access to its facilities with regular shuttle and bus services between campuses at reduced fares, by meeting all federal accessibility regulations, and by making additional improvements as scheduled maintenance funding allows.

Hartnell College addresses campus safety on a daily basis by the maintenance staff, custodians and the Hartnell Community College Campus Safety Office. There has been district-wide installation of code blue phones, external and internal notifications for emergencies, and internal classroom locks. Campus police are unarmed and are on all campuses 24 hours/7 days a week. Campus safety is reviewed and regulated on a continual basis ranging from the management of staff-initiated requests for maintenance and safety planning from a preventative and crisis response perspective (III.B.1). Online safety training, designed specifically for school employees, is provided to faculty and staff by Keenan Safe Schools.

The work-order system currently does not provide a way to return the work order to the facilitator once it has been filled. This is being studied and a better, more efficient work-order system is being explored.

Construction management is solely for the use of buildings using bond money. This is where space inventory is conducted on a yearly basis, and the results are reported to the Chancellor's Office. The Construction Management Facilitator reports to the Director of Facilities, Operations and Asset Management. The Construction Plan integrates physical planning by determining the programs and activities needed to provide students a full college experience and to identify the needed physical facilities. There are in-depth monthly reports and an annual report. Physical resource planning is integrated to some extent with institutional planning. The 2008-2011 Facilities Master Plan allowed for physical resource planning, however, beyond 2011, there is no evidence of the continuation of a master plan.

Hartnell College conducts regular facilities evaluations and has a process through which college programs can request a large range of improvements, repairs and remodeling. When planning the space for new buildings and future programs, the end users, staff, instructors, deans and

maintenance personnel are involved. However, this process is not integrated with an overall college planning and assessment process.

Hartnell College has an Information Technology Services Department that interacts with a cross representation of campus employees to chart and prioritize upgrades needed in existing classrooms and the needs for new buildings and new programs. There is a Technology Master Plan being used as a blueprint for decision making.

The Information Technology Services Department is represented on the Technology, Human Resources and Facilities Committee (THRFC), which meets once a month; its members are representatives of the college at large, and receive input from academic and administrative constituents. The focus of this committee is the planning and logistics for major moves and determining how best to handle physical changes on campus, i.e., technical, personnel, etc. This committee reports as an advisory to the RAC (Resource Allocations Committee).

Conclusions

The college administrators (Administrative Services, Maintenance, Purchasing, and Construction) all recognize the teamwork involved in the planning of physical resources. They present a united front dedicated to the college's success and are proud of the progress made thus far. The completion of attractive buildings, upkeep of grounds, upgrades at all locations where courses are offered, and access to the entire community demonstrate cohesive professional working relationships. Physical resources at all locations are maintained to assure access (shuttle buses and regular buses run regularly between campuses), safety, security, and a healthy and working environment. It important for Physical Resources to be assessed as part of the collegewide effectiveness review.

Recommendations

Recommendation #9

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

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

Standard III. C: Technology Resources

General Observations

The Self Evaluation Report indicates an overall optimism that the college is on the right track; the evidence for technology resources shows that this area is particularly engaged in developing a plan for systematic assessment and improvement. The Vice President of Technology and Information Systems position was filled over a year ago, and has led to a reinvigorated technology support service. The re-institution of a Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness position may lead to integrated efforts with technology resources towards greater institutional effectiveness (IV.B.2.b).

Most commendable is the college's demonstrated commitment to serving the needs of the student community; technology resources play an integral part in many of these efforts:

- The ongoing commitment to a "guaranteed class schedule" encourages student retention and success;
- The Library and Learning Resource center offers up-to-date facilities to support student learning;
- The Alisal Campus, with its Center for Advanced Technology, appears to meet the needs of a historically-underserved student population;
- An array of programs, including the Academy for College Excellence, Math Academy, STEM, New Media Center, Summer Bridge, etc., addresses a variety of student needs and interests.

Technology resources appear to be hampered by the lack of an demonstrated integrated planning and resource-allocation processes at the college. The Self Evaluation Report indicates all committees make resource-allocation recommendations to Resource Allocation Committee (RAC). The Self Evaluation Report also notes concerns that the RAC is too small a group to have such a decision-making responsibility. The Self Evaluation Report also clearly shows how the college has attempted to reorganize shared governance, and has created four large committees: PPA/SLOA (Program Planning and Assessment/Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment); Technology, Human Resources, and Facilities; Enrollment Management, Matriculation, and Student Policy; and Financial Information Subcommittee (FIS). However, the Self Evaluation Report offers conflicting information about the processes and procedures that drive resource-allocation and decision-making. It is further unclear how these processes are integrated, aside from the concept that everything flows through RAC. The Self Evaluation Report cites the budget crisis following 2008, in which a 2009-10 shortfall of \$4.9 million "became a serious test for the shared governance process," and the college pulled together to make communal decisions about necessary cuts. This example is laudable, but does not represent a systematic, ongoing process for making allocation decisions.

Findings and Evidence

To ensure that technology needs are systematically identified, prioritized, and allocated to meet learning and teaching needs, Hartnell intends to link resource allocation to its Program Planning and Assessment process. However, the Self Evaluation Report does not clarify the status and strength of this process. Terms such as "is strengthening" and "plans...need to be integrated" suggest that the current status is inadequate to meet needs identified by the college.

To guide technology decision-making, the college relies on a Technology Master Plan, completed March 2012 as a follow-up to a 2007-09 TNO and the *Hartnell College High Level Strategic Direction* report of 2011. The Technology Master Plan is an exemplary planning document, which includes input gleaned from an external review, completed in October 2010; it presents a thorough, complete blueprint outlining the College's Technology needs, identifying areas of concern raised by the College community and strategies for action.

The Self Evaluation Report does not clarify how the framework detailed in the TMP has been or will be systematically implemented. However, interviews indicate a two-pronged approach is currently used to allocate resources: Information Technology Services funds support the ongoing upkeep of technology (used in classrooms, labs, etc.), as indicated in the Self Study; needs for new technology are brought to the attention of the VP of Technology through joint meetings with the VP of Academic Affairs—informed by requests from the Deans—and the Comptroller. In this regard, the Self Evaluation Report states that “deans and faculty are consulted so that appropriate computer equipment is ordered.” The process seems functional; however, it appears that this process is not directly linked to broader institutional planning. Allocation of technology resources is coordinated by the THRFC (Technology, Human Resources, and Facilities Committee), whose recommendations are forwarded to RAC (the Resource Allocation Committee). The language of the Self Evaluation Report is vague; THRFC meetings provide a “forum for informing...planning” and create “a platform for college decision-making.” Further, the Self Evaluation Report notes that “THRFC has been recently resurrected and is beginning to meet regularly;” this statement indicates that integrated planning is still in its infancy. The linking of technology resource allocation to student learning outcomes assessment and service area outcomes assessment remains incomplete.

Hartnell College has recently transitioned from eCollege to Etudes LMS to accommodate Distance Education needs. As indicated in interviews, in the transition to the new platform, all online faculty were required to complete training, either in person or through the online Etudes course. Given the relatively user-friendly quality of Etudes, faculty has been less reliant on Information Technology Services staff since this transition. All faculty, regardless of teaching modality, can utilize Etudes course shells; however, a very small percentage of non-DE instructors are utilizing this feature.

Adequate technology training for staff and students has been identified as an area needing improvement. The Technology Master Plan notes survey results in which services for Staff technical training and Student technical assistance was ranked “poor.” The Self Evaluation Report notes that “there still remains a gap between the need and the college's ability to develop its constituents at a satisfying level” and that “feedback from the college community reflects the need to increase training for several areas, including Datatel.”

The Self Evaluation Report is incorrect in stating that an instructional technology specialist “is available” to assist faculty. According to information supplied in interviews, it appears that this position has been vacant for over a year, with the webmaster responding to demands on-the-fly (as the webmaster's office is proximate to the Faculty Resource Center). The Instructional Technology Specialist position appears essential for effective service and support. Interviews also suggest that the “two dedicated computer technology coordinators in the [sic] both the library and

two other in ITS...” are inadequate to the needs of the College. To improve student success, the college should endeavor to provide greater technological training and support of faculty and students.

Conclusion

Language throughout the Self Evaluation Report seems contradictory, regarding whether a planning process is in place, or is still in process. For example, the self-evaluation for this section notes that “the college is evolving a structure for college wide planning and decision making for technology that includes the TTF, FIS and ultimately THRFC and RAC.” This statement appears to contradict previous statements about how the process currently works. Further, there are no indicators of how these committees will prioritize needs when making allocation decisions.

The planning agenda should include some indication of how and when the technology decision-making and allocation process (reflected in the Technology Master Plan) will be integrated with an institutional planning process.

Recommendations

See Recommendation #9 above

Standard III.D: Financial Resources

General Observations

It is not clear how sufficient funds have been identified through the Resource Allocation Committee process to align with program reviews. However, financial planning, review and assessment have played a role in resource allocation outside of the Resource Allocation Committee. For example the Hartnell College Technology Master Plan 2011 -2021 provides planning and rationale for the procurement of equipment and technology infrastructure within the consolidated project list for infrastructure. This list contains a source for funding. It is not clear whether this list is connected to the college strategic planning and program reviews. Evidence of prioritization for funding and implementation is contained in the Technology Master Plan.

Interviews with the Vice President of Administrative Services and the Vice President of Technology and Information Systems confirm that funds are being budgeted for technology in multiple ways guided by extensive planning and assessment, as evidenced within the Technology Master Plan but not through the institutional standards for program review. Additionally, Administrative Services does not have a completed program review but has been following a solid plan for revenues and expenses projection. Documents specific to creating program reviews have been finalized and are scheduled for completion prior to July 2013.

The college received audit findings and recommendations during the previous three years. The schedule of findings and questioned costs related to financial statements issued ending June 30, 2011 listed seven state compliance findings including financial and student enrollment issues. The college noted in its responses difficulty meeting, and subsequent application for exemption from, Education Code Section 84362--commonly known as the 50% Law. Categorical Funds from the State were reduced by over \$1 million dollars. The college had chosen to maintain a substantive portion of these services using General Funds and did so by providing funds in excess of the required match. This finding and all other State compliance findings were resolved as of the external audit ending June 30, 2012. There were no findings or questioned costs related to financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2012. This audit contained one finding related to federal awards and six findings related to state awards. The District has implemented plans and procedures to assure full compliance with each finding.

The college fiscal trend analysis of actual unrestricted general fund revenues and expenses from 2008 to 2011 and budgeted for 2012 to 2013 reflects the college's efforts to build adequate reserves and comply with Education Code Section 84362. The college projected deficit spending for 2012 – 2013 of just over \$1.6 million. The projected ending fund balance maintains over 20% of budgeted expenditures.

The District passed \$131 million in general obligation bonds in November 2002 for the construction and renovation of buildings and equipment throughout the District. The first series of \$35 million was issued in April 2003 and the fourth series of \$48.4 million was issued in September 2009. Proceeds were received in October 2009. As of June 30, 2012 69% of projects have been completed. The remaining projects are scheduled for completion within three years. A performance audit has been conducted for Measure H General Obligation Bond funds for the year ended June 30, 2012. The results of tests within the performance audit indicate that the

college (District) has properly accounted for the expenditures of funds held in the Bond Projects Fund and that such expenditures were made on authorized bond projects. At the end of the 2011-2012 fiscal year, the District had \$139.2 million in bonds outstanding from the voter approved general obligation bonds and other long-term obligations. These bonds will be repaid annually through property taxes on assessed property within the Hartnell Community college District boundaries.

On April 14, 2009, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution for the implementation of an Early Retirement Incentive for full-time faculty adding to the long-term liabilities for the District. A total of seven full-time faculty are participating. A payment of \$80,974 was made during the 2011-2012 fiscal year. A payment of \$78,612 is due during the 2012-2013 fiscal year with subsequent payment amount varying through 2017 – 2018. The total remaining liability has been reflected in the annual audit financial statements ending June 30, 2012. The net savings for the life of the plan is estimated at \$945,000.

The District's other post-employment benefit (OPEB) cost (expense) is calculated based on the annual required contribution of the employer (ARC), an amount actuarially determined in accordance with the parameters of GASB Statement 45. The ARC represents a level of fund that, if paid on an ongoing basis, is projected to cover normal costs each year and amortize any unfunded actuarial liabilities over a period not to exceed thirty years. As of October 1, 2010, the most recent actuarial valuation date, the plan was deemed unfunded because the District is using an assigned fund rather than an irrevocable trust to set aside resources for retiree health care costs. The unfunded actuarial accrued liability was \$4,221,464. Although the plans have no segregated assets, the District does maintain a retiree benefits fund to assign resources for retiree health care costs. The fund's assigned balance was \$4,258,425 and \$4,124,012 at June 30, 2012 and 2011, respectively.

Accumulated employee sick leave benefits are not recognized as a liability of the District. The District's policy is to record sick leave as an operating expense in the period taken since such benefits do not vest nor is payment probable; however, unused sick leave is added to the creditable service period for calculation of retirement benefits when the employee retires and within the constraints of the appropriate retirement systems.

The team examined the college's longitudinal data relative to the institution's fiscal condition, including significant increases or decreases in enrollments and revenue.

Fiscal trend analysis for prior years reveals that the college has experienced significant reductions in revenue and enrollments since 2008-2009, a year in which significant budget issues had also been present.

In 2008-2009 the college's actual combined credit and non-credit FTES totaled 7,697 and unrestricted general fund revenues totaled \$37,834,103. In 2011-2012 the college's actual combined credit and non-credit FTES totaled 7,127 and unrestricted general fund revenues totaled \$36,642,927. This represents a reduction in enrollments and revenues of over 9%.

The college states that the reductions in enrollments and expenditures have been planned over time to stabilize the college's budget in relation to assumptions of declining state

apportionments. Having noted this trend analysis the college has addressed the need to reduce expenditures and has maintained an adequate fund reserve as the College continues to refine enrollment management and develop new sources of revenue.

The Citizen's Bond Oversight Committee meets regularly and posts minutes on the college's website. The annual report was presented to the Governing Board for 2010 – 2011 and then posted the report to the college's website.

The college has previously established business and financial policies including purchasing and contract policies that are contained within the collection of policies labeled as "old" as in evidence posted on the college's website. New policies are also posted on the college's website containing one updated business policy for construction and change orders. No other revised business policies are in evidence or posted.

Findings and Evidence

The college has made significant improvements to address, resolve, and significantly improve upon previous recommendations under Standard III.

The most recent financial audits reflect successful resolution of previous findings and contain no significant findings related to the financial statements.

The college budget process and the distribution of financial information in a timely way have improved as evidenced by posted presentations and testimonials of staff. Staff generally trusts that budget information is being presented in a transparent and timely manner.

The college has established a standard for program review and an allocation of resources for all areas of the college but has not yet implemented program review for most non-instructional areas. There is little to no evidence that the allocation of resources occurs through the use of the college's RAC and program review nor is it linked to budget development.

Conclusions:

It is the conclusion of the team that Hartnell partially meets the standard. Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency.

However, financial planning is not integrated with institutional planning. The lack of program reviews in most non-instructional areas make it difficult to assess if institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability. The development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements are not documented in evidence of meeting the standard.

Recommendations

See Recommendations # 2 and #9 above

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.)

Standard IV Leadership and Governance

Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

The district has had constant turnover in the past few years. There has been instability in the leadership of the college and no consistency in the organizational structure. The Board of Trustees hired a new president in 2006 which presented the district with the opportunity to improve the processes of decision-making, internal dynamics, re-establish effective leadership, and strategic planning. The board hired a new president in July 2012. The change in presidents has caused the district to have gone through a troubling period. Under the leadership of the new president, the district will work toward a united front for the good of the students and the community served.

In response to the previous recommendation, the Board of Trustees unanimously adopted the Code of Ethics policy that includes procedures for sanctioning members who violate those policies.

The college has a governance body called the Resource Allocation Council (RAC). The RAC was designed to have equal representation of the leadership or their designees of all constituencies: Superintendent/President, Academic Senate President, Hartnell College Faculty Association President, Classified Senate President, President of the CSEA, Chief Steward of the IUOES, and the President of the ASHC.

In the governance structure, the following committees report to RAC: Program Planning and Assessment; Technology, Human Resources and Facilities; Enrollment Management, Matriculation and Student Policy; the Financial Information Subcommittee; and through the Academic Senate, the standing committees of the Senate. RAC leaders shared that they make recommendations to the Board of Trustees; however, the College CEO asserted that the recommendations come through him.

Findings and Evidence

The policy and procedure review schedule has the timelines for approval of the APs and BPs. The completion of the several BPs and APs is July of 2013.

The Board self-evaluation was completed in the fall of 2012 with all members participating in the process. In the previous self-evaluation, there was limited participation from the membership. The self-evaluation process will be repeated in June. The new president plans to bring in a consultant to assist the membership in facilitating meaningful discussion at board meetings and retreats.

The new president has made the Board Development process an important task. The Board of Trustees is committed to having two meetings a month. One meeting is strictly for business and the second one is for development.

With the changes in the office of the President, the administrative structure has gone through several changes which resulted in the ineffectiveness of the shared governance committees. The President has a new administrative structure in a draft form. It is a work in progress and has gone through the RAC as an information item.

The following governance groups: Faculty/Staff Development Committee, BSI/Student Success Committee, RAC, BOT, and the Academic Senate have stated enthusiastically they are confident that the new president will move the college forward.

Each group noted that the instability in the administrative structure, constant changes in the presidency, lack of institutional support, and lack of communication has caused each group to function ineffectively.

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. The summary report is posted on the college's website. The next step in the continued assessment and review of the college's governance model and structures is the formation of a task force that will take into consideration the results from the retreat and other information in making recommended changes and improvements to the existing governance model. The goal of the restructuring is to implement a governance model and structures that facilitate decision-making and resource allocation.

The college has a governing board of seven trustees and one student trustee. They serve four-year terms and elections are held in odd-numbered years. The independent policymaking body holds monthly meetings open to the public, with notices and agendas posted in advance and subject to the Brown Act. This is in compliance with the ER 3.

Conclusions

The college has an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. It encourages faculty, staff, and students to participate in activities to improve the practices and programs of the institution. There is evidence (leadership retreats) to conclude that staff are participating in the governance processes of the institution and are encouraged to work to improve it. (IV.A.1)

Hartnell College establishes a written Board policy that provides faculty, staff, and students with the ability to participate in the decision-making processes of the institution. Staff is aware of their roles on the Resource Allocation Council and other shared governance groups. Several members of the various groups have expressed concern with the changes in the office of the President, changes in the administrative structure on campus, financial issues, and the lack of consistent communication from the administration has contributed to the ineffectiveness of the shared governance committees. Also, each group has stated that an internal evaluation on the effectiveness of their groups was completed. (IV.A.2.a.b)

As a result of the change in the President, the college has begun to focus on the review and revision of policies and procedures, development of an administrative structure, and revision of

shared governance committees. The RAC is an established governance structure that has worked well for the college but more effective participatory governance as well as a clear delineation of roles in the decision-making process from the employee level and all the way to the Board of Trustees is needed to fill the need on college.

The college has demonstrated honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. The college meets its obligations to various other external agencies to the U.S. Department of Education by submitting its various grant reports in a timely and efficient manner. The reports are received by the Board of Trustees in public meetings. Written reports are available to the public.

The goal of the college is to restructure and implement a governance model and structures that facilitate decision-making and resource allocation.

Recommendations

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.
(Standards IV.A.2; IV.A.2.a)

Standard IV.B: Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The governing board responded to address the probation status of the college. It adopted an Ethics policy. It also decided to make the evaluation of the board a regular activity, including the use of a facilitator. The board holds board development sessions where it delves into serious issues and provides to the College community the example of ongoing professional development. Furthermore, it was evident that the board participates actively in national as well as local professional activities. The board succeeded at hiring a new CEO as the previous one decided to retire. The governing board revised its policy prior to initiating a search for a new CEO. In interviews during the site visit, some pointed out the important role the policy played in a good outcome for the search. The board has taken its fiduciary responsibility seriously as it shepherded the institution through a turbulent period of economic uncertainty.

The board attends to the review of its policies and there is evidence that the policies are being reviewed regularly. While there is claim that the board acts as a whole, there is evidence that the board has not acted in the best interest of the institution as dissenters on some decisions appear to argue beyond a vote of the board and that is in violation of the expectations of boards. The board's establishment of an ethics policy helps the board police itself. The fact that the board had to resort to the sanctions established in the ethics policy "from time to time," may demonstrate that the board has not completely understood their actions or need to take steps to be fully in compliance with Standard IV. The board's self-evaluation process does not seem to meet the needs of the board because of the lack of participation in implementation. While a thorough evaluation of the board is appropriate once a year, until much progress is made, it may be advisable that the board be surveyed on its responsibilities at least quarterly. Both of these steps have recently been implemented.

On March 15th, 2011, there was a presentation on "Effective and Ethical Governance." The workshop dealt with the role of the board and the CEO. In particular, it outlined that the board establishes policies "... that ensures the quality, integrity and effectiveness of student learning programs and services ..." Furthermore, it pointed out that the "Board acts as a whole once a decision has been made and focuses on allegiance toward the College and the community." The workshop further stated that governing board members must "... support the decision of the board once it is made..."

By reviewing the minutes of the board, it shows that some board members arrive late or leave early. This practice may put into question the commitment of the affected board members.

Through the Self Evaluation Report and interviews with individuals, it is apparent that the new leader is respected and has the best interest of the College. There are key vacancies in Academic Affairs and managerial positions that need to be filled and that have gone unfilled for some time. There is evidence that the institution needs to ramp up its staffing and organization to be most effective. The reference to individuals being "tired" may be an expression of total participation by all and the lack of personnel.

Some board members feel that the arrival of the new CEO has fostered a better level of transparency at the College that has not been heretofore present. The board development sessions have helped the board better focus on issues prior to voting.

Findings and Evidence

It is not clear through the evidence or the interviews how much time the board has spent in addressing student learning outcomes issues. But, with the special sessions to learn more about the effective trusteeship, the issue of learning outcomes could be a topic of discussion led by college leaders.

The board shows a great deal of interest in issues of student achievement. This is verified through dialog with the board and college leaders. The California Student Success Taskforce implementation provides a great avenue for focus on student success. In the future, the board will need to be involved in ensuring that adequate resources are allocated for the goal of helping students succeed.

The board addressed the issue of Ethics policy addressed by the previous team. Evidence showed that the board approved a policy and included in the policy how to sanction board members who violated the policy. Evidence shows that the sanctions have been applied already. The board has also agreed to evaluate itself periodically. It has chosen to do so once a year as reported in the Self Evaluation Report. The board moved swiftly to ensure that it hired a CEO. He has been a welcome presence at the college. He has moved quickly to direct the activities of the college to be in compliance with accreditation standards.

Despite the Ethics policy and the existence of the self-evaluation process, the Self Evaluation Report, the evidence and interviews with members of the College community show that the board as a whole has not totally complied to the standard:

- Not speaking with one voice;
- Three out of seven board members not participating in the original board evaluation.
- Having a self-evaluation that lags too much in its frequency.

Conclusions

It is the conclusion of the team that Hartnell fails to meet Standard IV.B. While, there has been significant improvement in the board actions and behavior since the arrival of the new president, these are fragile and early steps in a long road to trusteeship recovery. Interviews with board members as well as the Self Evaluation Report clearly show that the board was divided, but is slowly making progress to be an effective board that focuses on policy while empowering its president to lead the institution; all board members are now fully participating in the board evaluation.

Staff and faculty members have pointed to the instability in leadership for the lack of progress in planning, student learning outcomes, program reviews and employee evaluation. The president is not only aware of the situation, but is committed to addressing them as quickly as he can.

It is important that each board member adhere to its Ethics policy and that all board members, incoming or existing, agree to adhere to the policy or modify it. While the board has made good progress, it is important that it be sustained and the Code of Ethics, along with due considerations for fellow board members will put the trustees in a good position to provide leadership for the college and support the CEO.

The board started the important task of evaluating itself. The first evaluation saw 3 out of seven board members not participating in the process. However, since the arrival of the new president, the evaluations have been more regular and the participation is 100%. It is important that the board self-evaluation be completed regularly and with full participation of each board member.

Recommendations

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. (Standards IV.B.1.a-j; IV.B.2.a-e)

Compliance with U.S. Department of Education (USDE) Regulations
HEOA 2008 including 2010 and 2011 Regulations interpreted through July 2012

34 CFR Paragraph	Team Response
602.16(a)(1)(i)	<p>The institution set standards for students' satisfactory performance both in achievement and student learning. The institution provided data on student achievement for all types of credentialing offered. As noted in the Self Evaluation Report, "The college assures the high quality of all its courses and programs through college curriculum review processes which include an examination of the type of credit awarded, course content, instructional methodologies, methods of evaluation, delivery methods, and link to college mission." The team found that Hartnell College is fulfilling its intended mission. (Board Policy: 4250)</p>
<p>602.16(a)(1)(viii) 602.24(e) 602.24(f)</p>	<p>The college aligns its practice of awarding credit with the Carnegie Unit and with those of other systems of public higher education in California as determined through the examination of course outlines, syllabi, and the class schedule. The college does not offer classes that convert clock hours to credit hours.</p> <p>The team reviewed over five courses, including those in the categories listed. As stated in the Self Evaluation Report, Hatnell's degrees require a total of 60 credits. Furthermore, Hartnell's advisory committees, and the California Chancellor's Office, as well as regional groups, play a role in helping to determine the length of certificates offered. Hartnell College provides information for transfer to students interested in transferring out or transferring into the institution. This information is available in the 2012-2013 College Catalogue. However, this information is not available on the website; in fact, the listed transfer handbook online has no information and is entirely blank. The institution has a policy on transfer, but it appears to specifically address students transferring out as opposed to students transferring into the College. It does, however, put emphasis on students from underrepresented groups in higher education.</p> <p>(Board policies: BP5120 (Transfer), 4050 (Articulation), 4220 (Standards of Scholarship), 4230 (Grading) – 2012-2013 College Catalog)</p>
<p>602.16(a)(1)(ix) and related</p> <p>668.43</p>	<p>There were no complaints filed with the accreditation agency against Hartnell College.</p> <p>In its catalog and policies, Hartnell College gives students information about accreditation agencies' relationship with the college. It lists the mailing address of ACCJC. It, however, did not identify the opportunity the public, students or potential students have to file a complaint with the accreditation agencies. The college provides ample opportunities for</p>

	<p>students to file complaints, and students are directed to file complaints with the Office of Student Affairs. The team inquired about complaints and did not find any disturbing patterns of student or public complaints against Hartnell College.</p> <p>Neither the web site nor the Web Portal provides a means for students residing out of state to file a complaint in their resident state against Hartnell College.</p>
602.17(f)	<p>Data provided in the context of the Self Evaluation Report were not sufficiently put in context to evaluate fairly the level of achievement of the institution vis-à-vis its students' performance for courses or programs. The only exception is in Basic Skills, where it was stated that the college performs near or above state average. The Self Evaluation Report cites mathematics as one where the college continues to perform at 10% improvement regularly.</p> <p>The team documented the lack of focus on planning and true assessment of learning at various levels of the institution. Consequently, standards will need to be set and achievement measured against those standards to meet accreditation standards.</p>
602.17(g)	<p>The team examined online courses and determined that the courses offered online are legitimately online courses not requiring paperwork. While courses were in general of high quality, there are faculty members who have very little interaction with their students. With a new emphasis being put on the courses, and the transition to a new online learning management system (Etudes), the quality of delivery is likely to improve.</p> <p>The team examined the authenticity of the system. Students are required to access the courses via a secure website with login information for each student.</p>
602.19 (a-e)	<p>The team examined the long-term fiscal condition of the district and found it to be very sound with a 26% reserve. However, this reserve comes at the price of lack of institutional capacity.</p> <p>The data-Hartnell presented to the team shows that it is striving to meet the educational needs of students. Indeed, the establishment of the Alisal Campus and the King City Education Center are two good examples of work the College is doing to support students' achievement. In examining the data for student achievement, the team sees an institution that is trying to do its best. However, to fully meet the expectations of its constituents and accreditation standards, a lot of work needs to be done on assessment of learning outcomes at the course, program and degree or certificate levels.</p>