

EXTERNAL FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION REPORT

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

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

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Hartnell College for an Educational Quality and Institutional
Effectiveness Review
April 10, 2015

Jowel C. Laguerre, Ph.D.
Chair

VISITING TEAM ROSTER
Hartnell College

April 10, 2015

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

Dr. Dan Walden
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Los Angeles City College

Dr. Lynn Wright
Dean of Academic Affairs
Ventura College

Dr. Marlon Hall
Superintendent/President
Lassen College

JOWEL C. LAGUERRE, PH.D.
HARTNELL COLLEGE FOLLOW-UP REPORT CHAIR
April 30, 2015

MEMORANDUM

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
From: Jowel C. Laguerre, Team Chair
Subject: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Hartnell Community College District

Introduction

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

Hartnell College operates three sites in the Salinas Valley: the Main Campus at 411 Central Avenue in Salinas; the Alisal Campus on Alisal Street in East Salinas; and the King City Education Center in King City, southern Monterey County. The Alisal Campus is over 40 years old. The King City Education Center has been established since 2002. 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 100 full-time and 240 part-time faculty, 140 classified employees and 38 administrators/managers who support the college efforts to meet the educational needs of the community.

Recent Accreditation History

As required by the Commission, Hartnell College submitted a follow-up report on March 15, 2015 addressing the seven recommendations contained in the Commission's Action Letter. The report was followed by a visit on April 10, 2015 by the present evaluation team consisting of Dr. Jowel C. Laguerre (Chair), Dr. Marlon Hall, Dr. Daniel Walden, and Dr. Lynn Wright (all members of the March 2013 Team).

Prior to its visit, the evaluation team studied the 2013 Team Report, the Commission's Action Letter, Hartnell College's March 2015 Report to the Commission and the evidence which the

college supplied as background to the report including Hartnell's 2013 Self-Study Report. During its visit, the team interviewed or met with approximately thirty (30) members of the college community including administrators, faculty, staff members and students. During its visit, the team also reviewed additional written evidence provided to it by the College.

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

As noted by previous visiting teams, this team found that there is a productive dialogue involving all constituents at the college. As with previous teams, this evaluation team found that Hartnell College is committed to meeting the Commission's Standards. Since the arrival of the current Superintendent-President the College has made tremendous progress to meet accreditation standards and act on the recommendations of the visiting teams.

In its action letter of July 3, 2014, the Commission found that Hartnell College had addressed Recommendations 1, 6, 8, 10, and 12, resolved the deficiencies, and met the associated Eligibility Requirements and Standards. Therefore this report addresses unresolved Recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11.

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.)

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)

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)

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

THIS TEAM’S FINDINGS, ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS REGARDING EACH RECOMMENDATION

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

Recommendation 2

As previously noted in Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 in the 2007 Comprehensive Team Report and in order to meet the eligibility requirements and the standards, the team recommends that the college develop a comprehensive integrated planning process and that the outcomes of these processes be regularly communicated to all college constituencies. The team further recommends that budget planning and allocation of resources inform financial projections. (Eligibility Requirement 19; Standards I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; 1.B.4; I.B.5; II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f; II.B.4; III.C.2; III.D.1; III.D.1.a,d; III.D.2.b; III.D.3)

Findings and Analysis

Hartnell College has taken several steps to respond to Recommendation 2. In the report from the 2013 site visit, the Team was able to verify that the College had taken appropriate steps to clarify the planning process and timeline to demonstrate how program review and other planning activities inform the budgeting process.

The 2015 Team found that the College has made significant progress in developing a Strategic Plan that is integrated with the other institutional plans, e.g. the Technology Plan, President’s Task Force Funding Plan, Equal Employment Opportunity Plan, Continuous Improvement Plan, Basic Skills Plan, Student Success and Support Plan, Student Equity Plan, Facilities Master Plan, as well as the key elements of program reviews. In addition, the College has not only developed a good planning system to link planning to budgeting, but has fully implemented its strategic and annual planning cycles that include annual evaluations of its Strategic Plan over the past year. These planning and budgeting processes are clearly communicated to the college and community constituencies through its planning and governance documents, committee agendas and minutes posted on the College website, in public forums, and via the President’s presentations, communications, and reports to the College stakeholders.

The Team further found that the College has created and implemented a budgeting process that informs the allocation of its financial resources and uses a thorough process that begins with the program review resource allocation process and works its way through the participatory governance process to the College Planning Council that is both transparent and collegial. The Council’s recommendations to the President are forwarded based on rubrics that clearly tie learning outcomes, program reviews, and planning to budget. This process was evidenced in team interviews with campus constituents and documents provided as evidence to the Team such as the Budget Development Calendar and the 2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent – President September 5, 2014.

Conclusion

It is the opinion of the 2015 Team that Hartnell College has embraced the concept of integrated planning that drives budget decisions and that elements such as program reviews, student learning outcomes and other institutional plans all contribute to the budgeting process. The timing issues between budget deadlines and planning timelines have been resolved, including program review schedules. The Team commends the college for its work and progress over the past two years for satisfying the requirements of Recommendation 2.

The College now meets the Standards and Eligibility Requirement 19.

Recommendation 3

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

Findings and Analysis

Through the 2014 Follow-Up Report and interviews held on site at that time, the 2014 Team was able to verify that the college was in the process of developing a process for assessing its long term and annual plans, as well as its planning process, in order to facilitate continuous sustainable institutional improvement.

The 2015 Team found that the College has made substantial progress in this area by developing and implementing a process to annually assess its progress toward accomplishing the goals and objectives of its strategic plan. The veracity of this claim was verified in interviews with College constituents and in evidence supplied to the team, such as Development, Review, & Revision of the Strategic Plan. This document demonstrates how the College selects goals, outcomes, and key performance indicators in its annual review of the Strategic Plan. This process also assesses other institutional plans, e.g. technology, basic, skills, etc. The first report of this annual assessment was presented to the Board of Trustees at its development meeting on November 12, 2014.

Comprehensive and annual updates of program reviews are reviewed annually as demonstrated in a document labeled Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement. These annual assessments are evaluated using a program planning and assessment report per the continuous improvement process and posted online.

During the past year, the College established a second tier of systematic assessment of its planning, governance, and assessment process and evaluation instruments by establishing the Continuous Improvement Committee. This committee has worked to create the Hartnell College Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018 that will be used to cultivate institutional effectiveness through implementation and assessment of purposefully designed processes of continuous improvement. The plan has already been implemented and is following a timeline that is described in the plan to regularly look at organizational effectiveness, effectiveness of strategic planning, effectiveness of strategic operations, processes for hiring job classifications, and

performance evaluation procedures.

Conclusions

It is the opinion of the 2015 Team that Hartnell College has fully developed a regular and systematic process for assessing its strategic and annual plans as well as its planning processes. The Team found that the College has met the requirements of Recommendation 3.

Hartnell College has taken the necessary steps to satisfy the requirements of Recommendation 3 and now the College meets the Standard.

Recommendation 4

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

Findings and Analysis

Evidence exists to demonstrate that regularly scheduled, broad-based dialogue on Student Learning Outcomes (and Service Area Outcomes) at the course and program levels occurs and that such dialogue is beginning to extend to institutional level (Core Competencies). An impressive year-long process was undertaken to implement eLumen, an online program to collect and map outcomes results at the course, program, and institutional levels and to create reports to analyze and take action on. As of February 2015, all full-time faculty and many adjuncts have been trained in the use of eLumen, and extensive training materials in hard copy and online formats exist to help faculty when they need to enter their outcomes data at the end of each term.

Two Faculty Assessment Specialists (one is the Chair of the Outcomes and Assessment Committee) review all curriculum SLOs as part of the Curriculum Committee process, helping faculty create measurable SLOs that will truly inform student learning. These assessment specialists also offer trainings and host an SLO Verification Day each fall and spring semester where all full time faculty and many adjuncts participate in assessing their program and course level learning outcomes.

The Outcomes and Assessment Committee, which includes the two faculty assessment specialists, meets twice a month to ensure that dialogue and planning with regard to outcomes assessment is ongoing and widespread. The college further ensures that outcomes assessment is a part of the campus culture by devoting significant resources to it: the dean of academic affairs and learning resources is formally assigned to oversee it, an online outcomes management tool (eLumen) has been purchased, trainings and rich support materials have been developed and implemented through the support of two faculty assessment specialists, and funds have been provided to adjunct faculty both for eLumen training and attendance at SLO Verification days to ensure that adjuncts are involved in the outcomes assessment and action dialogue processes. The team verified that online classes are assessed as are face to face classes.

In recommendation 9, the College connects the assessment of student learning outcomes with program review. The expectations are that the budget process is also linked to the assessment of SLOs and a program may not receive funding if program review is not done. There was indication from the review of materials and interviews that this system is not impermeable. The team suggests that be made stronger.

Conclusion

Hartnell College has taken the necessary steps to satisfy the requirements of Recommendation 4 and now the College meets the Standards and Eligibility Requirement 10.

Recommendation 5

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the college create an evaluation and assessment process for the library and support services that is integrated with the college's program review processes, and that includes an assessment of the process for integrating library acquisitions into circulation in a timely manner and how the needs for staffing, maintenance, and technology support are addressed. The team further recommends that the College create a process to evaluate the impact of minimal library and learning support services at the King City Education Center and Alisal Campus to ensure the sufficient availability of library and support services, including better up-to-date counseling online. (Standards II.B.1; II.B.3; II.B.3.a,c,d,e,f ; II.B.4; II.C;II.C.1; II.C.1.a; II.C.1.c.)

Findings and Analysis

At the first Follow-up visitation (Spring 2014), the team recognized "the significant progress that the College has made in evaluating and addressing library and support services and integrating them into the college's program review process." Also, the team acknowledged that the college had "made significant progress in evaluating the library and support services at the centers and responding to those needs" (Hartnell Team Report, April 2014). At that time, the college was found only to partially address the recommendation, however, because there were "some additional evaluation and student support plans that remained to be implemented in the spring and fall semesters to fully address the needs of the students."

Several actions have been taken since last year to address these insufficiencies. Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) have been created and most of them assessed, including one to assess the cataloging workflow issue. The library now purchases books pre-catalogued and pre-processed to speed up workflow in the technical service area. This has allowed the systems/technology librarian to have time to develop a prototype online library orientation delivered through the college's online course management system (Etudes); the pilot program is being tested and assessed this semester (Spring 2015). Afterward, this online orientation will be made available to all Hartnell students.

SAO assessment results have been integrated into the Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) process and used to justify requests for staffing, maintenance, and technology support. However, requests for 2014 PPA requests for additional staffing (20-hour a week outreach librarian for the satellite campuses as well as a full-time replacement student services librarian for the main campus) have not been fulfilled: They weren't funded. Also concerning is that no follow-up student surveys have been conducted since the Fall 2013 survey that showed less student satisfaction at the two satellite campuses. Another survey should be conducted to see if the changes made at these two sites are making a difference.

Tutorial Services have been expanded and made more consistent across the three campuses. It provides an ESL Lab and a Computer Center in addition to a Tutoring Center. Tutoring at the main campus is now available two evenings a week and Saturday morning; the Alisal Campus provides additional English and math tutors; and the King City Education Center offers the Reading Plus software program that assesses student needs and provides a customized online study plan. In addition, an online tutoring program (Eduwizards) is being piloted this term (Spring 2015).

Counseling employs two forms of online counseling to better serve students: email response and online synchronous that is being piloted Spring 2015. While the online synchronous counseling holds great promise, the college notes that there are numerous issues still to address prior to full implementation; a Faculty Inquiry Group is dedicated to seeing this project through.

Conclusion

The team concludes that the requirements of the Standards have been met. The team suggests that the college conduct another user satisfaction survey for services provided at the Alisal Campus and the King City Education Center and respond to the services and staffing needs that area revealed in the results.

Hartnell College now meets the Standards.

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

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

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

Findings and Analysis

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

Evaluation Processes

The 2014 Visiting Team verified that the management evaluations were happening as expected. The 2015 Team verified that that the College has sustained its progress in evaluation of managerial staff.

Evaluation processes and criteria for Classified Staff are outlined in their respective collective bargaining agreements. Added to the CSEA contract is Article 24, permitting requests for job reclassification. To assist in this process, the college has engaged in updating all Classified employment positions. All of the Classified evaluations are now completed.

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

The 2015 team was able to verify that all evaluations were performed. This is a major accomplishment for the institution.

Professional Learning Opportunities

The Professional Development Committee now almost two years old continues to have access to an allotted budget that has been reduced on purpose to \$80,000 from the previous level of \$100,000. This reduction is purposefully done because the committee could not spend its allocation last year. This is not only more realistic, but the difference is kept in reserve in case it is later needed. The two instructional technologists staffing the Faculty and Staff Resource Center ensure that professional learning opportunities are regularly and formally offered to all employee groups. Targeted trainings are offered to Classified staff as well as faculty via face-to-face and online modalities. Surveys have been conducted to identify needs, and the professional development team is committed to addressing these needs. All activities are evaluated to ensure continuous improvement. In addition to the campus-wide professional development offerings, the Academic Senate has a Faculty Development Committee charged with managing the "Flex" professional development program. This Academic Senate committee has two representatives on

the overall Professional Development Committee, and further collaboration along with additional opportunities for professional growth, were developed last summer and rolled out in the fall of 2014. Several new features have been added to the Professional Development program and evidence shows that they are being used well by faculty and staff.

Student Learning Outcomes as a Component of Evaluation

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

The college has adopted a comprehensive online “talent management” tracking program that will not only help track evaluations but will also enable tracking of professional development opportunities taken by employees as well as employee recruitment statistics. Implementation roll out is in progress along with other modules the software provides.

Conclusions

The Team concludes that Hartnell College has demonstrated a serious commitment to enhancing and improving opportunities for all of its personnel. The enormous effort undertaken to implement an evaluation processes for all employees is to be commended. The College has invested in a comprehensive online “talent management” tracking program that will not only help track evaluations, but will also enable tracking of professional development opportunities taken by employees as well as employee recruitment statistics.

The efforts in professional development is excellent as the College has built a system on which it can expand for future opportunities.

Hartnell College now meets the Standards.

Recommendation 9

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

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

Findings and Analysis

The 2014 Visiting Team found that the new planning and program review process began with the program reviews conducted in the fall of 2013 for integration into the 2014-15 allocation budget. Of the areas scheduled for annual reviews, 58 of 59 areas submitted reviews; and of the areas

scheduled for comprehensive reviews, 13 of 17 areas submitted reviews. The 2014 Team verified that these processes occurred and viewed the draft lists that were being developed to recommend funding to the President for the 2014-15 fiscal year. The 2015 Team was able to verify that the actual priorities as observed by the 2014 Team were funded and the results of that funding shared via an email from the President to the College on September 5, 2014.

The 2015 Team further found that the College has fully implemented the requirements of this recommendation by creating and implementing a systematic program review process that is ongoing, systematic, and incorporates student learning outcomes, student achievement, and annual action plans for improvement for every college program. In addition, the College has incorporated into its integrated planning process program review results and resource allocation requests. The College requires all identified programs to undergo a five-year-comprehensive review and an annual update using a template designed and approved through the participatory governance process. At the time of the 2015 Visit, 85 percent of all college programs had satisfactorily completed the most recent round of program reviews. Although program reviews are required and mandatory, the Team suggests that the College establish a process to ensure that ALL programs complete its reviews in a timely and satisfactory manner and identify corrective actions to be taken for programs that fail to comply

Conclusions:

As did the 2014 Team, the 2015 Team verified that the college has developed an integrated program review process that is used to assess and improve student learning, and to coordinate institutional planning processes. The college has implemented a program review process that is inclusive of programs, services, and offices throughout the college and of their planning related to student learning, student achievement, service area outcomes, and strategic directions. The 2015 Team verified that the College followed through with the resource allocation process and completed prior year's funding and completed another round of program reviews in the spring of 2015. Through interviews and other evidence submitted to the 2015 Team, the Team concluded that the College is using the results of its program reviews to improve program outcomes and student learning at the program level. The team concludes that this recommendation has been sufficiently addressed.

The College now meets the Standards.

Recommendation 11

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

Findings and Analysis

A revised, fully vetted Governance Model has been established and implemented beginning in Fall 2013 at Hartnell College. The November 2012 participatory planning retreat, a Governance Planning Task Force, and a Town Hall are examples of this implementation. The governance structure includes several governance councils, each with its own handbook delineating purpose,

membership, and responsibilities. A website dedicated to disseminating the calendars, agendas, actions, and other documents of these governance councils exists for ease of access for campus constituents. The College Planning Council (CPC) was established as the highest level governance council. Recommendations from other Councils are forwarded to the CPC. The CPC facilitates institutional planning and decision-making and serves as the college's budget committee.

In April 2014, the CPC approved methods and procedures for assessing governance council effectiveness. Each council has assessed the degree to which its activities actually align with the duties and responsibilities listed in respective handbooks; council members also have discussed survey results with regard to effectiveness and are providing recommendations to the CPC.

Hartnell's new governance structure appears sound. There is a "remarkable difference in how decisions are made" noted a member of one of the new Governance Councils. Numerous interviewees attested to a new culture of "transparency and trust" on campus, and that the integrity of the president as the college's leader as well as the consistency in processes, procedures, and documents has helped greatly to foster this trust, encourage collegiality, and embrace ongoing and systemic participatory governance. Meetings with leaders from Classified Staff and Associated Students, as well as faculty and managers, confirm that a place and space is regularly made for people to speak their minds and contribute to the college. Respect is apparent, and they appreciate the new cultural climate of open and appreciative dialogue. One suggestion made was to offer training in committee participation protocol and expectations.

Conclusion

The team concludes that this recommendation is met. The College now meets the Standards.