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Statement of Report Preparation

Hartnell College received the Team Report and the Commission’s Action Letter in regards to Follow-up Report #2 on June 29, 2015. The report and letter were broadly distributed via campus email, and made available to the public on the college website immediately upon receipt.

This Midterm Report was prepared by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), lead administrators assigned to the 12 recommendations and 44 Planning Agendas, and the Accreditation Council, a shared governance council comprising representatives from all employee groups. Information was gathered from all college constituents, including full- and part-time faculty, classified staff, students, and managers/administrators.

Drafts of this report were updated monthly by the lead administrators and posted on Google docs. These updates were reviewed and edited by members of the Accreditation Council on September 21, 2015, October 19, 2015, November 16, 2015, and February 1, 2016. The Accreditation Council approved the Midterm Report at its February 1, 2016 meeting. A consultation draft was emailed to the Hartnell College community on January 21, 2016 asking them to review the report for accuracy and to send in comments and corrections to the ALO by January 28, 2016. All responses were compiled and sent to the lead administrators, who addressed minor revisions. This version was reviewed and approved by the College Planning Council at its February 3, 2016, meeting and by the Academic Senate at its February 9, 2016, meeting. It also was presented to the Board of Trustees as a first reading on February 16, 2016. The Board of Trustees discussed and approved the final Midterm Report at its regular monthly meeting on March 1, 2016.

The Midterm Report, including all hyperlinked evidence files, was disseminated to the college community on March 15, 2016, by posting it to the college website.
Response to the Commission Action Letter

Recommendation 1
In order for the college to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college develop a process for regular and 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).

Resolution and Analysis
During 2012-13 the process for review of the college’s vision, mission, and values statements was initiated. The Governance Planning Task Force was charged with conducting the review and recommending changes, if any, to these statements. During March 2013, all college employees had an opportunity to respond to a survey of vision, mission, and values statements (1.1). A report of the findings from the survey was completed and posted to the college website in August 2013 (1.2). The Governance Planning Task Force (GPTF) reconvened in the fall of 2013 to continue the review of the vision, mission, and values statements. All of the agendas, minutes, and document for the GPTF can be accessed here. The GPTF reviewed the results of the survey of vision, mission, and values statements, reviewed accreditation recommendation 1, and reviewed the accreditation standards for college mission. The GPTF formed three small work groups comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators, and assigned each group to address one of the three types of statements. Each subcommittee reported its recommendations to the GPTF in October 2013. In its consideration of the mission statement, the GPTF focused its review to ensure that the statement reflected the intended student population and that the statement addressed student learning. The GPTF forwarded its recommendations to the College Planning Council.

The College Planning Council had its first review of the statements at its November 6, 2013 meeting (1.3) and subsequent reviews at its November 20, 2013 (1.4) and December 4, 2013 (1.5) meetings. The CPC approved the new vision and mission statements at its December 4, 2013, meeting and approved the values statements at its December 18, 2013, meeting (1.6). The CPC approved BP 1200 - Vision, Mission, and Values Statements, at the December 18, 2013, meeting. BP 1200 establishes a review schedule for vision, mission, and values statements that is linked to the cycle for the strategic plan. Under BP 1200, the review of vision, mission, and values statements will occur during the year preceding the final year of the strategic plan which for the current strategic plan will be 2016-17. In this way, vision, mission, and values statements will be established prior to the development of the next strategic plan and will be used to guide the development of the next strategic plan.

The Board of Trustees had its first reading of BP 1200 - Vision, Mission, and Values Statements, at its January 14, 2014, meeting (1.7). At its February 4, 2014, meeting, the Board of Trustees
approved BP 1200, adopting the following vision, mission, and values statements including a process for the regular and systematic review of the statements (1.8).

**Vision**
Hartnell College will be nationally recognized for the success of our students by developing leaders who will contribute to the social, cultural, and economic vitality of our region and the global community.

**Mission**
Focusing on the needs of the Salinas Valley, Hartnell College provides educational opportunities for students to reach academic goals in an environment committed to student learning, achievement and success.

**Values**
Values are the essential enduring tenets that guide Hartnell College. They set forth what we believe and they define how we conduct ourselves. At the core of these values is the student.

*Students First*
We believe the first question that should be asked when making decisions is “What impact will the decision have on student access, learning, development, achievement, and success?”

*Academic and Service Excellence*
We commit to excellence in teaching and student services that develop the intellectual, personal, and social competence of every student.

*Diversity and Equity*
We embrace and celebrate differences and uniqueness among all students and employees. We welcome students and employees of all backgrounds.

*Ethics and Integrity*
We commit to respect, civility, honesty, responsibility, and transparency in all actions and communications.

*Partnerships*
We develop relationships within the college and community, locally and globally, that allow us to grow our knowledge, expand our reach, and strengthen our impact on those we serve.

*Leadership and Empowerment*
We commit to growing leaders through opportunity, engagement, and achievement.

*Innovation*
Through collaboration, we seek and create new tools, techniques, programs, and processes that contribute to continuous quality improvement.
Stewardship of Resources
We commit to effective utilization of human, physical, financial, and technological resources.

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
1.1 Survey Instrument for Vision, Mission, and Values Statements
1.2 Report of the Results from the Vision, Mission, and Values Survey
1.3 Minutes for CPC meeting November 6, 2013
1.4 Minutes for CPC meeting November 20, 2013
1.5 Minutes for CPC meeting December 4, 2013
1.6 Minutes for CPC meeting December 18, 2013
1.7 Minutes for Board of Trustees meeting January 14, 2014
1.8 Minutes for Board of Trustees meeting February 4, 2014
Recommendation 2
As previously noted in Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 in the 2007 Comprehensive Team Report and in order to meet the eligibility requirements and the standards, the team recommends that the college develop a comprehensive integrated planning process that includes participatory governance and meets both the strategic and annual needs of the college. The team further recommends that all institutional plans of the College (e.g., budgeting, technology, Student Services) be linked to its planning process and that the outcomes of these processes be regularly communicated to all college constituencies. The team further recommends that budget planning and allocation of resources inform financial projections.

Resolution and Analysis

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

Hartnell’s Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement (2.1) was approved by the College Planning Council at its meeting on September 17, 2014 (2.2). A comprehensive presentation was delivered by several key administrators and others to the governing board on February 17, 2015 (2.43). The College Planning Council had previously approved, at its meeting one year earlier on February 5, 2014, several documents that collectively contribute to this comprehensive integrated planning process (2.3).

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

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

The compressed integrated planning process that commenced with program review/program planning and assessment (PPA) in fall 2013 was implemented through spring 2014 to inform budget development for FY 2014-15 (2.5, 2.6). The expanded integrated planning process that
began with program review/PPA in spring 2014 (2.7), and that applies to all subsequent annual integrated planning processes moving forward (2.8, 2.44), allows for:

- A full (spring) semester of program planning/assessment activities and intra-divisional content review and oversight; followed by
- summer months during which vice presidents summarize priorities for funding requests; then
- A full (fall) semester of governance council involvement in reviewing and discussing PPA results, and making recommendations concerning priorities for funding; and finally
- Transition into the next academic year subsequent to the superintendent/president’s decisions regarding which PPA requests for funding will move forward into the tentative budget for the subsequent fiscal year.

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

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

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

Hartnell fully appreciates the imperative to focus on new and increasingly critical external requirements and mandates, most notably, the development and monitoring of institution-set standards for student achievement and goals for institutional effectiveness. As such, the college
has acted swiftly to build institutional research as a central function within the office of institutional planning and effectiveness, and place increased emphasis on the validity and accessibility of institutional data toward the utilization of data for planning purposes and in decision and policy making. Also in growing recognition of the importance of research and data in enhancing institutional effectiveness, the College Planning Council (CPC) approved the handbook for and formation of the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) at its meeting on September 2, 2015; the IEC functions at the first tier of councils in the governance system, both replacing and subsuming all responsibilities of the Continuous Improvement Committee, which had served as a CPC subcommittee throughout spring 2015 (2.45, 2.46, 2.47).

Starting in fall 2013, all program reviews, related budgetary requests, and planning documents or summaries began to flow through the new governance structure for discussion, recommendation, and approval, as appropriate. The College Planning Council, for example, voted to support the recommended prioritization of full-time faculty positions from the Full-Time Faculty Hiring Committee at its February 5, 2014, meeting (2.3), and to recommend approval of prioritized resource allocation requests for FY 2014-15 at its April 2, 2014, meeting (2.17). Also commencing in fall 2013, Board policies (BPs) and administrative procedures (APs) have continually been routed through and vetted by constituent groups and relevant councils; a planned schedule of BP and AP review is issued annually (2.48).

Starting in fall 2014, all long-term institutional plans were presented to and approved by relevant governance bodies prior to being approved by the College Planning Council. The Timeline for Deliverables of 3 Major College Plans provides an example of this sequencing through the governance system (2.18). The master meeting schedule depicts when and how frequently governance councils meet (2.19), while the academic and governance Google calendar displays governance meetings via a vehicle available to all college employees for the purpose of informing the internal community on a timely and ongoing basis (2.20).

Starting in spring 2015 and continuing indefinitely into the future due to the ongoing and increasing requirements of the ACCJC and the Chancellor’s Office, governance councils and other bodies - most notably the Academic Senate and Governing Board - are participating in the review and approval of growing numbers of institution-set standards and goals for institutional effectiveness (2.49, 2.50, 2.51, 2.52, 2.53, 2.54).

Beginning with the calendar year 2015, in an effort to better integrate decision making in advance of making individual decisions, and to effectively plan initiatives before they are implemented, the college has utilized more complex, sophisticated, and comprehensive approaches involving greater numbers of key stakeholders and active consideration of strategic issues, thereby requiring more thorough discussion and ongoing deliberation. Numerous examples follow:

- Spearheading an annual summer retreat with broad representation of administrators and other key constituent groups (2.55).
Establishing a central institutional research (IR) function several years subsequent to the disbanding of an IR office at the college, thereby jump-starting or otherwise contributing to focused strategic and long range efforts to improve data infrastructure, analytics and reporting (2.56, 2.57, 2.58, 2.59, 2.60, 2.61).

Developing a distance education (DE) plan, reviewed and revised by the Academic Senate’s DE Committee in May 2015 (2.62).

Creating a position and recruiting for an Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) initiatives director who has a direct communication path to the college president, links HSI grant applications to strategic goals and metrics, and helps ensure that HSI related activities are not siloed at the college but rather embedded in the organizational structure moving forward (2.63).

Forming the SSSP/SEP/BSI Steering Committee of administrators in AY 2014-15, expanding its membership with the addition of the HSI initiatives director and subsequently the student academic support systems director in fall 2015 (2.64).

Identifying flagship program areas in STEM, agriculture, and allied health/nursing (2.65).

Beginning to address the institutionalization of grant funded activities in college structure and function from day one of receipt of grant funds (2.66), and to plan more thoughtfully for sustainability in advance of approval of grants and other innovative ideas (2.67, 2.68).

Engaging in comprehensive planning and sequenced timing of activities when developing the college’s next strategic plan; the compressed timeframe in developing the first plan did not allow for the integrated strategic planning envisioned in developing the second plan, the latter of which is intended to provide for extensive research studies (such as economic impact, the labor market for academic programs, identification of peer and aspirant colleges, and organizational climate), consideration of many additional topics (e.g., distance education, flagship program areas, and emergency and grants management planning), and multiple years of activities indicative of a more purposeful and thoughtful approach (2.69).

Forming an integrated strategic planning team (ISPT) in spring 2016 for the purposes of more effectively assessing the college's strategic plan, better integrating all institutional plans with the umbrella strategic plan, and implementing the process of developing the next strategic plan (2.70).

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

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

The following nine plans, including the umbrella Strategic Plan, were identified as long-term institutional plans in FY 2014-15 (2.21); the inventory was updated in fall 2015 (2.71). The plans are listed in alphabetical order under the Strategic Plan, and displayed with the highest level of institutional approval.
The college’s Strategic Plan 2013-2018 serves as the umbrella plan for the institution in that it encapsulates the Board’s six overarching priorities and therefore provides guidance through spring 2018 (2.22). It is therefore essential that all annual and long-term plans are linked to one or more of the plan’s priorities and goals. Requests for funding that appear in annual action plans must establish such linkage regardless of the specific program, service, or office submitting such plans. The four strategic plan levels include the six (6) institutional or strategic priorities and the eleven (11) strategic goals linked to specific priorities at the macro levels of the plan, along with the many outcomes tied to specific goals and the key performance indicators (KPIs) associated with specific outcomes down to the micro levels of the plan (2.72). These tiered linkages allow annual assessment of the plan to be effectively accomplished on an annual basis via goal progress reports and KPI scorecards.

Although requests for funding specific components of long-term plans must be forwarded through the annual integrated planning process, it is nonetheless important that each long-term institutional plan establish and maintain clear linkages to the college’s Strategic Plan. To this end:

- The Technology Plan (2.23) was updated (2.24) to ensure explicit alignment with the Strategic Plan.
- The funding priorities in the President’s Task Force Funding Plan 2012-2017, previously tied only to the six priorities of the governing board, were subsequently linked to the goals in the Strategic Plan (2.25).
- The Continuous Improvement (CI) Plan 2013-2018 describes the alignment between specific CI processes and goals in the Strategic Plan, whereby each of the 11 goals is supported by one or more CI processes (2.26).
- The Student Success and Support Program Plan speaks directly to multiple goals in the Strategic Plan (2.27, 2.73, 2.74).
- The Student Equity Plan includes reference to goals in the Strategic Plan (2.28, 2.75, 2.76).
- The Facilities Master Plan (FMP) links each prospective project to one or more goals in the Strategic Plan (2.29, 2.77, 2.78); successful implementation of activities in the BSI Action Plan (and other plans) are ultimately linked to physical space requirements as addressed in the FMP (2.79).
Strategic decisions and other key outcomes are systematically communicated in various ways in fulfillment of the established continuous improvement process governing internal and external communications (2.30). Vehicles of communication include:

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

As several successive and overlapping cycles of program review and integrated planning, budgeting and resource allocation have occurred, strategic communications have increasingly included timely information relative to key benchmarks in and outcomes of these respective cycles. These communications to college constituents have for example included informative follow-up and closure on resource allocation expenditures in FY 2014-15 from the fall 2013 PPA cycle (2.80, 2.81) and funding decisions for FY 2015-16 from the spring 2014 PPA cycle (2.82, 2.83, 2.84).

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

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

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

**Next Steps**

None.

**Conclusion**

Completed.
Supporting Evidence/Documentation

2.1 Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement
2.2 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting September 17, 2014
2.3 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting February 5, 2014
2.4 Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement
2.5 Timeline for fall 2013 PPA Process
2.6 Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15
2.7 Timeline for 2014 PPA Process
2.8 Annual Budget Development Calendar
2.9 Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes
2.10 Governance & Planning Model
2.11 Academic Affairs Council Handbook
2.12 Administrative Services Council Handbook
2.13 Advancement Council Handbook
2.14 Student Affairs Council Handbook
2.15 Technology Development Council Handbook
2.16 College Planning Council Handbook
2.17 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting April 2, 2014
2.18 Timeline for Deliverables of 3 Major Plans
2.19 2014-15 Master Meeting Calendar
2.20 Academic and Governance Calendar
2.21 Inventory of Long Term Plans with Leads FY 2014-15
2.22 Strategic Plan 2013-2018
2.23 Technology Master Plan 2011-2021
2.24 Technology Plan 2011-2018
2.25 President’s Task Force Funding Plan 2012-2017
2.26 Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018 7-1-14
2.27 Student Success and Support Program Plan
2.28 Student Equity Plan
2.29 Draft Facilities Master Plan
2.30 Internal & External Communications – Components of Continuous Improvement
2.31 Highlights of Board of Trustees Meeting February 4, 2014
2.32 Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014
2.33 Actions from Academic Senate Meetings September 23 & October 14, 2014
2.34 Access to Minutes of Governance Council Meetings
2.35 2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent – President September 5, 2014
2.36 President’s Forum April 11, 2014
2.37 Administration Meeting Agenda September 3, 2014
2.38 President’s Corner - Presentations, Communications and Reports
2.39 Financial Projections Worksheet
2.40 Hartnell Budget Presentation Tentative budget 2013-14
2.41 Hartnell Budget Presentation Tentative budget 2014-15
2.42 Budget Worksheet
2.43 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting February 17, 2015
2.44 Timeline for 2015 PPA Process
2.45 Purpose & Rationale for Institutional Effectiveness Council
2.46 Institutional Effectiveness Council Handbook
2.47 Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting September 2, 2015
2.48 2015-16 Board Policy & Administrative Procedure Review Schedule
2.49 Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement for 2014-15
2.50 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting April 7, 2015
2.51 Institution-Set Standards for CTE Program Job Placement for Fall 2015
2.52 Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting October 7, 2015
2.53 Goals for Institutional Effectiveness for 2015-16
2.54 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting June 2, 2015
2.55 Agenda for First Annual Institutional Planning Retreat June 4, 2015
2.56 Organizational Transition to Central Institutional Research Function
2.57 Database & Data Path Map
2.58 Data, Analytics & Reporting Team Purpose & Membership
2.59 Request for Technical Assistance
2.60 Areas of Focus for Technical Assistance
2.61 Meeting Schedule for Initial PRT Visit November 9, 2015
2.62 Draft DE Plan May 2015
2.63 Job Description for HSI Initiatives Director
2.64 SSSP, SEP, BSI, HSI Comparison Chart
2.65 Minutes for Academic Deans Retreat June 10, 2015
2.66 Project Sustainability & Institutionalization - Sinclair Community College
2.67 Draft Revised Grant Concept Form November 2015
2.68 Draft Innovation Concept Form November 2015
2.69 Draft Time Line for Development of Strategic Plan 2019-2024
2.70 Integrated Strategic Planning Team Handbook
2.71 Inventory of Long Term Plans Fall 2015
2.72 Hierarchical Elements in Strategic Plan 2013-2018
2.73 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting October 7, 2015
2.74 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting October 6, 2015
2.75 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 18, 2015
2.76 Draft Student Equity Plan December 8, 2015
2.77 Facilities Master Plan 2014-2024
2.78 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting March 3, 2015
2.79 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting October 7, 2015
2.80 Email on FY 2014-15 Resource Allocations
2.81 FY 2014-15 Resource Allocation Expenditures
2.82 Email on FY 2015-16 Funding Decisions
2.83 FY 2015-16 Resource Allocation Requests
2.84 FY 2015-16 Funding Decisions - Personnel
**Recommendation 3**

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

**Resolution and Analysis**

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

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

The process for assessing the Strategic Plan is documented in the continuous improvement process, Development, Review & Revision of The Strategic Plan (3.1, 3.2). The process entails an annual evaluation of selected goals, outcomes, and key performance indicators (KPIs) in the plan, with a complete evaluation of the plan in its final (2017-18) year of implementation. The initial progress report focused on the first two institutional priorities, student access and student success, and was presented to the governing board at its development meeting on November 18, 2014 (3.3, 3.30). The second progress report was presented at the governing board meeting on January 12, 2016 directly from designated pages on the website of the institutional planning and effectiveness office, including two pages for each of the 11 goals in the plan - one for the progress report, and the other for the key performance indicator (KPI) scorecard (3.31, 3.32).

The process for assessing long-term institutional plans is provided in the continuous improvement process, Development, Review & Revision of Long Term Institutional Plans (3.4). This process consists of an annual assessment of the extent to which the plan’s implementation is on, behind, or ahead of schedule, relative to the final year of the plan’s implementation; information on the linkages between the initiatives in that plan and the goals in the Strategic Plan; and a quantitative assessment of progress made on each initiative as applicable. Plan assessments completed for FY 2013-14 include those for the Technology and President’s Task Force Funding plans (3.5, 3.6), and for FY 2014-15 include those for the Continuous Improvement, President’s Task Force Funding, and Student Success and Support Program plans (3.33, 3.34, 3.35, 3.36).

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

Both qualitative and quantitative indicators are considered as appropriate to the program and/or services offered. Annual assessment includes completion of program planning and assessment (PPA) reports (3.10, 3.11) and submission of student learning or service area outcomes assessments per the continuous improvement process, Annual SLO Assessment (3.12). A separate comprehensive review involves evaluating specific programs, services, offices, and campuses/sites at least once every five years so that the participants reflect back several years and project several years into the future. The annual review of the chemistry program reveals how the criteria are applied to a specific academic program (3.13). The comprehensive review of the then newly established Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness highlights the various components of this review as applied to a service unit (3.14).

One set of mechanisms for reviewing planning at the college encompass a broad spectrum of criteria associated with the integrated planning model (3.15) and various continuous improvement processes, such as long-term institutional planning, annual program planning, governance, budget development, and other processes (3.16, 3.17, 3.2, 3.4, 3.7, 3.8, 3.12, 3.18). The key features of integrated planning are charted to display an overview of continuous improvement that has occurred from calendar years 2010 through 2015 (3.19) and extended through 2016 (3.37).

A second type of ongoing mechanism was initially established via approval of the Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC) by the College Planning Council (CPC) at its meeting on September 17, 2014 (3.20); this committee functioned as a subcommittee of the council. One area of the committee’s responsibilities encompassed Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning: to “review alignment, and recommend ways to maximize alignment, between and among the college’s strategic and long term plans,” and “review strategic integration of, and recommend ways to better integrate, annual planning and budgeting” (3.21). Convening in 2014-15, the CIC’s governance life was short-lived due to the institution’s recognized need to create a larger governance body at the level equivalent to other first-tier councils - the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) - that would continue to tackle the former CIC’s function within a greatly expanded set of responsibilities (3.38, 3.39, 3.40).

Systematic Review of Effectiveness of Evaluation Mechanisms
In fall 2013, the dean of institutional planning and effectiveness conducted a systematic review of the college’s evaluation and assessment mechanisms relative to:

a) which mechanisms/processes were currently in place;
b) how frequently relevant elements for each specific process were scheduled to be evaluated per the existing evaluation cycle;
c) whether a complete inventory/master list of elements existed for each process; and
d) to what extent all elements in the inventory for each process had recently been evaluated.
It was determined that the college possessed 17 formalized evaluation mechanisms. The review identified varied weaknesses and challenges associated with these mechanisms and their execution, such as irregularity of evaluation cycles, incomplete or non-comprehensive master lists of programs, and inconsistent or irregular evaluation of specific elements (3.22).

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

The aforementioned empirical findings and analysis led to the decision to create a structured system of evaluation procedures, based on the identification of all key institutional CI processes as the starting point for aligning evaluation mechanisms over the timeframe of the newly developed Strategic Plan (2013-2018). The processes were developed utilizing a template that addresses four areas with sub-components, including (3.23):

A. The CI process, cycle, and process lead;
B. Participants, tasks, and evidence in the evaluation process;
C. Participants, tasks, and evidence in making improvements in effectiveness; and
D. Participants, tasks, and evidence in making improvements in process effectiveness.

Designing this approach to cultivating institutional effectiveness encompassed a framework of the five CI categories delineated above and represents 30 total processes, nearly doubling the number previously in place (17) (3.24):

A. Organizational effectiveness (5)
B. Effectiveness of strategic planning (7)
C. Effectiveness of strategic operations (6)
D. Processes for employee hiring and job classification (5)
E. Performance evaluation procedures (7)

Approved by the College Planning Council at its meeting on September 17, 2014, the Continuous Improvement Plan and accompanying Handbook of Continuous Improvement Processes—currently with 27 completed templates of the 30 total processes—highlight the college’s commitment to sustainable continuous quality improvement (SCQI) (3.25, 3.26, 3.27). A basic conceptual definition of SCQI (3.41) and a conceptual framework for implementation
evaluation (3.42) were established. The college has followed through in evaluating its implementation of CI processes as appropriate for the particular year, such as AY 2014-15 (3.43, 3.44).

Another ongoing approach for reviewing the college’s evaluation mechanisms was incorporated into the second set of responsibilities of the formerly existing Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC), Continuous Improvement of Institutional Effectiveness: to “review progress on and outcomes of institutional continuous improvement processes,” and “recommend creative ideas, innovative practices, and data driven approaches directed toward sustainable continuous quality improvement at the college” (3.21). This precise language was incorporated into expanded set of responsibilities of the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) when the IEC replaced the CIC (3.39).

Hartnell endeavors to become a role model for other colleges in the area of continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness. Numerous competitive proposals for presentations on this topic have been accepted for inclusion and presentations have been made at:

- The CCLC Annual Convention in November 2014 (3.28, 3.45).
- The ACCCA conference in February 2015 (3.29, 3.46).
- The CCLC Excellence in Trusteeship Program in March 2015 (3.47).
- The RP Conference in April 2015 (3.48, 3.49).
- The CCLC Annual Convention in November 2015 (3.50).

Beginning in spring 2015, the institutional planning and effectiveness office started making plans to become the hub for institutional research (IR) at the college, several years after the college disbanded the then existing IR office (3.51). Hired in late fall 2015, the IR director oversees the conduct of research studies and, as relevant for evaluation effectiveness, is responsible for providing “guidance and support in conducting evaluation and assessment of college functions, programs, services, plans, initiatives, student learning and achievement, and continuous improvement processes” (3.52). A needs assessment survey was conducted in fall 2015 across all college divisions for the purposes of identifying research, data collection, and data analysis projects, and to plan a prioritized schedule for fulfilling these varied needs (3.53). The survey items and results were bifurcated into 2015-16 (current year) and 2016-18 (future years) (3.54, 3.55).

**Next Steps**
None.

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

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

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

The team further recommends that faculty members teaching online be evaluated regularly and that assessment of student learning be measured regularly for online students.

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

The dean of academic affairs, languages, learning support, and resources (LLS&R) continues to collaborate with other college administrators and faculty and staff members to ensure that outcome assessment at all levels is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement. Faculty members and staff members demonstrate that student learning improvement is a priority, which is evidenced by increased meetings and discussion among colleagues regarding the analysis of outcome assessment data (4.8, 4.9, 4.10). Discipline meetings for assessment planning took place in December 2013, with follow-up meetings in January to discuss and analyze assessment results from Fall 2013. In August 2014, faculty participated in assessment activities to begin discussing assessment of spring 2014 assessment data, which was submitted in November 2014 (4.11). Assessment results for fall 2014 were submitted by February 13, 2015 (4.12) as instructed at the Fall 2015 Convocation; faculty members were also introduced to “Assessment Cycles,” which take place during the last week in September/first week in October (fall) and the last week in February/first week in March (spring) for analysis and discussion of the previous semester’s data and to confirm assessment schedules.
Action Plans are completed at the section and course level to record assessment observations and discussion (4.58, 4.59, 4.60, 4.61, 4.62, 4.63, 4.64).

The O&A Committee continues to meet on the second and fourth Mondays of the month and has collaborated with the Curriculum Committee to establish a process to review all newly created and revised SLOs at the course and program levels (4.13). Both committees recognize the importance of ensuring that course-level SLOs are accurately reflected in all locations (syllabi, CurricUNET, and eLumen). In fall 2014, the O&A Committee sponsored an SLO Verification Day, where a discipline representative for each discipline verified that course and program SLOs were consistent and accurate. (4.14, 4.15, 4.16, 4.17). Currently, the faculty chair of the O&A Committee is a member of the Curriculum Committee and will be meeting with discipline faculty members to review course-level outcomes in spring 2015. In addition, a timeline for outcome revision has been developed to ensure alignment with other College deadlines.

As noted in the External Follow-up Evaluation Report from April 2014, discipline faculty members developed five-year course assessment calendars in fall 2013, which they are continuing to follow (4.18). Calendars were first developed in Excel and then transferred to more user-friendly Word documents for easy reference (4.19, 4.20). This planning tool helps to facilitate consistent and cyclical course/program assessment/reassessment by full-time and adjunct faculty members and to ensure that assessments at all levels are conducted and evaluated on an ongoing basis. These calendars have again been updated and are posted on the Hartnell website at hartnell.edu/slo (4.69, 4.70). Course and program outcomes are either assessed or reassessed based on analysis and discussion of data after the determination has been made as to whether expectations were met. Fall 2013 and spring 2014 course-level assessment reports, housed on the college’s shared internal drive, align with calendars (unless modifications to the schedule were made based on assessment data) (4.21). As noted below, these reports now reside in eLumen.

Faculty members collaborate about assessment schedules and make adjustments if necessary (for example, assessments may be postponed if interventions are being conducted and evaluated).

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

- Data are collected in the current semester based on selected outcomes for assessment (as determined by assessment calendars and need, based on previous assessments and interventions to “close the loop”).

- Data from the previous semester are aggregated, discussed, and analyzed by faculty members during the next semester. Formerly, faculty members posted course level assessment summary forms that contained aggregated data and salient discussion points on the college’s internal shared drive (R Drive) (4.21). The transition from the R Drive repository of assessment data to eLumen began in spring 2014 with the inputting of all outcomes, the mapping of outcomes to program outcomes and core competencies, and the
development of course groups for both degree and certificate level assessment (4.65, 4.66, 4.67, 4.68).

- Course-level assessment data are used to examine program-level outcomes; results and discussion were recorded on program-level assessment summary forms and posted in the internal shared drive (R Drive) (4.31). Faculty members answered prompts on the form to address what was examined, what actions were taken, and to identify next steps. This examination is now recorded on Section-level and Course-level Action Plans using eLumen. (4.61, 4.62, 4.63, 4.64).

Since fall 2013, faculty members have engaged in systematic and continuous planning and assessment. In December 2013, faculty members attended mandatory meetings and were required to submit assessment plans for courses offered in fall 2013 (4.22). In January 2014, both full-time and adjunct faculty attended workshops to analyze their aggregated fall 2013 course data, which also was used in program-level outcome assessment (4.23). In fall 2014, faculty discussed and analyzed core competency assessment data from the 2014 Graduation Survey, which repeated questions from the spring 2012 survey and included Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) questions to assess core competencies (4.10, 4.24, 4.25, 4.26). Spring 2014 assessment data and analysis were submitted by November 15, 2014 (4.27). During flex days at the beginning of the spring 2015 semester, faculty attended presentations on alignment and integration of assessment strategies and tools of SLO assessment and rubrics: strategies in practice; introduction to eLumen, and aligning course objectives and SLOs with online modules (4.28). Implementation of eLumen began on a small scale in fall 2014 with a wider implementation in spring 2015. Approximately 88 percent of all full-time faculty entered assessment data into eLumen by the end of spring 2015. This course-level assessment data was used for assessment discussions by disciplines in fall 2015. Training for adjunct faculty is more challenging to schedule and to implement. Service area outcomes (SAOs) are assessed regularly; 2014 - 2015 SAO data are stored on the internal R: drive (4.73). The structure for SAO assessment in eLumen was created in fall 2015. ELumen training for service area staff members will begin in spring 2016. SAO assessment data for the 2015 - 2016 year will be entered in eLumen. Planning for the next cycle of core competency assessment began in the Outcomes & Assessment (O&A) Committee in spring 2015; (CC assessment schedule). The committee has reviewed and proposed revisions to the College’s Core Competencies to ensure alignment with the institution’s mission and the new ACCJC standards; these revisions are being vetted through the College’s participatory governance structure.

Until fall 2014, the college’s process for collecting and cataloging assessment data was less than optimal, using Word documents that were saved to an internal shared drive (the R Drive). The process limited access to users and required a time-consuming, manual “counting” process to determine the number of courses that had been assessed. As early as 2012, the College recognized the need for a better system, and so it embarked on a process of evaluating the systems available in spring 2013. After a thorough vetting process, the College decided to purchase eLumen software in the fall of 2013 to assist it with a systematic collection and analysis
of outcome assessment data needs (4.51). Through a mapping process, eLumen links course learning outcomes to both program learning outcomes and core competencies. Reports with aggregated data at the course level can then be used to measure student learning at different levels over time.

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

The pilot group met regularly during the fall 2014 semester to develop mastery of eLumen and to create training materials in several modalities (4.52, 4.53, 4.54, 4.55); in addition, this group developed a training schedule that included 14 workshop sessions for both full-time and adjunct faculty (4.50, 4.29). Implementation began on a small scale basis in fall 2014 with a wider implementation in spring 2015. In January, approximately 10 percent of faculty received training (in addition to pilot faculty); by the end of February over 150 faculty had been trained, of which 88% were full-time faculty. By the completion of spring 2015, assessment results for all courses offered in fall 2014 on which assessment was conducted were entered into eLumen. Assessment Specialists and an O&A Professional Expert participate in webinars and face-to-face training with eLumen staff; in addition, updated video and text-based training materials are being developed in collaboration with the College’s instructional technologist.

While the course and program summary forms through fall 2014 remain housed on the internal shared drive (4.21, 4.31), faculty members currently enter assessment data and complete Action Plans in eLumen. Faculty members have assessed or reassessed most courses taught in fall 2013, spring 2014, and fall 2014 and have aggregated assessment results from multiple section courses. As a result, the number of active courses assessed has increased from 71 percent to 80 percent. At the Third Annual Student Success Conference Day in January 2015, faculty were surveyed regarding training needs for assessment; based on results, training sessions were provided in Spring 2015 (4.23, 4.26). In addition, faculty members have engaged in broad-based discussion to examine results, to discuss potential modifications, and to use course-level assessment data to assess at least one program-level outcome (4.31). Program-level outcomes will again be assessed in spring 2016.

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

the team noted that some courses that have not been assessed because they have not been offered recently in the schedule. Those courses unable to be assessed or offered to students within a reasonable time should be removed from the catalogue. It is the team suggestion that these courses be inactivated to allow the College to have a true indication of its progress in course assessment (4.57).
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All academic areas are reviewing their curriculum to determine if courses that are not regularly offered are still relevant. Those that are not will be moved through the College’s Curriculum Committee’s inactivation process. A course scheduling matrix that includes all courses that are necessary (active) to meet the learning outcomes of the program and students will be included in program planning documents to help plan for more efficient schedule development.

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

Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) have been developed for all non-instructional areas, and assessment is ongoing on a yearly basis. Staff members in non-instructional or service areas have continued to develop and assess outcomes on a regular basis. If assessment results do not meet expectation criteria, interventions are planned and implemented before reassessment. One example of this improvement cycle can be found in the area of human resources, where an analysis of focus group comments regarding the college’s employee recruitment process resulted in the purchase of software to ensure more efficient and effective hiring, onboarding, and evaluation procedures. The selection process will be reassessed after the new procedures have been implemented (4.33). If outcome expectations have been met, new outcomes that will provide meaningful data are developed and assessed. Another example is menu improvements at the College’s Grille that have been made based on survey data for Grille consumers (4.72).

Training to use eLumen for SAO’s will begin in spring 2016. Staff will use data submitted on Word documents (to the R drive) for training purposes and to transition to the assessment database.

To provide assessment information to college constituents and the public and to align with instructional reporting, service areas have provided summaries of their assessments by describing what they “looked at,” what they “found,” and what the “next steps” are. These summary forms are accessible through the Outcomes & Assessment webpage on the college’s website. One hundred percent of service area outcomes have been assessed and analyzed. Where necessary, interventions have been implemented and reassessment will take place to “close the loop” (4.34). Service area outcomes will be entered into eLumen along with assessment data and Action Plans. While SAO assessment is ongoing, eLumen training for service area staff members will begin in spring 2016.

All core competencies (institutional outcomes) were assessed (and some reassessed) in spring 2014. On May 30, 2014, the second Graduation Survey was administered to 260 students at graduation rehearsal. This survey included the original 10 questions from the 2012 Graduation Survey as well as 15 questions that were supplements to the CCSSE survey conducted in spring 2014 (4.24). The O&A Committee and chair, the Dean of IPE, and the Dean of LLS&R collaborated on the selection of questions to be included in the Graduation Survey. Discussion and analysis of results among faculty members occurred during the college’s fall 2014
convocation in August (4.11). This activity involved small group, across-discipline discussion and analysis of survey results by full-time and part-time faculty members. Each group selected a recorder, who was responsible for entering the group’s responses to discussion prompts provided in a Google document (4.26). These results have been included in assessment discussions and analysis. The O&A Committee is reviewing the graduation assessment tool (Graduation Survey) and is collaborating with the Office of Student Life for planning and implementation to 2016 graduates.

Through research and discussion, the Outcomes & Assessment Committee revised the College’s Core Competencies to better align with the mission and vision of the College and to reflect changes in ACCJC standards. The first reading of these changes were presented to the Academic Senate in fall 2015; revisions were approved at the beginning of spring 2016 and will be shared with other appropriate committees and councils as well as faculty and staff (4.71).

To ensure transparency and to provide information to college constituents, the college updated the O&A webpage, which contains committee meeting agendas and minutes and outcome and assessment data for all levels of outcomes as well as assessment calendars. Presentations about outcome assessment have been made to the Board of Trustees (4.35), various college councils (4.36), full-time and part-time faculty members (4.37), and service area administrators and staff members (4.38, 4.39).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- An online template allowing DE students to complete a student appraisal of their course identical to the face-to-face appraisal was developed and implemented for those classes whose instructors were being evaluated, as of spring 2014.

- A student satisfaction survey is being developed by the DE committee. It will guide future decisions for training and technical needs. It will be administered to all on-line students on an annual basis.
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- A template surveying DE faculty members on questions asked in the annual CCCC report was developed by the instructional technologist and presented to the DE Committee at its October 2014 meeting. It is to be administered to all online instructors on an annual basis (4.56).

Next Steps
The college will continue to practice outcomes assessment that is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement of all practices and structures across the college. Data needs for program planning and assessment (PPA) have been identified in a Title V Research Group survey of faculty. Data collection and reporting are easier and more accurate with the implementation of eLumen (4.48).

The college has developed student learning outcomes and assessment that is ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement; training has been provided for all personnel in the development and assessment of learning outcomes at the course, program, institution and service levels; faculty members teaching online are evaluated regularly; and assessment of student learning is measured regularly for online students. The cycle of data collection and analysis has been occurring on a semester basis with evidence of an established, sustainable pattern.

Conclusion
Completed.
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Recommendation 5
In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends the college create an evaluation and assessment process for the library and support services that is integrated with the college’s program review processes, and that includes an assessment of the process for integrating library acquisitions into circulation in a timely manner and how the needs for staffing, maintenance, and technology support are addressed. The team further recommends that the College create a process to evaluate the impact of minimal library and learning support services at the King City Education Center and Alisal Campus to ensure the sufficient availability of library and support services, including better up-to-date counseling online.

Resolution and Analysis
The library has set institutional goals for its services, and staff members have engaged in conversations to develop these goals. These goals are reviewed and updated if necessary during the library’s program planning and assessment (PPA) process. In addition, the library staff collaborates with the staff at satellite sites to improve awareness of the library’s online databases and other resources that are equally accessible for all students, regardless of which campus they attend. To better inform students and faculty of the many online services the library has to offer, faculty have received an e-mail and flyer inviting them to take advantage of both online and face-to-face services and encourage their students to do so as well; faculty often post informational flyers in locations accessible to students (5.1). The new website includes a “For Faculty members” tab, where faculty members can request a library purchase and schedule a library orientation, for example. A faculty librarian serves the King City Education Center one day per week for four hours. She is available to assist students with research and provide library orientations, as well as teaching a one-unit self-paced information literacy course. In addition to serving students at the Center, the librarian conducts outreach to Hartnell students taking classes at King City High School and Soledad High School. Furthermore, the collection of reference books at the King City Center’s Library continues to increase and the library has purchased additional course textbooks to be used at the Center. A Hartnell Employee Innovation Grant will support expansion of the King City textbook collection and fund a librarian to make instructional presentations to classes at King City and the Alisal Campus. The librarian assigned to the King City Center has also conducted surveys of her LIB 2 classes, and as a result of student comments, more textbooks are being made available for loan and disposable earplugs have been provided to help reduce noise distraction.

The library’s many online resources are available on- or off-campus to all students, faculty, and staff, 24 hours per day, seven days per week. Among these resources accessible through the library’s webpage are over 100,000 electronic books, including encyclopedias and other reference sources, and more than 30 databases providing full-text articles from magazines, newspapers, and scholarly journals. A subscription to the online Credo Reference collection was begun in 2014 to partially meet the multidisciplinary information needs of students at the King City Education Center, the Alisal Campus, and students working at a distance (5.12). Reference service is available to all students via telephone, in-person, and email. Librarians respond to messages sent to reference@hartnell.edu within 24 hours.
To address the information competency needs of students, the library offers three sections of information competency credit courses during the fall and spring semesters, and one course during summer session. Librarians track the individual assistance provided to students at Reference Services in a statistical log. Since the reference email account was created in December 2013, the number of faculty and students using this service has been increasing. Librarians reached out to faculty members during the spring 2014 semester (5.2), and as a result, the number of orientations and attending students has increased since 2013-2014; in addition, the number of database searches has increased significantly. In general, reference transactions in libraries are declining. Librarians are handling fewer individual reference interactions; however, these interactions tend to be more in depth than in the past and require more time. Additionally, librarians aligned reference transaction data with reporting criteria from the Chancellor’s Office, US Department of Education, and the Association of College and Research Libraries, which resulted in the decrease shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations, Orientations, &amp; Tours</th>
<th>Number of Students/Participants</th>
<th>Reference Transactions</th>
<th>Other Reference Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>3,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database Searches [Regular Searches]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library is now purchasing books pre-cataloged and pre-processed to speed up workflow in the technical services area. In addition, more books in electronic format are being purchased to allow for quick and easy access to all Hartnell students, especially those enrolled in online courses and at our remote sites. The library has established Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and has assessed most of these services (5.11). Assessments through fall 2014 are located with the other college SAOs on the campus R Drive. Beginning with spring 2015, assessment results have been entered into eLumen along with SLO and other SAO assessment data. A Service Area Outcome was created to assess and improve the cataloging workflow issue. The results of assessments have been integrated into the library’s program review/program planning and assessment (PPA) document and have been used to justify requests for staffing, maintenance, and technology support (5.10).

To better serve the library and information needs of students at the Alisal Campus and the King City Education Center, the library requested in its 2014 PPA a 20-hour per week part-time
outreach librarian who would work at both King City Education Center and the Alisal Campus. This position was not funded in the 2014-15 fiscal year. The library also has purchased the Credo Academic Core Reference Collection, which is an easy-to-use tool for research projects and homework. Through this online library students may search in hundreds of encyclopedias, dictionaries, thesauri, quotations, and subject-specific titles, as well as 200,000+ images and audio files, and nearly 200 videos (5.12).

To better serve the needs of all students and faculty at Hartnell, the library requested through the PPA process and the Full-Time Faculty Hiring Committee, replacement of the full-time student services librarian (previous faculty librarian retired five years ago). The process has been completed, and this position did rise to the top of the Hiring Committee’s recommendations for faculty hiring for 2016-17. In fall 2015, librarians presented data to the Full-time Faculty Hiring Committee that continues to show the need for an additional librarian (5.21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic/College Libraries in the Monterey Bay Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Libraries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hartnell’s systems/technology librarian created a prototype online orientation in the college’s learning management system. After incorporating faculty feedback solicited in spring 2015, it has undergone pilot testing this semester (fall 2015) with English and economics faculty. The English faculty members chose to incorporate modules from the orientation into their own course shells, while the Economics faculty member elected to have her students added to a separate library shell. This flexibility is an advantage of creating the orientation in a modular format and locating it in the college’s learning management system. After evaluation of the pilot and revision, particularly focused on making assessments self-graded, the library staff plan to open the orientation to all students who wish to learn about the library’s resources. It will also need to be migrated to the new LMS, Canvas (5.3).

A student satisfaction outcome was developed and administered in fall 2013 and again in fall 2015 to determine if students have adequate access to library and learning support services at the King City Education Center and Alisal Campus:
Students and faculty of the King City Center will report that they have adequate access to library and learning support services.

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

The criterion for assessment is that a minimum of 50 percent will indicate they are satisfied/very satisfied with library/learning services at external sites. An initial Library Service User Survey was given to 237 students from 10 classes at the King City Center during September 17-26, 2013. Survey results revealed that most students were either somewhat satisfied (43 percent) or not satisfied (38 percent) with library services provided at the King City Center. Many students indicated that they needed the following services to be successful in their classes: two-hour textbook check out (68 percent), access to reference materials/dictionaries (44 percent), and a reference librarian to talk to or call (29 percent). Students also indicated that they would like to have a quiet place to read or to study on that campus (5.4).

Surveys (using Google Forms) were administered at all three campuses in October and November 2013 to measure this outcome, with 113 students responding at the Alisal Campus, 151 responses at the King City Center, and 407 responses at the Main Campus. Staff at all three sites contributed in recruiting patrons/students to participate. (5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8). Surveys were repeated at the Alisal Campus and the King City Center in November 2015. The responses show that there have been increases in satisfaction and access at both sites. Comments provided by students have resulted in more books available for loans, ear plugs to help reduce noise, and more communication from the librarian serving South County students (5.19, 5.20).

A summary of responses is below that compares the fall 2013 results to the fall 2015 results; the Main Campus survey was not administered at this time because of favorable survey results in 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Main Campus</th>
<th>Alisal Campus</th>
<th>King City Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Very Satisfied with existing library and learning support services?</td>
<td>90% 39% 42% 3</td>
<td>34% 58% 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Very Satisfied with access to library services?</td>
<td>NA 66% 60% -6</td>
<td>39% 65% 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Very Satisfied with access to tutorial services?</td>
<td>NA 46% 66% 20</td>
<td>48% 59% 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of library services and resources in Hartnell classes?*</td>
<td>97% 94% 92% -2</td>
<td>89% 88% -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of tutorial services in Hartnell classes?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>78%</th>
<th>87%</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>87%</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

√ There were 39 respondents to the survey at the Alisal Campus.

≠ Of the 846 surveys that were distributed to 39 classes at the King City Center, 355 surveys were completed between November 24 and December 8. While there is duplicated enrollment, most students who completed the survey in one class did not complete it in another class. Not all classes were able to complete the survey due to the Thanksgiving Holiday. The responses to some questions were intentionally left blank by participants.

* Results represent services are important/very important.

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

Based on results from the survey administered in fall 2013, improvements have been made to tutorial support at both the King City Center and the Alisal Campus. For example, at the King City Center, a professional expert assists students in assessing their reading skills by using the Reading Plus software program. Once a student’s skills have been assessed, activities to help the student improve are made available. There were 57 students who used Reading Plus in fall 2014 (5.9, 5.13, 5.14), and there were 62 students who will be using Reading Plus on the Main Campus in spring 2015. November 2015 survey results show that interventions in both library and tutorial support are having positive impacts on satisfaction and access for students at remote campus sites.

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

A pilot program using an online tutorial service (Eduwizards) was offered to students beginning in spring 2015. Tutoring support programs in both math (using ALEKS software in MAT 121 and MAT 123) and in English (using Reading Plus software in ENG 253) continue to be offered at all three sites. Students can visit the ESL lab, Tutorial Services, or the Computer Center to receive tutoring support on the Main Campus. The new Director of Student Academic Support was hired in fall 2015; he is surveying faculty and staff to develop a plan for implementing a highly coordinated, college-wide academic support system for students. Professional development activities, such as a Habits of Mind workshop sponsored by 3CSN (offered at Hartnell in fall 2015) and Reading Apprenticeship training, is available to faculty.
The college has developed better, up-to-date counseling online, and will continue to make improvements to these processes. First, during the 2014 spring semester, it developed and distributed a mixed model quantitative/qualitative survey to students who submitted questions online to a counselor (5.15). The survey was designed to gauge the usefulness of the online counseling service and whether that service effectively answered their questions and prepared them for college success. Results of that survey were compiled and analyzed in fall 2014, and refinements and modifications to the online counseling service were made. Also in spring 2014, a faculty inquiry group of counselors began meeting to research and discuss online counseling models used at other community colleges (5.16). During this time, a team from Hartnell (four counselors, the Director of Information Technology, and the Dean of Student Affairs/Student Success) visited Fresno City College to study its online counseling process (5.17). After the visit to Fresno City College, the Dean of Student Affairs in conjunction with full-time counselors began exploring different software available to provide an online live chat function to academic counseling. Exploratory work was conducted by the Counseling Department to identify an online live chat software. “Live Person” software was identified, and the Dean of Student Affairs, Student Success, and the Vice-President of Information Technology, began preliminary implementation steps. However, as a result of state-level projects through the Online Education Initiative (OEI) and Educational Planning Initiative (EPI), software is being developed that would allow for online dialog through a live chat function between counselors and students. This tool would be low-cost and open for all California Community Colleges to access. Because of this development, Hartnell College will seek to become a pilot school for this software in spring 2016.

As a result of these analyses and feedback, Hartnell is in the process of implementing two types of online counseling: e-mail counseling and online synchronous counseling. E-mail counseling, piloted in fall 2014, allows students to send messages and questions to the Counseling Department (5.18). All counselors will have access to this general email account, but only a pilot group of counselors were responsible for responding to students during the first month of the program. Online synchronous counseling is scheduled to begin in spring 2016, through a pilot program being offered through the statewide Educational Planning Initiative (EPI). Once the software is available, students will be able to access this option through the PAWS portal, which will allow them to schedule online appointments for online chats with academic counselors. Both options will be cooperative efforts of the counseling and IT departments. In addition, online counseling for EOPS/CARE program are being offered via Skype at the King City Center and Alisal Campus. Before they are fully implemented, the college will address important issues of confidentiality, the use of automatic responses, electronic signatures for general counseling e-mail, expectations and guarantees about response times, record-keeping, and counselor workload.

**Next Steps**

Librarians will continue to look for new ideas, methods, and opportunities to teach information competency skills and improve outreach to students. The online library orientation accessed through the college’s learning management system will be available to all Hartnell students, thus
providing access to the library’s orientation to our online students as well as to our students attending Hartnell College courses at the Alisal Campus or in South County. In addition, delivery of services to assist students at all three campuses, such as online tutoring and counseling, will continue to be assessed and modifications will be made as necessary to improve these services.

**Conclusion**
Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

5.1 Library Flyer of Remote Services
5.2 Hartnell College e-mail Regarding reference@hartnell.edu
5.3 Hartnell Library Online Orientation
   https://sites.google.com/a/hartnell.edu/orientation/
5.4 Student Survey KCC Library Services Narrative
5.5 Student Survey KCC Library Services Data
5.6 Main Campus Library Survey Analysis
5.7 King City Center Survey II Analysis
5.8 Alisal Campus Survey Analysis
5.9 Reading Plus Progress Report Fall 14
5.10 Library PPA Spring 2014
5.11 SAO assessments-Library
5.12 Credo Academic Core Reference Collection
5.13 Reading Plus® List of students who used Reading Plus FALL 2014
5.14 Number of students who used Reading Plus Fall 2014
5.15 Online Counseling Services Student Surveys
5.16 Agenda and Minutes of Online Counseling FIG
5.17 Agenda of Fresno City Visit
5.18 Summary Report on General Counseling Emails
5.19 KCC Library-Learning Services Survey - Fall 2015 (Responses)
5.20 Alisal Library-Learning Services Survey - Fall 2015 (Responses)
5.21 Faculty Hiring Presentation
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.

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

The college currently has a Memorandum of Clarification (MOC) with California State University at Monterey Bay, Gavilan College, and Monterey Peninsula College that was signed in March 2013 to continue to address the following needs: Voyager catalog database hosting and maintenance, Voyager modules, shared server costs, exit stipulations, and individual library responsibilities (6.1, 6.2).

In January 2014 and in March 2015, the Memorandum of Clarification between Hartnell College, California State University, Monterey Bay, Gavilan College, and Monterey Peninsula College Libraries was reviewed and evaluated. The responsible parties from these participating libraries were interviewed and their responses recorded (6.3). Evaluation criteria included the quality of the service that CSUMB provides, technical issues relating to the Voyager/Ex Libris system, the costs of the system, any needs not being met by the system, and a “vote” to continue participation or not with the consortium. The member/provider of services, CSUMB Library Director Bill Robnett reported during an interview also in January 2014 that the CSU libraries will be moving to a unified library system in May-June of 2017 (6.4). While CSUMB has indicated that they will maintain the server for a few months to assist in a transition, Library staff are reviewing other integrated library systems (ILS). These systems will be analyzed in an ILS side-by-side analysis document to compare Ex Libris Alma, OCLC WMS, Innovative Sierra, and ProQuest Intota. In addition, area colleges are engaging in discussions to determine the feasibility of remaining in a consortium.

The Hartnell College Lead Librarian met with Library staff from Cabrillo, MPC, and Gavilan and a senior account manager from Ex Libris in November 2015 to discuss the Ex Libris current system, its features, cost, and the benefits of a shared ILS (which may be available on a state-funded basis in the future). Migration timelines and fees were also discussed.

Among the member libraries all parties expressed satisfaction, and a desire to remain in the consortium as long as CSUMB continues to host Voyager. Member libraries did have some suggested enhancements (see recorded responses under “Explanation of unmet needs”).

Hartnell Library librarians (Systems/Technology Librarian, the Technical Services Librarian, Reference Librarians), the Vice President of Information and Technology Resources, and library staff were also either interviewed or completed an online survey (6.5). Generally, the staff expressed satisfaction with CSUMB service and Voyager. Most did not have knowledge about
the costs. One staff member labeled the system as “slow, archaic, not intuitive,” while another complained about the system timing out when not in use. Problems with Voyager were reported as “once or twice a year.”

Next Steps
The MOC is evaluated on an annual basis to include a review of the costs associated with the agreement, CSUMB service, Ex Libris issues, and needs that are not being met by the Voyager system. As can be seen on the Library Services Assessment Calendar, the Voyager Consortium MOC will be reevaluated in spring 2015 (6.6). In addition, the Systems/Technology Librarian will maintain close contact with other MOC representatives to monitor potential changes and issues, including the likelihood of CSUMB migrating to another integrated library system; potential solutions for hosting the Voyager-based catalog or Hartnell's migration to a new Integrated Library System (ILS) will be considered in the future. (6.7)

The Systems/Technology Librarian will continue to meet monthly with members as part of the Monterey Bay Cooperative Library System (MOBAC) Technology Committee.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
6.1 Memorandum of Clarification (signed)
6.2 Voyager Consortia Meeting Minutes
6.3 MOC Member Survey (Responses)
6.4 MOC Eval-Provider Survey
6.5 Hartnell Staff Survey (Responses)
6.6 Library Services Outcomes Assessment Calendar
6.7 ILS Planning Document
Recommendation 7
In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college ensure that evaluation processes and criteria necessary to support the college's mission are in place and are regularly and consistently conducted for all employee groups.

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

The team further recommends that faculty members and others responsible for learning have as a component of their evaluation effectiveness in producing those student learning outcomes. Use the results of employee evaluations as a basis for continuous improvement.

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

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

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

The comprehensive evaluation process includes several elements: a self-evaluation; a co-workers’ assessment that includes input from 10 to 15 peers, faculty members, and staff
members; the supervisor’s assessment of performance; goal-setting for the next year and
assessment of progress toward previous goals; and a summary of the evaluation. The process
runs on an academic year cycle, with all evaluations scheduled to be completed and approved by
the superintendent/president by June 30 of each year. The evaluation provides the basis for
assessing and improving performance as it relates to the responsibilities of the particular
managerial position and the mission and goals of the District, for making decisions on continued
employment, and for making decisions on advancement on the salary schedule.

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

Evaluations of all managers were completed in 2013, 2014, and 2015 using the processes
outlined in AP 7150 (7.5).

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

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

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

All comprehensive management evaluations scheduled to occur during each of the years covered
by this report were completed, as were all of the annual goal-setting and assessment meetings.
(7.5)
Classified Staff Evaluations

Comprehensive evaluation processes and tools for all classified staff members are written into their collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) or working conditions. For the California School Employees Association (CSEA) member employees, evaluation procedures and rules are contained in article 7 of the collective bargaining agreement (7.7) and the evaluation form is appendix F (7.8). For the Local 39 (L39) member employees, evaluation procedures and rules are contained in article 31 of the collective bargaining agreement (7.9), and for confidential employees, working conditions provide that the evaluation is the basis for decisions about the employee’s eligibility for annual salary increases (7.10). The evaluation tools for CSEA (7.8), L39 (7.11), and confidential (7.12) employees are posted on the Human Resources Office’s website (7.13).

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

The college belongs to a training consortium that regularly offers webinars on topics useful to managers. It offered one on managing performance through evaluation in February 2014 and again on December 2, 2015. As with all of the webinars, these sessions came with an excellent set of written workbooks and other materials that remain available to all supervisory employees on a shared computer drive. (7.16)

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

Performance evaluations of classified staff members have been kept up-to-date. In December 2014, all classified evaluations were current. (7.19). As of December 11, 2015, 86% had been completed on time, with only one evaluation more than three months overdue. (7.57)

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

**Faculty Evaluations**

Evaluation of faculty members is governed by extensive procedures contained in articles 13 (tenured faculty members) (7.20), 14 (probationary faculty members) (7.21), and 21 (adjunct faculty members) (7.22) of the collective bargaining agreement between the Hartnell College Faculty Association (HCFA) and the District. The characteristics of professional competence and conduct that are evaluated provide assurance that satisfactory performance will support the college’s mission. Negotiations on revisions to Articles 13 and 14 were concluded in January 2016, ratified by the faculty and adopted by the Board of Trustees on February 2, 2016. Article 21 was negotiated in 2013, and its evaluation provisions were implemented beginning in the Spring semester of 2014.

**Full-time Faculty Evaluations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This amendment was accomplished in a separate MOU entered into on September 20, 2013, so that faculty members who were scheduled for review during the 2013-14 academic year would have ample notice of the amendment (7.27). Negotiations were concluded in January 2016, and the adopted revisions to both articles having to do with the evaluation of full-time faculty, articles 13 and 14, include language on the knowledge, development, and assessment of SLO’s as a core duty of faculty that will be evaluated.

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

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

On January 31, 2014, a training session for deans and full-time tenured faculty members, who
would be conducting peer evaluations, was scheduled to provide guidance on how to conduct
observations and evaluations of adjunct faculty members using the new process. The training
was jointly conducted by the director for teaching, learning, and assessment at California State
University Monterey Bay, Rebecca Rosenberg, and the chair of Hartnell’s Curriculum
Committee, psychology instructor Carol Kimbrough (7.28).

In the spring of 2014, the evaluations of 75 percent of adjunct faculty members were completed
(170 of the 228 adjunct faculty members employed during the spring semester). Evaluations of
adjunct faculty members continued into the summer and fall. At the end of spring 2015, 78.60%
of adjunct faculty evaluations were completed, including all of the adjuncts in their first year of
teaching. A three-year calendar of evaluations has been created, so that all adjunct evaluations
will continue to be timely done. (7.29).

Professional Learning Opportunities
The college has taken many positive steps to demonstrate its commitment to professional
development for all employees. As part of its strategic planning process, it repurposed its Faculty
Resource Center (FRC), housed in the Library and Learning Resource Center, into a Professional
Development Center (PDC), signaling that it views professional development as something
important for everyone. It hired two extremely gifted instructional technologists who staff the
center and create learning opportunities for all employees. They work with faculty and staff
members to address those employees’ instructional and administrative technology needs, and
they truly have established the PDC as a hub of innovative teaching and learning activities.

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

At the start of the 2013-14 academic year, the District announced the formation of a Professional
Development Committee (7.31). The committee began meeting in October 2013, targeting the
end of the fall semester to have a blueprint for professional development at Hartnell. All
agendas, minutes, resources, and calendars for this committee are posted to the governance
section of the college’s website (7.32).
The Committee’s charge was to (1) develop policies and procedures for assuring that all employees have access to professional development opportunities and resources, (2) develop, acquire, and arrange for programs of professional development for all employees, (3) develop criteria, procedures, and forms that assure that professional development funds are expended equitably and serve the college’s mission, values, and strategic priorities and plan, and (4) make recommendations on staff, student, and instructional improvement activities based on a comprehensive planning process that includes needs assessment and evaluation (7.33).

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

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

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

A year later, the Committee had developed and launched most of those programs, and they continue to encourage professional development across all employee groups.

The Conference and Travel Program was announced by the Committee in May 2014 (7.36). The program’s purpose is to provide Hartnell employees access to outside professional development and training to improve student learning and success. (7.37) Applications are taken four times a year, and awards are made for up to $1,000 per person per year. (7.38) The first awards were made in June 2014—to a full-time faculty member, a part-time faculty member, and a classified staff member—and announced to the community in the President’s Weekly Report to the Board of Trustees on June 6, 2014 (7.39) In the next two application cycles, awards were made to five additional employees, (7.40) and the participation in this program continues to grow. All funded requests are posted to the Professional Development Program’s website, found here: http://www.hartnell.edu/sites/default/files/u196/awardee_list.pdf
The Employee Innovation Grant Program was announced to all employees in September 2014. (7.41) This annual program provides financial assistance to spur innovation to improve student learning. (7.42) Up to five awards are made each year in an amount not to exceed $3,500, for projects that demonstrate a link to the college’s strategic priorities and goals, and that show how they directly enhance the quality of learning at Hartnell. (7.43) In the first year of this program, applications were due on October 15, and in the second year, applications were due a month earlier in the fall, but in subsequent years, the grants are anticipated to run a full academic year, with applications due in the late spring and announced before June 1. The first year recipients presented their work during the August 17, 2015, flex day activities. (7.42) Five awards were made during the first year, and were announced to the college community in the President’s Weekly Report for November 7, 2014 (7.44) The 2015 awards were announced in the President’s Weekly Report for October 9, 2015. (7.58)

While these other programs were running, the committee received requests from employees to bring speakers or workshops to campus, and so the committee launched a program to provide funds for this. The Speakers, Seminars, and Workshops fund allows any employee to request funds to have professional development activities and programs brought to campus. (7.45) Those who receive funding are asked to evaluate the program and solicit participant feedback of the presentation so that the Committee can assess its usefulness for the college community. A sample participant survey and evaluation form are provided to recipients of funds. (7.46) Initially, this program funded a four-hour seminar on the Vet Net Ally Program, chronicled in the President’s Weekly Report of May 2, 2014 (7.47), and purchased a subscription to Go2Knowledge, a resource for more than a hundred online, on-demand trainings in six categories appropriate to employees in higher education (7.48). Because of the positive response to the Vet Net Ally Program, the committee voted to fund that program again during the 2014-15 academic year. (7.49) On November 20, 2015, this program hosted an introductory Habits of Mind workshop, providing refreshments for all attendees during the free, day-long workshop, sponsored by 3CSN (7.59)

The Committee began an Educator in Residence program in 2014, and hosted its first Educator in Residence during the 2014-15 academic year. The inaugural Educator in Residence was Dr. Anne Benvenuti, a professor, poet, and author, who served for 24 years as a psychology and philosophy instructor at Cerro Coso Community College. She was a co-convener of the Gender Perspectives and Mental Health Working Group of the United Nations NCO Committee on Mental Health, a trustee and UN representative for the Council for a Parliament of the World’s Religions, and her 2014 book, *Spirit Unleashed: Reimagining Human-Animal Relations* was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize for nonfiction. Dr. Benvenuti visited the campus several times throughout the spring semester, presenting public talks, staff roundtables, and student seminars on a broad range of topics that included nature and human nature, global perspectives on depression and mental health, resilience, and creativity. (7.50)

The Committee has engaged its Educator in Residence for 2015-16, Rushton Hurley, the founder and executive director of the educational nonprofit Next Vista for Learning, and is currently
working out a calendar of activities he will lead for spring 2016 that will similarly engage employees, students, and the community in a joint learning and exploration experience. During the first year of the program, a subcommittee met with the College’s Director of Communications in mid-November 2014 to plan how to roll out this program, and then Dr. Benvenuti met with key constituents in early December to launch the program. (7.51) This year’s subcommittee will use the lessons learned from that program development. Each year, this program will bring a scholar of note to campus to engage in a communal, theme-based experience that highlights our shared commitment to teaching and learning. (7.52)

In the fall of 2015, the Committee launched the First Year, First Fridays program, which is a year-long schedule of activities for employees in their first year at Hartnell to get together on the First Friday of each month to learn more about the campus, the community, and each other. (7.60) The hour-long program includes an opportunity for the new employees from across the college to meet and socialize over refreshments, hear a brief introduction to a program or programs, with presentations by current employees that usually include a tour of a program or facility, learn about opportunities to engage in community service related to the profiled programs, and ask any questions or concerns about how to navigate in their new position so as to maximize their ability to serve our students, consistent with the college’s mission, vision, and values. During the fall 2015 semester, the program introduced new employees to: the athletics program, and provided them with a calendar of all the fall sporting events; Hartnell’s resident theater company, The Western Stage, which included a tour of the theater facilities and the 2015 production calendar; the art gallery, and attended its closing reception for a show of faculty art; a new STEMART lab—science, technology, engineering, art, and math—and a presentation of the process by which Hartnell faculty came up with the proposal to develop this interdisciplinary creative space and receive funding to make it into a reality; the Library and Learning Resource Center; and the NASA Science, Engineering, Mathematics, and Aerospace Academy facility and programs on the Alisal Campus of the college. The sessions are informal and informative, and intended to help new employees feel welcome and part of a group. The spring program will include tours and presentations about the nursing and allied health programs, our foster and kinship care and related programs, student activities and government, and all of the academic support programs on campus.

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

Independent of the annual review process, the Academic Senate and the Academic Affairs Office met over the summer of 2015 to consider merging the Academic Senate’s Faculty Professional Development Committee with the college-wide Professional Development Committee. Jointly,
they prepared a proposed membership list and revised committee handbook, and a draft position
description for a special faculty assignment to co-chair this committee and perform related
functions. (7.61) In the fall of 2015, the special assignment was awarded to Dr. Janeen Whitmore,
nursing faculty member, and the larger college-wide committee took over the functions of the
Academic Senate Committee. (7.62) This merged college-wide committee planned the January
Flex Days for 2016. For the first time, the slate of activities was designed so that one room of
concurrent workshop offerings during the two flex days would be identified as being of wide-
spread interest and would be recorded and posted to the college’s website so that any employees
who were unable to attend the sessions live would still have an opportunity to benefit from the
presentations.

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

Finally, the college is scheduled to deploy the Oracle Taleo talent management system for
Human Resources that will include a performance evaluation system that is linked to
professional development opportunities and tracking. This system will help each employee take
control of their own professional development, and encourage continual dialog linking
performance and development to the continuous improvement processes of the college. This is
part of a suite of programs that will be implemented during the 2015-16 academic year,
beginning with online applications and onboarding, after which point the performance
management system will be engaged. (7.56)

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

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
7.1 AP 7150 Evaluation of Management Employees
7.2 Agenda for April 2013 managers meeting
7.3 WCL 040313 email to managers re evaluation process
7.4 CHRO email to supervisors of managers 0413
7.5 Management Evaluations Tracking 2014
7.6 TJP 092113 email to supervisors
7.7 CSEA-District CBA, Article 7
7.8 CSEA Evaluation form
7.9 L39-District CBA, Article 31
7.10 Confidential working conditions
7.11 L39 evaluation form
7.12 Confidential evaluation form
7.13 All evaluation tools are linked from the Human Resources website, in the forms section, http://www.hartnell.edu/forms-and-related-information
7.14 Email from A Marble to supervisor
7.15 Email from A Marble to supervisor
7.16 Acad and Class Evaluation and Discipline CCD Core Workbook
7.17 FRISK workshop -12-3-14
7.18 Jan 2015 Administrators meeting agenda
7.19 Classified Evals as of December 2014
7.20 HCFA-District CBA, Article 13
7.21 HCFA-District CBA, Article 14
7.22 HCFA-District CBA, Article 21B
7.23 HCFA-District CBA, appendix DE2013, DE eval process
7.24 HCFA-District CBA, article 22 Distance Education
7.25 FT Faculty EVAL 2014-2015
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7.27 Evaluation MOU Sept 20, 2013
7.28 Agenda for adjunct evaluation training on January 31, 2014
7.29 2014-15 Adjunct evals complete and projected
7.30 PDC Spring 2015 email re training
7.31 Flex Day Presentation 081613
7.32 http://www.hartnell.edu/agendas-minutes-and-documents-10
7.33 PD Committee Handbook 2013
7.34 PDC Minutes 12-16-13
7.35 PDC Survey Tool
7.36 Travel and Conference Announcement
7.37 Conference - Travel reimbursement program
7.38 Conference - Travel Application Form
7.39 President’s Weekly Report of June 6, 2014
7.40 Sponsored Travel and Conference in 2014-15
7.41 Employee Innovation Grant Announcement
7.42 Innovation Grant Program Description
7.43 Employee innovation grant application 2014-15
7.44 President’s Weekly Report of November 7, 2014
7.45 Application for Professional Development Funds
7.46 Speakers, Seminars and workshop funds program
7.47 President’s Weekly Report of May 2, 2014
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7.48 Go2Knowledge announcement
7.49 Vet Net Ally evaluation summary
7.50 Educator-in-residence calendar of events 2015
7.51 President’s Report December 5 2014
7.52 Educator-in-Residence webpage
7.53 PDcommittee_handbook_2014_revised
7.54 Professional Development Program webpage
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7.57 Classified Evaluations - January 2016
7.58 President’s Weekly Report of October 9, 2015
7.59 Habits of the Mind Nov 2015
7.60 President’s Weekly Report of October 2, 2015
7.61 Special Assignment Position Description- Flex Coordinator 2015
7.62 Professional Development Committee Handbook 2015
**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)

**Resolution and Analysis**
During 2012-13 an assessment of the college’s organizational structure was completed. In November 2012, faculty, classified staff, administrators/managers were given an opportunity to respond to survey questions pertaining to the college’s organizational structure (8.1). A total of 112 persons responded. The response rate was as follows: 60 faculty members responded, representing 53.6% of all respondents; 30 members of the classified staff responded, representing 26.8% of all respondents; and 22 administrators/managers responded, representing 19.6% of all respondents. A summary of the results of the assessment along with the actual responses to the survey were shared with the college community and posted on the college’s web site (8.2). Two themes emerged from the assessment: the need for stability in the organizational structure and the need for additional middle management positions. Results from the assessment were also presented to the Resource Allocation Committee (now the College Planning Council) in January 2013 (8.3). Based on these results and other considerations, the superintendent/president finalized the college’s organizational structure and the structure was implemented July 1, 2013 and has been updated several times since that time (8.4). As part of the revised organizational structure, the following new administrative positions have been created and filled since July 1, 2013 (8.5):

Dean of Student Affairs (Student Success)
Director of Student Affairs (Student Life)
Dean of Academic Affairs (Learning Support and Resources)
Dean of Academic Affairs (Math, Science, and Engineering)
Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness
Director of Communications, Marketing, and Public Relations
Director of Information Technology
Director of Ag Business and Technology Institute
Deputy Sector Navigator
Director of Hispanic Serving Institutions Initiatives
Director of K-12 STEM Programs
Director of Student Academic Support
Director of Student Affairs (Special Programs)
Director of Student Affairs (Department of Supportive Programs and Services)
Director of Salinas Valley Adult Education Consortium
Director of Institutional Research
Additionally, the following interim positions were filled on a permanent basis since July 1, 2013.

Vice President of Academic Affairs
Vice President of Student Affairs
Vice President of Administrative Services (retirement in December 2014, filled permanently again August 2015)

The only current administrative vacancies are the Vice President of Information Technology and the Director of Salinas Valley Adult Education Consortium. Both positions are in recruitment and currently have interim personnel. It is anticipated that the positions will be filled early in 2016.

Evidence demonstrates a stable administrative infrastructure.

**Next Steps**
None.

**Conclusion**
Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**
8.1 [Organizational Structure Survey](#)
8.2 [Report of Results from Organizational Structure Survey](#)
8.3 [Minutes from RAC meeting 1-23-2013](#)
8.4 [Organizational Structure Effective Fall 2015](#)
8.5 [Position Descriptions for New Administrative Positions](#)
Recommendation 9
In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college ensures that program review processes are ongoing, systematic, and used to assess and improve student learning, and that the college evaluate the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes. The team further recommends that the institution:
- Review and refine its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness;
- Use the results of program review to clearly and consistently link institutional planning processes to resource allocation, including physical resources.

Resolution and Analysis

Ensuring that Program Review Processes are Ongoing and Systematic
Recognizing that program planning and assessment (PPA) in the year 2012 and previous years was accomplished through comprehensive reviews undertaken on an inconsistent basis, and limited exclusively to some but not all programs within the academic affairs and student affairs divisions, the dean of institutional planning and effectiveness in fall 2013 constructed - and has been updating for each successive PPA cycle - a comprehensive inventory of designated programs, services, and departments that are required to undergo regular review (9.1). The list is based on the institution’s divisional structure encompassing the office of the superintendent/president and the divisions of academic affairs, administrative services, advancement and development/foundation, information and technology resources, and student affairs (9.2). Programs, services, and/or departments that are substantially interdependent may complete one report rather than multiple reports per advance administrative agreement; synergistic efforts, activities, outcomes and planning might otherwise be unrealistically considered and reported. The main exception to the general rule of mandatory review applies to existing grant-funded programs and services that already prepare annual reports for external agencies and other entities, and do not therefore rely on the college’s general fund for resources.

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

The systematic cycle of annual and comprehensive reviews commenced in fall 2013, has continued through spring 2014, spring 2015, and spring 2016, and is scheduled to continue through 2018 in alignment with the complete 2013-2018 period comprising the college’s
Strategic Plan. The review calendar was created in consultation with all vice presidents to ensure that each comprehensive review would be undertaken at the most appropriate juncture and yet not overwhelm a particular division in any specific year (9.5). Each year’s schedule of program reviews is updated and modified annually - by the dean of institutional planning and effectiveness in consultation with the vice presidents and academic senate president - in advance of the next calendar year’s PPA process. Regardless of whether an annual or comprehensive review is scheduled, all designated programs, services, and offices are required to submit and justify an annual action plan leading into the next applicable fiscal year. Established beginning with the spring 2016 PPA process, an exception to this rule is permitted when, in lieu of completing the PPA report, a program submits a completed report based on revitalization or discontinuance in the same academic year (9.37).

PPA report submissions for fall 2013, the first annual systematic PPA process (delayed from spring 2013), showed great overall success, as 58 of 59 required annual reviews were completed, and 13 of 17 required comprehensive reviews were completed, for a grand total of 71 or 93% of the 76 required reviews (9.6). As for non-compliance, one academic program failed to submit a minimally acceptable annual review, and one office and three services failed to submit acceptable comprehensive reviews.

PPA report submissions for spring 2014 also showed good success, as 53 of 59 required annual reviews were completed, and 16 of 22 required comprehensive reviews were completed, representing a grand total of 69 or 85% of the 81 required reviews (9.7). Three academic programs, two programs/services, and one office failed to submit minimally acceptable annual reviews, and three academic programs and three offices failed to submit acceptable comprehensive reviews. Despite a multiple month extension in accepting PPA reports from divisions, the completion rate for the spring 2014 cycle may have been impacted adversely by the requirement that participants submit two reviews within the same academic year. Nonetheless, a report listing participants who contributed to their respective PPA reports shows roughly similar overall participation in fall 2013 and spring 2014 (9.8, 9.9).

PPA report submissions for spring 2015 showed a similar level of success to the fall 2013 cycle, as 49 of 52 required annual reviews were completed, and 27 of 30 required comprehensive reviews were completed, for a grand total of 76 or 93% of the 82 required reviews (9.38). This latter percentage matches the completion rate for the fall 2013 cycle; also worth noting is the fact that the number of comprehensive reviews completed in spring 2015 (27) was more than twice the number completed in fall 2013 (13). Another multiple month extension in accepting PPA reports from divisions was provided, however, subsequent to the initially designated period in spring for submissions. As for non-compliance, three non-instructional programs failed to submit minimally acceptable annual reviews, and two academic programs and one office failed to submit acceptable comprehensive reviews.
Ensuring that Program Review Processes are Used to Assess and Improve Student Learning

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

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

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

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

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

Three cycles of systematic program review have been experienced thus far (fall 2013, spring 2014, and spring 2015). Although the unavailability of software for fully implementing
streamlined and automated procedures continues to detract from the ability to assess potential impact on achievement and learning outcomes, for three consecutive PPA cycles, manual reports—one for academic programs, the other for non-instructional programs—have been produced for selected items in the PPA report template so that responses across programs can be reviewed for specific items of interest (9.20, 9.21, 9.39, 9.40). These manual reports represent an ongoing opportunity to gain a broad-based view regarding results found and actions taken across various programs and services. Also, starting with 2014 PPA reports in November 2014 and continuing with 2015 PPA reports in October 2015, the posting of completed program review documents to the college website allows information to be shared among all programs, divisions and constituent groups (9.22). In fact, according to the fall 2013 Information and Technology Resources Annual Action Plan, it was intended that deploying the new website would “provide better… information access” (9.23). The posting of PPA reports is therefore an example of how program review has supported the achievement of a service area outcome.

Review and Refinement of Program Review Processes to Improve Institutional Effectiveness

Program review processes have been reviewed and refined to improve institutional effectiveness. The resulting continuous improvement processes for annual program planning and assessment (9.3) and comprehensive program review (9.4) are prominent examples of this systematic approach. Additionally, evaluations of and expectations for integrated planning at the college from 2010 through 2015 (9.24), and more recently through 2016 (9.41), provide evidence of enhanced institutional effectiveness in key process features associated with program review.

Following is a list of specific improvements implemented, or anticipated to be implemented, from 2010 through spring 2016:

- Scheduling of comprehensive reviews
- Scheduling of annual reviews
- Consistency of items across PPA templates
- Incorporation of revisions to ACCJC standards
- Planning horizon for budget requests
- Long term planning linked to PPA process
- Justification for budget requests—link to Strategic Plan
- Completed PPA reports
- Consistency in PPA report responses
- Central housing of PPA reports
- Governance role—oversight of results
- Governance role—budget recommendations
- PPA linked to budget development
- Software for making budget requests
- Information flow—PPA reports to budget decisions
- PPA process automation
- PPA process linked to annual budget calendar
- Timeline of activities for complete process
- Amount of time to complete PPA reports
In fall 2015, with the assistance of a faculty program planning and assessment (PPA) specialist (9.42), substantial improvements were vetted and made to the PPA templates and the PPA timeline in advance of the spring 2016 PPA cycle. Equally promising is the enhanced prospect for a successful pilot program to implement software automation, starting with the spring 2016 PPA cycle. These improvements most notably include:

- Streamlined templates with clarified items (9.43, 9.44, 9.45).
- More effective timing of activities in the PPA process, especially an increase from two to three months for the completion of PPA reports, and elimination of redundant requests from governance oversight and consideration for the next fiscal year based on knowledge of requests funded in the current fiscal year budget (9.46).
- The targeting of nine (9) participating academic and non-instructional programs encompassing both annual and comprehensive reviews for the purpose of testing eLumen software for program review in lieu of requiring Word documents (9.47), thereby strengthening the probability of a complete rollout to all programs and non-instructional programs in the spring 2017 PPA cycle (9.48).

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

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

Implementation of the new governance and planning model during the 2013-14 academic year was integral to effecting greater transparency in the program planning and assessment (PPA) process. This model also provided specific vehicles - governance councils - to help ensure that program, service, and office planning is ultimately tied to budget development, funding decisions, and resource allocation. For example, while planning for budget development for fiscal year 2014-15, the Academic Affairs Council approved a PPA summary and prioritization list for the Academic Affairs division, including full-time faculty priorities, at its meeting on November 13, 2013 (9.26); the summary and prioritization list was then forwarded to the College Planning Council for its consideration. The Student Affairs Council approved the priority faculty and resource requests from the Student Affairs division at its meeting on November 26, 2013 (9.27). The College Planning Council, in turn, voted to recommend approval of prioritized resource allocation requests across all divisions at its April 2, 2014 meeting (9.28, 9.29). These governance activities substantially followed the timeline for the fall 2013 PPA process leading into FY 2014-15 (9.30). The superintendent/president issued a communication following the governing board’s approval of the FY 2014-15 budget (9.31). The loop in the planning/budgeting/resource allocation process was effectively communicated as closed one year later with the superintendent/president’s issuance of an email with an attachment that documented FY 2014-15 resource allocation expenditures (9.49, 9.50).
In another example relevant for the spring 2014 PPA process, at its meeting on October 8, 2014, the Academic Affairs Council approved the PPA resource requests for the Academic Affairs division to be moved forward to the College Planning Council, and full-time faculty priorities to be moved forward to the Academic Senate’s Full-Time Faculty Hiring Committee (9.32). The College Planning Council was initially presented with resource allocation requests across all divisions at its November 5, 2014 meeting (9.33, 9.34). These governance activities followed the timeline for the spring 2014 PPA process leading into FY 2015-16 (9.19). As had occurred in the prior year for the previous (fall 2013) PPA process, the superintendent/president issued a communication following the governing board’s approval of the FY 2015-16 budget (9.51); the attachments documented one-time resource allocation and personnel funding decisions (9.52, 9.53).

Finally, with respect to facilities planning, review of the Facilities Master Plan at a series of governance meetings represented multiple opportunities to consider future space/physical needs, and to incorporate these needs into the strategic planning process (9.35, 9.36).

**Next Steps**

None.

**Conclusion**

Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

9.1 [Inventory of Programs, Services & Offices Designated for Review-Starting Fall 2013 or Later](#)
9.2 [Organizational Chart for Hartnell Community College District](#)
9.3 [Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
9.4 [Comprehensive Program Review – Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
9.6 [Number of Program Reviews Completed – Fall 2013](#)
9.7 [Number of Program Reviews Completed – Spring 2014 (Revised)](#)
9.8 [Contributors to Academic Program Reviews – Fall 2013 & Spring 2014](#)
9.9 [Contributors to Non-Instructional Program Reviews – Fall 2013 & Spring 2014](#)
9.10 [Academic PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)
9.11 [Non-Instructional PPA Report Template – Spring 2014](#)
9.12 [Academic Affairs Council Handbook](#)
9.13 [Administrative Services Council Handbook](#)
9.15 [Facilities Development Council Handbook](#)
9.16 [Student Affairs Council Handbook](#)
9.17 [Technology Development Council Handbook](#)
9.18 [College Planning Council Handbook](#)
9.19 Timeline for 2014 PPA Process
9.20 Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014
9.21 Non-Instructional PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014
9.22 Access to 2014 Program Planning and Assessment Reports
9.23 Information and Technology Resources Annual Action Plan - fall 2013
9.24 Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning 2010-2015
9.25 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 6, 2013
9.26 Minutes for Academic Affairs Council Meeting November 13, 2013
9.27 Minutes for Student Affairs Council Meeting November 26, 2013
9.28 Program Review Resource Requests for FY 2014-15
9.29 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting April 2, 2014
9.30 Timeline for 2013 PPA Process
9.31 2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent - President September 5, 2014
9.32 Minutes for Academic Affairs Council Meeting October 8, 2014
9.33 Program Review Resource Requests for FY 2015-16
9.34 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014
9.35 Draft Facilities Master Plan
9.36 Timeline for Approval of Facilities Master Plan
9.38 Number of Program Reviews Completed - Spring 2015
9.39 Academic PPA Reports by Items - Spring 2015
9.40 Non-Instructional PPA Reports by Items - Spring 2015
9.41 Integrated Planning - Continuous Improvement 2010-2016
9.42 Position Description for PPA Specialist
9.43 Draft Revised Academic PPA Template November 20, 2015
9.44 Draft Revised Non-Instructional PPA Template November 20, 2015
9.45 Timeline for PPA Template Improvement
9.46 Draft Timeline for 2016 PPA Process
9.47 Programs in eLumen Pilot - Spring 2016
9.48 Rollout of eLumen for Program Review
9.49 Email on FY 2014-15 Resource Allocations
9.50 FY 2014-15 Resource Allocation Expenditures
9.51 Email on FY 2015-16 Funding Decisions
9.52 FY 2015-16 Resource Allocation Requests
9.53 FY 2015-16 Funding Decisions - Personnel
**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.)

**Resolution and Analysis**
A review calendar for all board policies (BPs) and administrative procedures (APs) was developed during 2012-13 and this calendar is updated each year. This calendar includes all BPs and APs, not just those related to human resources and business services (10.1). Board Policy 2410 - Board Policies and Administrative Procedures was approved by the governing board on December 10, 2013 (10.2, 10.3). Administrative Procedure 2410 - Board Policies and Administrative Procedures was recommended for approval by the College Planning Council (CPC) on November 6, 2013, and approved by the superintendent/president on November 6, 2013 (10.4, 10.5). The review process outlined in AP 2410 involves review of all BPs and APs by all constituent groups and the newly established governance councils. A tracking form has been developed and implemented to record input from constituent groups and governance councils and to document the action taken by various constituent groups and councils (10.6). Per BP and AP 2410, following input and review by all constituent groups and appropriate councils, the CPC will make final recommendations to the superintendent/president, who will then take the BP and AP forward to the governing board. The governing board considers approving each BP, and the APs go forward to the governing board as information items. Since July 1, 2013, 22 BPs have been either updated or created and 38 APs have been either updated or created.

**Next Steps**
Complete review of board policies and administrative procedures identified for review during 2013-14. All BPs and APs will be reviewed over a 5 year period (2013-2018). A group of BPs and APs will selected for review each year.

**Conclusion**
Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**
10.1 Policy and Procedure Review Schedule as of 2015-16
10.2 BP 2410
10.3 Agenda and Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting December 13, 2013
10.4 AP 2410
10.5 Minutes of CPC meeting November 6, 2013
10.6 BP-AP Routing Form (Part of AP 2410)
Recommendation 11
To fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the college implement and evaluate a governance model and establish a key participatory governance group to provide an avenue for meaningful input into decision-making including but not limited to resource allocation.

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

The new governance model was shared with the college community at a Town Hall meeting in May 2013 (11.5) and the revised governance structure was implemented in Fall 2013 (11.6). A website for all governance councils has been established so that all employees, students, and the community have access to council meeting calendars, agendas, actions, and documents (11.7). A master meeting calendar of all councils was established to enhance the coordination of the work of these groups (11.8).

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

In fall 2015 an additional governance council was established; the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Council. The purpose of the council is to recommend goals, standards, and benchmarks for institutional effectiveness in alignment with the college’s strategic goals; to promote best practices for the conduct of research and utilization of data at the college; and to propose sustainable approaches aimed at the continuous improvement of integrated planning and institutional effectiveness.

The methods and procedures for assessing effectiveness of the governance councils were approved by the College Planning Council at its April 23, 2014, meeting (11.10, 11.11). Additionally, the College Planning Council (CPC) utilized an instrument that captures the activity of the CPC in terms of its alignment with the duties and responsibilities of the CPC listed in its handbook (11.12). Lastly, the overall Governance System/Model has been assessed for
effectiveness through a survey sent to members of all councils (11.13). The following councils conducted an assessment of effectiveness utilizing the instruments previously mentioned. Each council discussed the results of the assessments, and the CPC discussed the results from the overall assessment of governance effectiveness. Each council provided a summary of those discussions along with recommendations for improving its effectiveness for 2013-14 and 2014-15.

Academic Affairs Council (11.14)  
Administrative Services Council (11.15)  
Accreditation Council (11.16)  
Advancement Council (11.17)  
College Planning Council (11.18)  
Facilities Development Council (11.19)  
Student Affairs Council (11.20)  
Technology Development Council (11.21)  
Overall Governance Effectiveness (11.22)

All Councils review improvement recommendations each year and consider improvements based on the assessments. Progress toward improvement becomes part of the assessment of governance effectiveness when each Council conducts its annual assessment at the end of the year. For example, the CPC reviewed results from the assessment of CPC effectiveness and overall governance effectiveness in May 2014 and again in October 2014. A theme emerged from this review and discussion; communication of CPC actions. Constituent representatives serving on CPC are well-informed and engaged in governance. However, keeping the college community informed about governance activity and actions remains a challenge. In an effort to improve communication, the CPC acted to approve the broad distribution of a “highlights” report that summarizes CPC activity and actions (11.35). The highlights documents are posted to the CPC website and all employees will receive a notice when they are posted (11.36, 11.37). A result of the 2014-15 assessment of overall governance effectiveness revealed that “training” related to governance was rated low by respondents. As a result, every governance council provided an orientation to all council members as part of the first meetings of the 2015-16 academic year (11.38).

All councils have avenues for meaningful input into the budget development and resource allocation recommendations. At its February 5, 2014, meeting, the CPC approved all of the following documents and processes that guide budget development and resource allocation that are part of the annual integrated planning processes (11.23). Several of these documents are examples for a particular cycle of integrated planning to illustrate the process.

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

Additionally, the “Faculty Hiring Committee”, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, brings forward to the CPC its recommendations in terms of the prioritization of faculty positions for the subsequent year (11.34). The CPC takes action to approve the forwarding of the Committee’s recommendations to the superintendent/president (11.39). The superintendent/president then reports back to the CPC after decisions have been made about full-time faculty positions for the subsequent year (11.33).

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
11.1 Report from Governance Planning Retreat November 19, 2012
11.2 Agendas Minutes Documents for Governance Planning Task Force
11.3 Governance Model
11.4 Handbooks for Governance Councils
11.5 Town Hall Presentation May 22, 2013 on Planning and Governance
11.6 Fall Flex Day Presentation August 16, 2013, announces implementation plan
11.7 Governance Web Site
11.8 Governance Councils Master Meeting Calendar
11.9 College Planning Council Handbook
11.10 Sample of Instrument for Assessing Council Effectiveness
11.11 Minutes of CPC Meeting April 23, 2014
11.12 Inventory of CPC Agenda Items-Responsibilities 2013-14
11.13 Instrument for Assessing Overall Governance Effectiveness
11.14 Academic Affairs Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.15 Administrative Services Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.16 Accreditation Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.17 Advancement Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.18 CPC - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.19 Facilities Development Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.20 Student Affairs Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.21 Technology Development Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.22 Overall Governance Model/System- Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness
11.23 Minutes of CPC Meeting February 5, 2014
11.24 Timeline for 2013 PPA Process
11.25 Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15
11.26 Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes
11.27 Timeline for 2014 PPA Process
11.28 Annual Budget Development Calendar
11.29 Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 - 12-11-13
11.30 Annual Program Planning & Assessment - Components of Continuous Improvement
11.31 Comprehensive Program Review - Components of Continuous Improvement
11.32 Integrated Planning Model Diagram
11.33 Minutes for CPC Meeting April 15, 2015
11.34 Recommendations from Faculty Hiring Committee for 2015-16
11.35 Minutes of CPC Meeting October 15, 2014
11.36 Highlights of CPC Meeting October 15, 2014
11.37 Communication to Campus - Highlights of October 15, 2014 CPC Meeting
11.38 Minutes for CPC Meeting September 2, 2015
11.39 Minutes of CPC Meeting December 17, 2014
Recommendation 12
In order to meet standards, the team recommends that:

- Each board member adhere to the Governing Board's Ethics policy;
- The board self-evaluation continues to be done with full participation of each board member. (Standards IV.B.1.a-j; IV.B.2.a-e)

Resolution and Analysis
The governing board has established Board Policy 1055 on ethical conduct (12.1). The policy includes statements about ethical conduct expectations and procedures for handling alleged ethical conduct violations. The Board of Trustees has utilized BP 1055 to address two alleged ethical conduct violations by governing board members. In June of 2011, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution issuing a warning to two governing board members as a result of violations of BP 1055 (12.2). In August of 2008, the Board of Trustees discussed an alleged violation of BP 1055, but no action was taken (12.3). Adherence to BP 1055 is demonstrated by using the board policy to address alleged ethics violations. There have been no alleged violations of ethical conduct since 2011.

The Governing Board has completed the following self-evaluations beginning in 2013.

January 2013
- Minutes of January 15, 2013 meeting (12.4)
- Survey results (12.5)

May 2013
- Minutes of May 28, 2013 meeting (12.6)
- Survey results from May 28, 2013 Self-Evaluation (12.7)
- Summary of self-evaluation (12.8)
- Minutes of August 6, 2013, follow-up (12.9)

May 2014
- Minutes of May 20, 2014 (12.10)
- Survey results (12.11)
- Inventory of meeting agenda items linkage to strategic plan and accreditation standards (12.12)
- Summary of self-evaluation (12.13)

June 2015
- Minutes of June 16, 2015 (12.14)
- Survey results (12.15)
- Inventory of meeting agenda items linkage to strategic plan and accreditation standards (12.16)
- Summary of self-evaluation (12.17)
- Minutes of July 21, 2015, follow-up (12.18)
Beginning in May 2013 the self-evaluation process has included a linkage to the strategic plan and accreditation standards. Every Governing Board meeting agenda item has a link to the strategic plan and a link to accreditation standards (12.19). As part of the self-evaluation process the Governing Board reviews the inventory of meeting agenda items which gives the Governing Board a quantitative view of how it is spending its time related to the strategic plan and accreditation standards. For three of four self-evaluations there has been 100% participation of Governing Board members in completing the survey. For the actual meetings where the self-evaluations are conducted, there has been 100% participation in the meetings.

Two concrete examples of how self-evaluation has led to improved effectiveness of the Governing Board are provided. An outcome of the May 2013 self-evaluation revealed a desire to explore utilization of technology in managing meetings and conducting the business of the District in an effort to provide ease of access to materials and to cut down on the use of paper (sustainability, eco-friendly). As a result of this self-evaluation item the District adopted the use of BoardDocs in April 2014, a software solution for managing Governing Board meetings. This implementation resulted in considerable savings from not printing/duplicating materials and also provided greater access to meeting agendas and materials. An outcome of the June 2015 self-evaluation identified the need to clarify how items can be placed on the agenda by Governing Board members. This resulted in the adoption of BP 2340: Agendas at the December 8, 2015 meeting which provides clear procedures for placing an item on the agenda (12.20).

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation

12.1 BP 1055 - Ethical Conduct of the Governing Board
12.2 Board of Trustees Resolution June 2011 (Docs re: BOT warning resolution)
12.3 Board of Trustees Ethics Discussion August 2008 (page 5)
12.4 Board of Trustees Meeting January 15, 2013 Minutes
12.5 Survey Results from January 15, 2013 Self-Evaluation
12.6 Board of Trustees Meeting May 28, 2013 Minutes
12.7 Survey Results from May 28, 2013 Self-Evaluation
12.8 Summary of May 28, 2013 Self-Evaluation
12.9 Board of Trustees Meeting August 6, 2013 Minutes, follow-up
12.10 Board of Trustees Meeting May 20, 2014 Minutes
12.11 Survey Results from May 20, 2014 Self-Evaluation
12.12 Inventory of Meeting Agenda Items Linkage to Strategic Plan and Accreditation Standards 2013-14
12.13 Summary of Self-Evaluation May 20, 2014
12.14 Board of Trustees Meeting June 16, 2015 Minutes
12.15 Survey Results from June 16, 2015 Self-Evaluation
12.16 Inventory of Meeting Agenda Items Linkage to Strategic Plan and Accreditation Standards 2014-15
12.18 Board of Trustees Meeting July 21, 2015 Minutes, follow-up
12.19 Board of Trustees Agenda Item October 6, 2015
12.20 Board of Trustees Agenda Item December 8, 2015
Response to Self-Identified Improvement Plans

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

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

Resolution and Analysis:
The response to Recommendation 1 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 1 had been resolved.

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

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

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

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation:
I.B.1 Strategic Plan 2013-2018
I.B.3 The linking of the budget development to the systematic program review process was successful with instructional programs in developing the budget for fiscal year 2012-13. The college Vice Presidents, working within the participatory governance structure, will be responsible for implementing this to all other operational areas of the college in developing the budget for the 2013-14 fiscal year.

Resolution and Analysis:
The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. (I.B.2) (I.B.3)

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation:
I.B.2 Recommendation 2
I.B.3 Recommendation 9
I.B.4 The linking of the budget development to the systematic program review process was successful with instructional programs in developing the budget for fiscal year 2012-13. The college Vice Presidents, working within the participatory governance structure, will be responsible for implementing this to all other operational areas of the college in developing the budget for the 2013-14 fiscal year.

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

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation:
I.B.4 Recommendation 2
I.B.5 Recommendation 9
I.B.6 The college Vice Presidents, working within the participatory governance structure, will fully implement the integrated planning and resource allocation processes in budgeting for the 2013-14 fiscal year. This will include developing methods for assessing the effectiveness of those processes.

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

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation:
I.B.6 Recommendation 2
I.B.7 Recommendation 3
I.B.8 Recommendation 9
I.B.7 During the 2012-13 academic year the college Vice Presidents, working within the participatory governance structure, will be responsible for more fully developing and implementing procedures for assessing the effectiveness of evaluation mechanisms necessary for improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Resolution and Analysis:
The responses to Recommendations 3 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. (I.B.9) (I.B.10)

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation:
I.B.9 Recommendation 3
I.B.10 Recommendation 9
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation:
II.A.1 CC Minutes 12-5-13
II.A.2 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013
II.A.3 Recommendation 2
II.A.4 Recommendation 9
II.A.1.a During the 2012-13 academic year, the Superintendent/President, interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness and college planning subcommittees will consider the need for additional research to update the *Salinas Valley Vision 2020 Project* to contribute to an updated *Educational and Facilities Master Plan*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Next Steps:**
None.

**Conclusion:**
Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation:**
II.A.5 [Strategic Plan 2013-2018](#)
II.A.6 [Community Research_Environmental Scanning - Components of Continuous Improvement](#)
II.A.7 [Draft Facilities Master Plan](#)
II.A.8 [Strategic Planning Advisory Group Handbook](#)
II.A.9 [Strategic Planning Advisory Group Membership December 2014](#)
II.A.10 [Notes of Strategic Planning Advisory Group Meeting April 9, 2014](#)
II.A.11 [Agenda for Strategic Planning Advisory Group Meeting December 4, 2014](#)
II.A.12 [Institutional Data Analyst Job Description](#)
II.A.13 [Survey Results on Data Needs for Academic PPA Reports](#)
II.A.14 [Recommendation 4](#)
II.A.1.b College Administration working in collaboration with the Distance Education Committee will take steps to plan and implement student and instructor evaluation procedures for distance education courses during the 2012-13 academic year.

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

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

Resolution and Analysis
All faculty members teaching online courses were evaluated according to the “Agreement Between Hartnell Community College District And Hartnell College Faculty Association/CTA/NEA For 2013-16.”

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

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

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

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

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

- An online template allowing DE students to complete a student appraisal of their course identical to the face-to-face appraisal was developed and implemented for those classes whose instructors were being evaluated, as of spring 2014.

- The student survey results will be reviewed by a newly hired DE Specialist whose recommendations will be discussed with the DE coordinator, DE Committee, and the VP of Academic Affairs. Subsequent requests for funding of training in addition to that posted by the Professional Development Center will be forwarded to the Professional Development Committee.

- The template surveying DE faculty about questions asked in the annual CCCCO report was developed by the Instructional Technologist and presented to the DE Committee at its November 2014 meeting. It is to be administered to all online instructors on an annual basis.

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

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.15 HCFA Appendix DE2013(4.46)
II.A.16 Hartnell College Mail - Assessment Workshop Using Online Technologies
II.A.17 HCFA-District CBA appendix DE2013, DE eval process
II.A.18 Academic PPA Report Template—Spring 2014
II.A.19 Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014
II.A.1.c  The SLO and PPA Committees will evaluate and refine the assessment process and timelines for course-, program-, and institutional-level SLOs during the 2012-13 academic year.

The Student Learning Outcome Assessment (SLO) and Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) committees began combining efforts from fall 2010 through spring 2013 because of the overlap of processes and committee members. As a result, assessment processes including methodology and timelines were addressed collectively by both committees.

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

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

The pilot group met regularly during the fall 2014 semester to develop mastery of eLumen and to create training materials in several modalities (II.A.25, II.A.27, II.A.28, II.A.29, II.A.30); in addition, this group developed a training schedule with 15 individual time slots for both full-time and adjunct faculty (II.A.20, II.A.24). Implementation began on a small scale basis in fall 2014 with a wider implementation in spring 2015. In January, approximately 10 percent of faculty received training (in addition to pilot faculty); by the end of spring 2015, approximately 88 percent of full-time faculty participated in eLumen training and entered calendared assessments from fall 2014.

While the course and program summary forms through fall 2014 remain housed on the internal shared drive (II.A.21, II.A.26) faculty members currently enter assessment data and complete Action Plans in eLumen. Faculty members have assessed or reassessed most courses taught in Fall 2013, Spring 2014, and Fall 2014 and have aggregated assessment results from multiple section courses. As a result, the number of active courses assessed has increased from 71 percent to 80 percent. In addition, faculty members have engaged in broad-based discussion to examine results, to discuss potential modifications, and to use course-level assessment data to assess at
least one program-level outcome (II.A.26). Program-level outcomes will again be assessed in spring 2016. Survey results from the Third Annual Student Success Conference Day were analyzed and training sessions were provided (II.A.22, II.A.23).

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

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

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

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.20 Instructions for Core Competency Survey Activity (8.14)
II.A.21 Course Outcome Assessment Report Samples
II.A.22 3rd Annual Student Success Conference (Flex Day) Agenda 1.16-17.14
II.A.23 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation
II.A.24 Side-by Side Comparison document
II.A.25 Elumen PPT
II.A.26 Program Outcome Assessment Report Samples
II.A.27 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 1
II.A.28 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 2
II.A.29 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 3
II.A.30 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 4
II.A.2 The interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will collaborate with the Student Learning Outcomes and Program Planning and Assessment Committees to review the current assessment processes of all courses and programs, including those courses delivered by Distance Education modalities. This review will identify additional research tools and data that may be integrated into the regular program review of all courses and programs. The process and timeline will be determined during the strategic planning process that will be completed by June 2013.

Resolution and Analysis:
In fall 2013, the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness conferred with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and separately with the Dean of South County Education Services/Distance Education and the Distance Education Committee Chair to discuss the gap in both student success and retention between online (DE) and face-to-face (F2F) courses. It was determined that disaggregated success and retention data for students in DE and F2F classes would be provided to discipline faculty members for their review, starting in Spring 2014 with the second annual program planning and assessment (PPA) cycle. The data was integrated into the program review process, and the academic PPA template was revised to incorporate items allowing for faculty members response to the disaggregated data (II.A.31, II.A.32).

Comprehensive data on enrollment, success and retention rates have been compiled for all online courses taught between Fall 2010 and Spring 2014 and are being analyzed by discipline deans and the newly hired DE Specialist. The communication among adjunct and full-time DE faculty members has been increased through a survey sent out to all on their current practices and information shared on progress made with policies pertaining to DE (II.A.33, II.A.34).

The DE Specialist is working with the Dean IPE on aligning the DE Plan with strategic priorities defined by Hartnell College. Minutes of monthly DE meetings are posted and shared on the dedicated DE Committee web page (II.A.35). The DE Committee now also has a student representative in its membership.

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

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

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

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

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.31 Academic PPA Report Template—Spring 2014
II.A.32 Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014
II.A.33 Current DE Practices Survey
II.A.34 DE Policies Progress
II.A.35 Sample DE Minutes
II.A.2.a By Spring 2013, the SLO and PPA Committees will collaborate with the interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness to review the program evaluation process and forms to ensure that program needs are being expressed and supported with sufficient data and evidence to justify budget expenditures.

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

Resolution and Analysis
The responses to Recommendations 2, 9, and 11 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. (II.A.36) (II.A.37) (II.A.38)

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation:
II.A.36 Recommendation 2
II.A.37 Recommendation 9
II.A.38 Recommendation 11
II.A.2.e The interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will collaborate with the Student Learning Outcomes and Program Planning and Assessment Committees to review the current assessment processes of all courses and programs. This review will identify additional research tools and data that may be integrated into the regular program review of all courses and programs and the college budget and master education/facilities planning process. The process and timeline will be determined during the strategic planning process that will be completed by June 2013.

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

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.39 Recommendation 2
II.A.40 Recommendation 9
II.A.2.f The interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness will collaborate with the Student Learning Outcomes and Program Planning and Assessment Committees to review the current assessment processes of all courses and programs. This review will identify additional research tools and data that may be integrated into the regular program review of all courses and programs and the college budget and master education/facilities plans. The process and timeline will be determined during the strategic planning process that will be completed by June 2013.

Resolution and Analysis:
The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 address this planning agenda item. (II.A.41) (II.A.42)

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.41 Recommendation 2
II.A.42 Recommendation 9
II.A.3.a The Curriculum Committee will review procedures and criteria for acceptance of
courses into general education by Fall 2013.

Resolution and Analysis:
The Articulation Officer reviews courses for inclusion into general education categories. BP
4025 (Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education) was discussed
during the Curriculum Committee meeting on November 1, 2012, (II.A.44), and approved by the
Academic Senate on February 26, 2013, (II.A.45). BP 4025 was approved by the Board of
Trustees on July 7, 2015. (II.A.43)

AP 4025 was developed in October 2014, and was moved through the shared governance process
and approved by the Superintendent/President on May 26, 2015. (II.A.46)

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.43 BP 4025 (Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education)
II.A.44 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012
II.A.45 Senate Minutes Approved 2-26-13
II.A.46 AP 4025 (Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education)
II.A.3.c  By Spring 2013, the Program Planning and Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes Committees will review the core competencies and their associated performance indicators. The PPA and SLO Committees will collaborate with the interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness to review the current assessment processes of all core competencies; this review will identify additional research tools and data that may be integrated into the systematic review of all core competencies.

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

In fall 2013, the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee discussed and approved a new name, the Outcomes & Assessment (O&A) Committee (II.A.50). This new name better reflects the role of the Committee to support outcome development and assessment across the college. This O&A Committee now has the support of two experienced faculty members serving in outcomes and assessments specialist positions, which includes the role of committee chair (II.A.52). The specialists report to the Dean of Academic Affairs, Languages, Learning Support, and Resources (LLS&R), thus creating a stronger infrastructure to support assessment activities. Both specialists work with faculty members and staff in outcome development and assessment in instructional and non-instructional areas as well implementing the transition to eLumen (II.A.54).

Additionally, in October 2013, the Committee assessed its membership, purpose, and committee responsibilities and made revisions to the Outcomes & Assessment Handbook to better align with the College’s commitment to involve all constituencies in outcome assessment and improvement (II.A.53). The Outcomes & Assessment Handbook was approved by the Committee and by the Academic Senate (II.A.51).

All core competencies (institutional outcomes) were assessed (and some reassessed) in spring 2014. On May 30, 2014, the second Graduation Survey was administered to 260 students at graduation rehearsal. This survey included the original 10 questions from the 2012 Graduation Survey as well as 15 questions that were supplements to the CCSSE survey conducted in Spring 2014 (II.A.48). The O&A Committee and chair, the Dean of IPE, and the Dean of LLS&R collaborated on the selection of questions to be included in the Graduation Survey. Discussion and analysis of results among faculty members occurred during the College’s Fall 2014 Convocation in August (II.A.47). This activity involved small group, across-discipline discussion and analysis of survey results by full-time and part-time faculty members. Each group selected a recorder, who was responsible for entering the group’s responses to discussion prompts provided in a Google Document (II.A.49). These results have been discussed in the O&A Committee and will be shared with faculty members during the spring 2015 semester to include in assessment discussions and analysis. The O&A Committee is discussing administering the next (2016)
Graduation Survey and is collaborating with the Office of Student Life for planning and implementation.

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

**Conclusion**
Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**

II.A.47 Fall Convocation agenda (8.15.14)
II.A.48 Core competencies-CCSSE survey results (convocation f14)
II.A.49 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation
II.A.50 O&A Minutes 11.25.13 - (O&A Committee Approval)
II.A.51 Academic Senate Minutes
II.A.52 Assessment Specialist Position Description
II.A.53 Outcomes and Assessment Committee Handbook Template v2
II.A.54 O&A Emails to Faculty Members
II.A.4 The Curriculum Committee will encourage the further development of AA-T and AS-T degrees.

Resolution and Analysis:
The Curriculum Committee Chair and Articulation Officer presented Flex Day activities regarding C-ID descriptors and development of transfer model curricula (TMC) on January 17, 2013. (II.A.55) Since that date, the Curriculum Committee Chair, Deans of Academic Affairs, and Articulation Officer have engaged in ongoing communication with discipline faculty members concerning specific issues in developing their respective AA-T and AS-T degrees.

During the 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-2015 academic years, 18 new AA-T and AS-T degrees had been approved by Curriculum Committee, Hartnell College Board of Trustees and the CCC Chancellor’s office, including:
- Associate in Science in Administration of Justice for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Science in Business Administration for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Arts in Communication Studies for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Science in Early Childhood Education for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Arts in Elementary Teacher Education for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in English for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Science in Mathematics for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Science in Physics for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Arts in Political Science for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Psychology for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Sociology for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Studio Arts for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Kinesiology for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Theatre Arts for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in History for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Spanish for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Economics for Transfer Degree (AA-T)
- Associate in Arts in Music for Transfer Degree (AA-T)

(II.A.84) (II.A.85) (II.A.86) (II.A.87) (II.A.93)

In addition, three more degrees were approved during the Fall 2015 semester:
- Associate in Arts in Biology for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Arts in Chemistry for Transfer Degree (AS-T)
- Associate in Arts in Geology for Transfer Degree (AS-T)

(II.A.88) (II.A.89) (II.A.90) (II.A.91) (II.A.92)
The Curriculum Committee and Deans of Academic Affairs continue to encourage further development of AA-T and AS-T degrees. The Articulation Officer is a member of the curriculum committee and will continue working with faculty members to develop additional degrees for transfer.

Next Steps
The Curriculum Committee and Deans of Academic Affairs continue to encourage further development of AA-T and AS-T degrees in new disciplines for which no associate degrees were offered at Hartnell.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.55 Flex Day Agenda for January 17, 2013
II.A.56 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012
II.A.57 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013
II.A.58 CC minutes 11-21-13
II.A.59 CC minutes 3-6-14 approved
II.A.60 CC minutes 05-15-14 (History)
II.A.61 Board minutes 06-03-14 (History)
II.A.62 CC minutes 10-16-14 (Spanish)
II.A.63 Board minutes 11-04-14 (Spanish)
II.A.64 CC minutes 12-04-14 (Economics)
II.A.65 Board minutes 01-13-15 (Economics)
II.A.84 CC minutes 11-20-14 (Music)
II.A.85 Board minutes 12-09-14 (Music)
II.A.86 CC minutes 03-27-14 (Theatre Arts)
II.A.87 Board minutes 05-06-14 (Theatre Arts)
II.A.88 CC minutes 10-15-15 (Biology)
II.A.89 Board minutes 11-10-15 (Biology)
II.A.90 CC minutes 11-05-15 (Chemistry)
II.A.91 CC minutes 11-19-15 (Geology)
II.A.92 Board minutes 12-08-15 (Chemistry & Geology)
II.A.93 Board minutes 04-08-14 (Kinesiology)
II.A.6.a The Curriculum Committee and Dean of Curriculum and Instructional Support will work with the Articulation Officer and discipline faculty to develop additional degrees for transfer by Spring 2013.

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

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.55 Flex Day Agenda for January 17, 2013
II.A.56 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012
II.A.57 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013
II.A.58 CC minutes 11-21-13
II.A.59 CC minutes 3-6-14 approved
II.A.60 CC minutes 05-15-14 (History)
II.A.61 Board minutes 06-03-14 (History)
II.A.62 CC minutes 10-16-14 (Spanish)
II.A.63 Board minutes 11-04-14 (Spanish)
II.A.64 CC minutes 12-04-14 (Economics)
II.A.65 Board minutes 01-13-15 (Economics)
II.A.84 CC minutes 11-20-14 (Music)
II.A.85 Board minutes 12-09-14 (Music)
II.A.86 CC minutes 03-27-14 (Theatre Arts)
II.A.87 Board minutes 05-06-14 (Theatre Arts)
II.A.88 CC minutes 10-15-15 (Biology)
II.A.89 Board minutes 11-10-15 (Biology)
II.A.90 CC minutes 11-05-15 (Chemistry)
II.A.91 CC minutes 11-19-15 (Geology)
II.A.92 Board minutes 12-08-15 (Chemistry & Geology)
II.A.93 Board minutes 04-08-14 (Kinesiology)
II.A.6.b The Academic Senate will collaborate with the interim Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness to review the current discontinuance processes by Spring 2013.

Resolution and Analysis:
In AY 2013-14, a task force of three members of the Academic Senate and the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness, led by the Senate Vice President/Curriculum Committee Chair, convened for the purpose of reviewing the college’s academic program discontinuance process and developing a more expansive process to encompass the full life cycle of program establishment, revitalization and discontinuance. These meetings resulted in draft documents for BP/AP 4021, Establishing, Revitalizing or Discontinuing Academic Programs, their approval at the College Planning Council meeting on November 5, 2014, and the incorporation of chief components of AP 4021 into an institutional continuous improvement process (II.A.75, II.A.76, II.A.77, II.A.78).

Next Steps:
None.

Conclusion:
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation:
II.A.75 BP 4021 Establishing, Revitalizing, or Discontinuing Academic Programs
II.A.76 AP 4021 Establishing, Revitalizing, or Discontinuing Academic Programs
II.A.77 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014
II.A.78 Academic Program Establishment, Revitalization Discontinuance Components of Continuous Improvement
II.A.6.c The Vice President of Information and Technology Resources will implement recommended changes to the college website by Fall 2013.

Resolution and Analysis:
Hartnell initiated a process beginning in Spring 2013 to replace the existing website. A campus wide web steering committee was formed to evaluate the aspects of the website that were critical to keep, and what the campus needed from a new web property (II.A.79). Improvements associated with outdated and ineffective information were identified and made, as well as new innovative ways to present services and tools for student orientation, success, and engagement. Additionally, the webmaster worked with various disciplines and areas of the institution to design and implement a new site organization and appearance. The goals were to strengthen the college brands and the college's program visibility, enhance navigation, and provide ways to ensure information remained useful and current.

By October 2011, Hartnell’s webmaster had been trained on new content management platform (Drupal) and started coordinating and participating in the significant effort of migrating content from the old website to the new, eliminating outdated content, and creating new content, images and processes for the new website. This process of weeding and reconfiguring new ways of providing information and services, given the advancement of web tools, took over 8 months to complete. There was great consideration of whether the entire campus was ready to make a transition from the old website to the new, including faculty and students. Many meetings of the web site steering committee occurred to determine what features and segments of the website were going to make the cut (II.A.80). The website design and progress was presented to the Board of Trustees and to multiple shared governance committees (II.A.81, II.A.82).

With final approval given by the President's cabinet, the new website launched in early October 2014, and has received unanimous accolades as a much better organized face of Hartnell and provides better tools for information management. Users report the user interface is much more efficient and pleasing to visitors and much more engaging of the Hartnell community, as many have now been placed in the responsibility of adding their own content. Hartnell views it's website as a living, growing resource which needs constant care and feeding. The new Hartnell website paradigm requires many people across campus “own” and maintain their own content areas and keep them up to date. Hartnell is confident that this new model of distributed content ownership will help the website remain relevant and fresh for visitors and campus constituents year over year. Hartnell’s ongoing website committee, which will continue to meet monthly, will assist in keeping the website in alignment with the information needs of the college (II.A.83).

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.
Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.A.79 Web committee membership
II.A.80 Web committee spreadsheet for essential features completed for go-live
II.A.81 Board agenda
II.A.82 Shared Governance committee agendas
II.A.83 Concept images/Screen shots
II.B.1 The College completed the PEER evaluation of Division of Student Affairs student programs during Fall 2011. Each area within the Division has finalized and staggered the implementation of a consistent student feedback survey form. The college will use the data generated by the evaluation and student feedback forms to improve program performance, support and reinforce those services deemed by students to be particularly helpful, and search for additional external funding opportunities to ensure continued student learning and success.

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

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

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.B.1 SALT Meeting Minutes - April, 2013
II.B.2 SALT Meeting Minutes - May, 2013
II.B.3 Student Affairs Summary of Priority Needs, 2013-14
II.B.4 Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews 2013-18
II.B.5 List of 2013 Student Affairs Program Planning and Assessment Documents
II.B.6 Recommendation 2
II.B.7 Recommendation 9
II.B.3.b Hartnell College will continue to partner with the ASHC and Student Senate to support a full-time Student Life Coordinator that will provide advisory and support services to the ASHC, student government, and student clubs. The college and Coordinator will continually work with student government leaders to identify any additional training these leaders may need in order to continue to develop their leadership skills. The ASHC and Coordinator will work with student senators representing the CAT and the King City Education Center students to ensure that students attending those centers feel connected to student government and have access to those programs that promote personal development.

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

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

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.
Supporting Evidence/Documentation

II.B.8  ASHC Officer Development Training, June 3, 2014
II.B.9  ASHC Retreat Agenda, Fall 2014
II.B.10 CCCSAA Fall 2014 Student Leadership Conference Program
II.B.11 Student Leadership Conference Agenda, Fall 2013
II.B.12 General Assembly Program, Fall 2014
II.B.13 Training Program for New and Current Student Senate Members
II.B.4 During the 2012-13 academic year, Student Affairs personnel will work with other colleagues to look at the feasibility of modifying PlaNET so that the college could transition from the PEER assessment tool to the program review and assessment software system used by the academic services. In addition, the resource needs of Student Affairs will systematically be integrated into the college’s planning and assessment process.

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

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

The resource needs of Student Affairs areas continue to be integrated into the institutional planning and assessment process according to the cycle followed for various departments and grant-funded services. Annual action plans for all areas of Student Affairs continue to be completed on an annual basis (II.B.18) (II.B.19). The completed annual action plans are reviewed by members of the Student Affairs Leadership Team and are used as the means to identify program resource needs that are prioritized and forwarded to the Student Affairs Council and later the College Planning Council before being recommended to the Superintendent/President for consideration.

The responses to Recommendations 2 and 9 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 also address the integration of resource needs into the college’s planning and assessment process. (II.B.20) (II.B.21)

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.
Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.B.14 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template - Spring 2014
II.B.15 SALT Meeting Minutes - April, 2013
II.B.16 SALT Meeting Minutes - May, 2013
II.B.17 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template - Spring 2014
II.B.18 Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews 2013-18
II.B.19 List of 2013 Student Affairs Program Planning and Assessment Documents
II.B.20 Recommendation 2
II.B.21 Recommendation 9
II.C.1 Based on the recommendations in *A Blueprint for Student Success at Hartnell College*, Learning Support Services staff will collaborate with college administration, faculty members and staff to begin planning for a Student Success Center during the 2012-13 academic year.

**Resolution and Analysis**
The efforts of the faculty, staff, and management to create a Student Academic Support Success System at Hartnell College have resulted in the hiring of a Director of Student Academic Success in fall 2015. The director is collaborating with constituency groups on campus to develop a plan to institute a highly coordinated, campus-wide academic support system for students. This support system for students is widely supported by faculty and staff members as well as management.

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

**Next Steps**
Planning for the development of coordinated and centralized academic support activities for students began in fall 2015.

**Conclusion**
Ongoing.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**
II.C.1 [Budget 4 Student Equity Plan](#)
II.C.1.a Library staff members will continue to evaluate its collections, deselecting older materials, and purchasing updated items that meet the curricular needs of students. Electronic publications that can be accessed by distance learning students and students at the other campuses will be given a high priority. Support for faculty members requesting technical assistance will be provided.

Resolution and Analysis
Full-time and adjunct librarians actively evaluate books, periodicals, and databases that meet circulation needs. The Systems/Technology Librarian is a member of the Curriculum Committee and attends meetings regularly; in addition, she is currently serving as a Curriculum Specialist. She keeps other discipline selection librarians informed about changes in the curriculum, courses, and programs that may affect purchasing decisions. All materials in the media collection (primarily DVDs and videos) are now RFID tagged to align with the Library’s new security system.

In the Library’s 2013-14 Comprehensive PPA and Action Plan, it was documented that the security “gates” that ensure authorized checkouts of materials were not functioning consistently (II.C.2). A resource request for replacement gates and necessary personnel to assist in the transition to a new system was vetted through the participative governance process, which resulted in an allocation of funds to replace the security gates. Board approval to replace the security gates was granted in January 2015, and the project was completed on time, by June 30, 2015. Adjunct librarians worked additional hours to assist in the “weeding” process to ensure that the Library collection did not contain outdated materials; in addition, all remaining materials were tagged with new RFIDs; student workers also assisted with this process.

Library staff prepared an implementation plan that documented tasks, persons, and start and completion dates for the following phases: Getting Started, Deselection, Tagging Circulating, Reserve, and Media Collections, and Technical Services Updates Catalog Records and Completes Discarding of Selected Materials (II.C.3). To prepare for the transition to a new system, quotes were solicited from three RFID vendors. The vendors also conducted on-site demonstrations. After a thorough comparison and evaluation, library staff selected a vendor (3M) in November 2014 (II.C.4). Board approval was granted at the January 2015 board meeting (II.C.5).

Next Steps
The new security system was installed in June 2015, and all remaining materials have been issued RFID tags; outdated books are being eliminated from the Library’s integrated library system and then will be discarded.

Conclusion
Completed.
Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.C.2 Library PPA Spring 2014
II.C.3 RFID Implementation Plan
II.C.4 RFID - Side by Side Comparison
II.C.5 January 2015 Board Minutes
II.C.1.b Librarians will continue to look for new ideas, methods, and opportunities to teach information competency skills. The library faculty members and staff will also continue to encourage implementation of an information competency graduation requirement and inclusion of information competency in the freshman/first year college experience. Filling the vacant Student Services Librarian position is a high priority among library classified staff and library faculty members.

Resolution and Analysis
In recognition of the AA-T and AS-T degrees, the librarians are no longer pursuing implementation of an information competency graduation requirement. Filling the vacant Student Services Librarian position remains a very high staffing priority among library workers (5.21). To address the information competency needs of students, the Library offers three sections of information competency credit courses during the fall and spring semesters, and often offers a summer course. The librarians reached out to faculty members during the Spring 2014 semester (II.C.6), and as a result, the number of orientations and attending students increased in 2014. Usage is tracked in the Reference Daily Statistics Log on an hourly basis by librarians at the Reference Desk. Since the account was created in December 2013, the number of faculty and students using this service has been increasing. Usually the annual number of library orientations is slightly more than 100. As of November 2014, 120 orientations have been taught. October 2014 was a very busy month, with 22 orientations taught and 516 students attending.

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

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

Hartnell’s Systems/Technology Librarian created a prototype online orientation in the College’s learning management system (Etudes) and is currently working with distance education faculty to pilot/test it in spring 2015. The online orientation will be provided not only to students enrolled in distance education classes but also will be available to all Hartnell students (II.C.9)
Next Steps
Librarians will continue to look for new ideas, methods, and opportunities to teach information competency skills and improve outreach to students. Hartnell’s Systems/Technology Librarian will be pilot-testing and implementing the online orientation accessed through Etudes, the College’s learning management system, in spring 2015. This will provide access to the Library’s orientation to our online students as well as to our students attending Hartnell College courses at the Alisal Campus or in South County.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.C.6 Hartnell College e-mail Regarding reference@hartnell.edu
II.C.7 LibGuide Sample Page (Library Web Page)
II.C.8 Library Flyer of Remote Services
II.C.9 Hartnell Library Online Orientation
   https://sites.google.com/a/hartnell.edu/orientation/
II.C.1.c Library staff and college administration will collaborate to review library staffing including the needs of the education centers for library services by Spring 2013.

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

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

Drafted in 2014, the Facilities Master Plan includes a Student Success Center as a core theme and a near-term project linked to the planned renovation of Building N, Merrill Hall (II.C.10). Potential sources of funding include funds remaining in the bond measure and available in the property acquisition fund (II.C.11). The Director of Academic Student Success began serving in Fall 2015. The Director has been meeting with faculty members from math, English, and ESL disciplines and the Tutorial Services Coordinator to determine appropriate activities to increase academic support for students. Currently workshops are being developed and expanded tutoring services are being offered. Currently, student support will be provided by remodeling a portion of existing Computer Center facilities to provide instructional capacity for face-to-face, traditional instruction as well as for small group and individual instruction.

**Next Steps**
Plans to hire the full-time Director of Student Academic Support is expected to provide increased academic support at all three sites for students. The Director is developing a coordinated and centralized processes to ensure consistent services that enhance student learning, success, and persistence.

**Conclusion**
Completed (Staffing) the District's library staff--including the dean, faculty, and classified staff have conducted a comprehensive staffing review and reported its recommendations to the District and the CSEA in August 2015. The new Director of Student Academic Support is responsible for collaborating with campus constituencies to develop a student academic support system that provides services for students at all three sites to help them develop skills for successful course completion. (In progress)
Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.C.10 Draft Facilities Master Plan
II.C.11 Financial Statements of District Funds September 30, 2014
II.C.1.d Library staff will work to raise awareness of library building security issues among other college departments and personnel.

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

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

To prepare for the transition to a new materials security system, quotes were solicited from three RFID vendors. The vendors also conducted on-site demonstrations. After a thorough comparison and evaluation, library staff selected a vendor in November 2014 (3M). (Board approval was granted at the January 2015 board meeting (II.C.12).

Next Steps
The new security system was installed in June 2015, and all remaining materials have been issued RFID tags; outdated books are being eliminated from the Library’s integrated library system and then will be discarded.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
II.C.12 January 2015 Board Minutes
II.C.1.e  Library staff will continue to work towards finalizing the Voyager agreement between CSUMB-Community College Library Voyager/ExLibris consortium members by Fall 2013.

Resolution and Analysis:
The response to Recommendation 6 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. In its action letter dated July 3, 2014 the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 6 had been resolved.

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
Standard III: Resources

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

Resolution and Analysis:
The response to Recommendation 8 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. In its action letter dated July 3, 2014 the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 8 had been resolved.

The response to Recommendation 7 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 and in this Mid-Term Report address the timely evaluation processes for managers and part-time faculty members. (III.A.1)

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
See follow-up report submitted March 15, 2014
III.A.1 Recommendation 7
III.A.5.a The College’s strategic plan will address the development of its employees. The college will continue to seek funding for such a program.

**Resolution and Analysis**
Strategic Priority 3 of the college’s Strategic Plan focuses on employee diversity and development, and Goal 3B in particular states (III.A.3):

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

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

The response to Recommendation 7 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2015 and in this report also address professional development of college employees. (III.A.5)

**Next Steps**
None.

**Conclusion**
Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**
III.A.3 Strategic Plan 2013-2018
III.A.4 Budget for Employee Professional Development FY 2014-15
III.A.5 Recommendation 7
III.C.1 The Technology Task Force needs to establish regular surveys of faculty members, staff and students as a primary means of identifying their satisfaction level with its array of technology services and functions.

**Resolution and Analysis**
Starting in March 2013, Faculty and Administration surveys were drafted, finalized, and administered (III.C.1) (III.C.2) during the Fall 2013 semester and remained open until a month after the beginning of Spring 2014 semester. The next set of surveys will be administered during the Spring 2016 term, and a report will be issued and shared from the office of the Vice President of Information Technology Resources.

A new student survey was prepared and delivered at the beginning of Spring 2014. (III.C.3) Results were collected, assessed and plans are being created for future adjustments or initiatives. ITR continuously gathers survey information via our help desk system, iSupport, to understand how we can improve our service and technology support. (III.C.4)

Surveys for all three groups will be administered again during the Spring 2016 semester. This cycle of regular surveys for students, staff, and faculty has been established as part of the Technology Development Council’s responsibilities.

**Next Steps**
None.

**Conclusion**
Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**
- III.C.1 2013 Faculty Members IT Surveys Administrators
- III.C.2 2014 Faculty Members IT Survey Staff
- III.C.3 2013 Student IT Survey
- III.C.4 IT iSupport Survey Feedback
Midterm Report  
March 15, 2016  

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

**Resolution and Analysis**  
Starting in March 2013, surveys were drafted, finalized (III.C.5) (III.C.7), and administered during the Fall semester and remained open until a month after the beginning of Spring semester. The next set of surveys will be administered during the Spring 2016 term, and a report will be issued and shared from the office of the Vice President of Information Technology Resources.

A student survey was prepared and delivered at the beginning of Fall 2014.(III.C.6) Results were collected, assessed and plans are being created for future adjustments or initiatives. This cycle of Fall Survey for students and Spring Survey for faculty members will be repeated bi-annually. The findings from this survey informed the planning, improvements, and initiatives of the PPA process for 2014/15. A survey for all groups will be administered again in Spring 2016. The results will inform the planning, improvements, and initiatives of the PPA process for the 2016/17 academic year.

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

**Next Steps**  
None.

**Conclusion**  
Completed.

**Supporting Evidence/Documentation**  
III.C.5 2013 Faculty Members IT Surveys Administrators  
III.C.6 2013 Student IT Surveys  
III.C.7 2014 Faculty Members IT Survey Staff  
III.C.8 IT iSupport Survey Feedback
III.C.1.b The Faculty Resource Center will continue to develop varied and helpful training options for the staff members on relevant tools and technologies. The IT organization will conduct a needs assessment in Spring 2013 via a survey in order to determine specific educational technology training needs. Upon completion of the needs assessment and, in coordination with the Learning Resource and Faculty Resource Centers, training plans will be adjusted and augmented to prioritize and address the various areas of need.

Resolution and Analysis
In recognition of the AA-T and AS-T degrees, the librarians are no longer pursuing implementation of an information competency graduation requirement. Filling the vacant Student Services Librarian position remains a very high staffing priority among library workers (5.21).

To address the information competency needs of students, the Library offers three sections of information competency credit courses during the fall and spring semesters, and often offers a summer course. The librarians reached out to faculty members during the Spring 2014 semester (II.C.6), and as a result, the number of orientations and attending students increased in 2014 and in 2015. Usage is tracked in the Reference Daily Statistics Log on an hourly basis by librarians at Reference Services. Since the reference email account was created in December 2013, the number of faculty and students using this service has been increasing. Librarians reached out to faculty members during the spring 2014 semester (5.2), and as a result, the number of orientations and attending students have increased since 2013-2014; in addition, the number of database searches has increased significantly. In general, reference transactions in libraries are declining. Librarians are handling fewer individual reference interactions; however, these interactions tend to be more in depth than in the past and require more time. Additionally, librarians aligned reference transaction data with reporting criteria from the Chancellor’s Office, US Department of Education, and the Association of College and Research Libraries, which resulted in the decrease shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations, Orientations, &amp; Tours</th>
<th>Number of Students/ Participants</th>
<th>Reference Transactions</th>
<th>Other Reference Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>3,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td>3,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Database Searches | Regular Searches
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>680,448</td>
<td>984,958</td>
<td>945,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Librarians have created and continue to create LibGuides, which are guides with links to selected library and web content for specific disciplines and topics, such as for Nursing, Administration of Justice, and Early Childhood Education (II.C.7). The Systems/Technology librarian has developed a LibGuide production schedule and has trained librarians in the software. As of spring 2015, the Library offers eight LibGuides for student use. A schedule to produce new LibGuides has been developed now that the migration to the current version of this service has been completed and librarians have been trained.

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

Hartnell’s systems/technology librarian created a prototype online orientation in the College’s learning management system. After incorporating faculty feedback solicited in spring 2015, it has undergone pilot testing in fall 2015 with English and Economics faculty. The English faculty members chose to incorporate modules from the orientation into their own course shells, while the Economics faculty member elected to have her students added to a separate library shell. This flexibility is an advantage of creating the orientation in a modular format and locating it in the college’s learning management system. After evaluation of the pilot and revision, particularly focused on making assessments self-graded, the library staff plan to open the orientation to all students who wish to learn about the library’s resources. It will also need to be migrated to the new LMS, Canvas (5.3).

Next Steps
Librarians will continue to look for new ideas, methods, and opportunities to teach information competency skills and improve outreach to students. Hartnell’s Systems/Technology Librarian will continue implementing the online orientation through the College’s learning management system. This will provide access to the Library’s orientation to our online students as well as to our students enrolled in Hartnell College courses at the Alisal Campus or in South County.

Conclusion
Completed.
Supporting Evidence/Documentation

II.C.9 Cumulative Customer Satisfaction Exit Survey Results
III.C.10 List of Supported Applications
III.C.11 Calendar of training classes
III.C.12 PDC Staff Bios
III.D.2.a Update the health benefits actuarial report every two years as required by GASB. The District has contributed approximately 85% of the funding requirements as of June 30, 2011.

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

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

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

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
III.D.1 Projection Worksheet
III.D.2 PowerPoint Presentation
III.D.3.f Complete the comprehensive student financial aid procedures manual, which will include the default management program.

Resolution and Analysis:
The financial aid staff continues to keep their financial aid manuals up-to-date annually as both federal and state mandates are issued. (III.D.3, III.D.4, III.D.5, III.D.6, III.D.7, III.D.8, III.D.9, III.D.10) Financial Aid staff continues to update student financial aid policies as required by the Department of Education on an annual basis.

A broader group of College personnel – the Default Prevention Task Force – continues to review the College’s default management plan. (III.D.11) The default management program manual has been completed. On October 17, 2014, the Task Force met and decided that the only activities that we should focus on in the next few years are those in Section IV - after students leave the school as the College no longer issues student loans. (III.D.12, III.D.13) We revised our processing of total withdraws from the College working with the Admissions & Records Staff as well as Counselors. (III.D.16) We have outlined Default Management Activities that are conducted by the financial aid staff to support managing the College’s default rate. (III.D.17) The Task Force also agreed that we should work with EdFinancials to assist us in managing our student loan portfolio.

During the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 year, the Financial Aid Department staff have continued to work closely with the California Community College Chancellor’s Office consultants Parker, Pierson, and Associates in monitoring and strategizing the College’s Loan Default portfolio. We went into contract with EdFinancials in January 2015. We meet as a team with both organizations once a quarter to review our portfolio numbers and have found that the work being done by both the College and the contractors are paying off as you can see from our 2012 FY cohort default rate decline.

On September 30, 2015, the College received the final FY 2012 cohort default rate which is at 20.4%. (III.D.14, III.D.15) This is an 8% decline in defaulted loans from the FY 2011. According to the Department of Education regulations, the College currently is in compliance with the Department of Education’s Federal Financial Aid regulations regarding cohort default rates.

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

The College will continue to annually review and update all required federal and state financial aid policies and procedures.
Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
III.D.3 2015-2016 FA Required Documentation
III.D.4 Reporting Verification Tracking Flags V4 and V5
III.D.5 2015-16 Policies and Procedures Section 3.6 Verification
III.D.6 Ability to Benefit Procedures
III.D.7 Financial Aid Disbursement Procedures with the Business Office and Higher One
III.D.8 Employing Federal Work Study Student Worker Handbook 2015-2016
III.D.9 SAP Policy 2015-2016
III.D.10 Disbursement Deadlines for 2015-2016
III.D.11 Approved Default Prevention Plan submitted to DOE 12-19-13
III.D.12 Default Management Task Force Agenda 10-17-14
III.D.13 Default Management Task Force Minutes 10-17-14
III.D.14 Final Default Cohort Rate for 2012 as of 9-30-15
III.D.15 HC Default Cohort Rates from 2009-2012
III.D.16 HC Total Withdraw Form and Process 7-15-15
III.D.17 Default Management Activity Calendar 2015-2016
Establish Administrative Services evaluation survey to be provided to college community. The survey will request input from staff and faculty members on how business services can improve in generating access to financial information, training in use of financial systems and participation in budget process.

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

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
III.D. 18 Budget Worksheets
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

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

Resolution and Analysis:
The response to Recommendation 8 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. In its action letter dated July 3, 2014 the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 8 had been resolved.

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

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

Resolution and Analysis:
See response to Recommendation 11 regarding the development and implementation of the new governance system/model. (IV.A.2)

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
IV.A.2 Recommendation 11
IV.A.3 Review the results of the self-evaluation of shared governance committees and make recommendations for populating and/or re organizing committees.

Resolution and Analysis:
See response to Recommendation 11 regarding the development and implementation of the new governance system/model. (IV.A.3)

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
IV.A.3 Recommendation 11
IV.B.1 The Board will continue its comprehensive update of Board Policies, and establish a regular schedule of review thereafter.

Resolution and Analysis:
The response to Recommendation 10 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. In its action letter dated July 3, 2014 the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 10 had been resolved.

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

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

Resolution and Analysis:
The response to Recommendation 12 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 12 had been resolved.

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

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

Resolution and Analysis:
The response to Recommendation 8 in the follow-up report submitted in March 2014 addressed this planning agenda item. In its action letter dated July 3, 2014, the Accrediting Commission communicated that Recommendation 8 had been resolved.

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

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

Resolution and Analysis:
See response to Recommendation 11 in the March 2015, Follow-up Report regarding the Annual Integrated Planning Processes. (IV.B.1)

Next Steps
None.

Conclusion
Completed.

Supporting Evidence/Documentation
IV.B.1 Recommendation 11
Appendix A: Master List of Recommendation Evidence

Recommendation 1
1.1 Survey Instrument for Vision, Mission, and Values Statements
1.2 Report of the Results from the Vision, Mission, and Values Survey
1.3 Minutes for CPC meeting November 6, 2013
1.4 Minutes for CPC meeting November 20, 2013
1.5 Minutes for CPC meeting December 4, 2013
1.6 Minutes for CPC meeting December 18, 2013
1.7 Minutes for Board of Trustees meeting January 14, 2014
1.8 Minutes for Board of Trustees meeting February 4, 2014

Recommendation 2
2.1 Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement
2.2 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting September 17, 2014
2.3 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting February 5, 2014
2.4 Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement
2.5 Timeline for fall 2013 PPA Process
2.6 Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15
2.7 Timeline for 2014 PPA Process
2.8 Annual Budget Development Calendar
2.9 Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes
2.10 Governance & Planning Model
2.11 Academic Affairs Council Handbook
2.12 Administrative Services Council Handbook
2.13 Advancement Council Handbook
2.14 Student Affairs Council Handbook
2.15 Technology Development Council Handbook
2.16 College Planning Council Handbook
2.17 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting April 2, 2014
2.18 Timeline for Deliverables of 3 Major Plans
2.19 2014-15 Master Meeting Calendar
2.20 Academic and Governance Calendar
2.21 Inventory of Long Term Plans with Leads FY 2014-15
2.22 Strategic Plan 2013-2018
2.23 Technology Master Plan 2011-2021
2.24 Technology Plan 2011-2018
2.25 President’s Task Force Funding Plan 2012-2017
2.26 Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018 7-1-14
2.27 Student Success and Support Program Plan
2.28 Student Equity Plan
2.29 Draft Facilities Master Plan
2.30 Internal & External Communications – Components of Continuous Improvement
2.31 Highlights of Board of Trustees Meeting February 4, 2014
2.32 Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014
2.33 Actions from Academic Senate Meetings September 23 & October 14, 2014
2.34 Access to Minutes of Governance Council Meetings
2.35 2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent - President September 5, 2014
2.36 President’s Forum April 11, 2014
2.37 Administration Meeting Agenda September 3, 2014
2.38 President’s Corner - Presentations, Communications and Reports
2.39 Financial Projections Worksheet
2.40 Hartnell Budget Presentation Tentative budget 2013-14
2.41 Hartnell Budget Presentation Tentative budget 2014-15
2.42 Budget Worksheet
2.43 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting February 17, 2015
2.44 Timeline for 2015 PPA Process
2.45 Purpose & Rationale for Institutional Effectiveness Council
2.46 Institutional Effectiveness Council Handbook
2.47 Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting September 2, 2015
2.48 2015-16 Board Policy & Administrative Procedure Review Schedule
2.49 Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement for 2014-15
2.50 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting April 7, 2015
2.51 Institution-Set Standards for CTE Program Job Placement for Fall 2015
2.52 Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting October 7, 2015
2.53 Goals for Institutional Effectiveness for 2015-16
2.54 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting June 2, 2015
2.55 Agenda for First Annual Institutional Planning Retreat June 4, 2015
2.56 Organizational Transition to Central Institutional Research Function
2.57 Database & Data Path Map
2.58 Data, Analytics & Reporting Team Purpose & Membership
2.59 Request for Technical Assistance
2.60 Areas of Focus for Technical Assistance
2.61 Meeting Schedule for Initial PRT Visit November 9, 2015
2.62 Draft DE Plan May 2015
2.63 Job Description for HSI Initiatives Director
2.64 SSSP, SEP, BSI, HSI Comparison Chart
2.65 Minutes for Academic Deans Retreat June 10, 2015
2.66 Project Sustainability & Institutionalization - Sinclair Community College
2.67 Draft Revised Grant Concept Form November 2015
2.68 Draft Innovation Concept Form November 2015
2.69 Draft Time Line for Development of Strategic Plan 2019-2024
2.70 Integrated Strategic Planning Team Handbook
2.71 Inventory of Long Term Plans Fall 2015
2.72 Hierarchical Elements in Strategic Plan 2013-2018
2.73 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting October 7, 2015
2.74 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting October 6, 2015
2.75 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 18, 2015
2.76 Draft Student Equity Plan December 8, 2015
2.77 Facilities Master Plan 2014-2024
2.78 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting March 3, 2015
2.79 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting October 7, 2015
2.80 Email on FY 2014-15 Resource Allocations
2.81 FY 2014-15 Resource Allocation Expenditures
2.82 Email on FY 2015-16 Funding Decisions
2.83 FY 2015-16 Resource Allocation Requests
2.84 FY 2015-16 Funding Decisions - Personnel

Recommendation 3
3.1 Strategic Plan 2013-2018
3.2 Strategic Plan Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.3 Strategic Plan Progress Report - Student Access and Student Success
3.4 Long Term Institutional Plans – Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.5 Assessment of Technology Plan FY 2013-14
3.6 Assessment of President’s Task Force Funding Plan FY 2013-14
3.7 Comprehensive Program Review – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.8 Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.10 Academic PPA Report Template – Spring 2014
3.11 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template – Spring 2014
3.12 Annual SLO Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.15 Model for Integrated Planning & Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement
3.16 Governance System – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.17 Mission, Vision & Values Development, Review & Revision – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.18 Budget Development & Resource Allocation – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.19 Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning 2010-2015
3.20 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting September 17, 2014
3.21 Continuous Improvement Committee Handbook
3.22 Review of Evaluation Mechanisms – Fall 2013
3.23 Template – Components of Continuous Improvement
3.24 Inventory of Continuous Improvement Processes
3.25 Continuous Improvement Plan 2013-2018
3.26 Handbook of Continuous Improvement Processes 2013-2018 11-14-14
3.27 Overview – Key Components of Continuous Improvement Processes
3.28 CCLC 2014 Annual Convention Program
3.29 2015 ACCCA Conference Session Selection Notification
3.30 Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting November 18, 2014
3.31 Strategic Goal 2A Progress Report Fall 2015
3.32 Strategic Goal 2A Scorecard Fall 2015
3.33 Inventory of Annual Assessment of Long Term Plans
3.34 Assessment of Continuous Improvement Plan 2014-15
3.35 Assessment of President’s Task Force Funding Plan 2014-15
3.36 Assessment of Student Success & Support Program Plan 2014-15
3.37 Integrated Planning - Continuous Improvement 2010-2016
3.38 Purpose & Rationale for Institutional Effectiveness Council
3.39 Institutional Effectiveness Council Handbook
3.40 Highlights of College Planning Council Meeting September 2, 2015
3.41 Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement
3.42 Framework for Evaluation of CI Process Implementation
3.43 Reports Required for Implementation of CI Processes Summer 2015
3.44 CI Process Implementation - Evaluation Reports Summer 2015
3.45 2014 CCLC Annual Convention - Presentation & Materials November 20, 2014
3.46 2015 ACCCA Conference - Presentation & Handouts February 25, 2015
3.47 CCLC Excellence in Trusteeship Program Regional Training - Presentation &
   Handouts March 21, 2015
3.48 2015 RP Conference Session Selection Notification
3.49 2015 RP Conference - Presentation & Handouts April 9, 2015
3.50 2015 CCLC Annual Convention - Presentation & Supporting Documents
   November 21, 2015
3.51 Organizational Transition to Central Institutional Research Function
3.52 Job Description for Director of Institutional Research
3.53 Needs Assessment Survey
3.54 Needs Assessment Results 2015-16
3.55 Needs Assessment Results 2016-18

Recommendation 4
4.1 Core Competencies (Catalog)
4.2 O&A Webpage (Core Competencies)
4.3 Degree Samples with SLOs in Catalog
4.4 O&A Webpage (PLOs)
4.5 Sample Syllabi
4.6 O&A Webpage (SLOs)
4.7 O&A Webpage (SAOs)
4.8 Assessment Discussion Samples
4.9 Hartnell College Mail - ECE Retreat for SLO Discussion
4.10 Graduation Survey Group Activity Results (8.25.14)
4.11 Fall Convocation agenda (8.15.14)
4.12 Elumen Training Flyer
4.13 SLO revision instructions (10/2014)
4.14 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 1
4.15 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 2
4.16 Hartnell College Mail - SLO Verification 3
4.17 Sample Spreadsheet for SLO Verification-CHM Spr 15 SLOs
4.18 Instructions for SLO From Phase II
4.19 BIO-SLO-PLO Mapping and Calendar
4.20 Course SLO Assessment Schedule Samples
4.21 Course Outcome Assessment Report Samples
4.22 Hartnell College Mail - Plan to Assess Course SLOs for Fall 2013, Mandatory Meetings Schedule
4.23 3rd Annual Student Success Conference (Flex Day) Agenda 1.16-17.14
4.24 Core competencies-CCSSE survey results (convocation f14)
4.25 Graduation Survey 2014
4.26 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation
4.27 Hartnell College Mail - NOT URGENT -- YET!! (SLO S14 Assessment Due Date)
4.28 2015 4th Annual Success Conference agendas
4.29 Elumen Training Calendar (2/2015)
4.30 Elumen PPT
4.31 Program Outcome Assessment Report Samples
4.32 Establishing, Revitalizing, and Discontinuing Academic Programs (AP 4021)
4.33 HR SAO 1
4.34 Service Area Outcome Report Samples
4.35 Presentation to the Board (2)
4.36 CPC Presentation
4.37 Presentation—orientation
4.38 Service Area Outcome-Assessment Summary Form (instructions)
4.39 SAO summary Report Form and Path
4.40 Assessment Activities PowerPoint (1/2014)
4.41 Checklist for Flex Day Assessment Activities
4.42 ACCJC SLO Workshop Handout
4.43 Hartnell College Mail - April Outcomes Assessment Workshop
4.44 Hartnell College Mail - Outcome and Assessment Workshop
4.45 Assessment Specialist Position Description
4.46 HDFA Appendix DE2013
4.47 Hartnell College Mail - Assessment Workshop Using Online Technologies
4.48 Data Needs Survey (11/2014)
4.49 Alignment & Integration of Assessment Strategies PowerPoint
4.50 Instructions for Core Competency Survey Activity (8.14)
4.51 SLO Management-Assessment Software - Side by Side Comparison
4.52 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 1
4.53 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 2
4.54 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 3
4.55 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 4
4.56 Distance Ed Committee Meeting 10-14-14
4.57 External Follow up Evaluation Report
4.58 PowerPoint Presentation to Faculty Fall 2015
4.59 Assessment Timelines Schedule for Fall 2015
4.60 Degree Course Group Sample
4.61 Action Plan Prompts—Section Level
4.62 Action Plan Prompts—Course Level
4.63 Section Level Action Plan Sample
4.64 Course Level Action Plan Sample
4.65 BIO Course SLO-PLO Mapping
4.66 BIO Course SLO-Core Competency Mapping
4.67 COM Course SLO-PLO Mapping
4.68 COM Course SLO-Core Competency Mapping
4.69 Course Assessment Calendar Links
4.70 Course Assessment Calendar Sample
4.71 Core Competencies (new)
4.72 Food Services Satisfaction SAO 1 v2
4.73 SAO Samples 2015

Recommendation 5
5.1 Library Flyer of Remote Services
5.2 Hartnell College e-mail Regarding reference@hartnell.edu
5.3 Hartnell Library Online Orientation
   https://sites.google.com/a/hartnell.edu/orientation/
5.4 Student Survey KCC Library Services Narrative
5.5 Student Survey KCC Library Services Data
5.6 Main Campus Library Survey Analysis
5.7 King City Center Survey II Analysis
5.8 Alisal Campus Survey Analysis
5.9 Reading Plus Progress Report Fall 14
5.10 Library PPA Spring 2014
5.11 SAO assessments-Library
5.12 Credo Academic Core Reference Collection
5.13 Reading Plus® List of students who used Reading Plus FALL 2014
Midterm Report
March 15, 2016

5.14 Number of students who used Reading Plus Fall 2014
5.15 Online Counseling Services Student Surveys
5.16 Agenda and Minutes of Online Counseling FIG
5.17 Agenda of Fresno City Visit
5.18 Summary Report on General Counseling Emails
5.19 KCC Library-Learning Services Survey - Fall 2015 (Responses)
5.20 Alisal Library-Learning Services Survey - Fall 2015 (Responses)
5.21 Faculty Hiring Presentation

Recommendation 6
6.1 Memorandum of Clarification (signed)
6.2 Voyager Consortia Meeting Minutes
6.3 MOC Member Survey (Responses)
6.4 MOC Eval-Provider Survey
6.5 Hartnell Staff Survey (Responses)
6.6 Library Services Outcomes Assessment Calendar
6.7 ILS Planning Document

Recommendation 7
7.1 AP 7150 Evaluation of Management Employees
7.2 Agenda for April 2013 managers meeting
7.3 WCL 040313 email to managers re evaluation process
7.4 CHRO email to supervisors of managers 0413
7.5 Management Evaluations Tracking 2014
7.6 TJP 092113 email to supervisors
7.7 CSEA-District CBA, Article 7
7.8 CSEA Evaluation form
7.9 L39-District CBA, Article 31
7.10 Confidential working conditions
7.11 L39 evaluation form
7.12 Confidential evaluation form
7.13 All evaluation tools are linked from the Human Resources website, in the forms section, http://www.hartnell.edu/forms-and-related-information
7.14 Email from A Marble to supervisor
7.15 Email from A Marble to supervisor
7.16 Acad and Class Evaluation and Discipline CCD Core Workbook
7.17 FRISK workshop -12-3-14
7.18 Jan 2015 Administrators meeting agenda
7.19 Classified Evals as of December 2014
7.20 HCFA-District CBA, Article 13
7.21 HCFA-District CBA, Article 14
7.22 HCFA-District CBA, Article 21B
7.23 HCFA-District CBA, appendix DE2013, DE eval process
7.24 HCFA-District CBA, article 22 Distance Education
7.25 FT Faculty EVAL 2014-2015
7.26 HCFA MOUs and resolution re evals
7.27 Evaluation MOU Sept 20, 2013
7.28 Agenda for adjunct evaluation training on January 31, 2014
7.29 2014-15 Adjunct evals complete and projected
7.30 PDC Spring 2015 email re training
7.31 Flex Day Presentation 081613
7.32 http://www.hartnell.edu/agendas-minutes-and-documents-10
7.33 PD Committee Handbook 2013
7.34 PDC Minutes 12-16-13
7.35 PDC Survey Tool
7.36 Travel and Conference Announcement
7.37 Conference - Travel reimbursement program
7.38 Conference - Travel Application Form
7.39 President’s Weekly Report of June 6, 2014
7.40 Sponsored Travel and Conference in 2014-15
7.41 Employee Innovation Grant Announcement
7.42 Innovation Grant Program Description
7.43 Employee innovation grant application 2014-15
7.44 President’s Weekly Report of November 7, 2014
7.45 Application for Professional Development Funds
7.46 Speakers, Seminars and workshop funds program
7.47 President’s Weekly Report of May 2, 2014
7.48 Go2Knowledge announcement
7.49 Vet Net Ally evaluation summary
7.50 Educator-in-residence calendar of events 2015
7.51 President’s Report December 5 2014
7.52 Educator-in-Residence webpage
7.53 PDcommittee_handbook_2014_revised
7.54 Professional Development Program webpage
7.55 See PDC website at http://www.hartnell.edu/resources
7.56 Taleo implementation project information can be found at:
    http://www.hartnell.edu/itr-projects
7.57 Classified Evaluations - January 2016
7.58 President’s Weekly Report of October 9, 2015
7.59 Habits of the Mind Nov 2015
7.60 President’s Weekly Report of October 2, 2015
7.61 Special Assignment Position Description- Flex Coordinator 2015
7.62 Professional Development Committee Handbook 2015
Recommendation 8
8.1 Organizational Structure Survey
8.2 Report of Results from Organizational Structure Survey
8.3 Minutes from RAC meeting 1-23-2013
8.4 Organizational Structure Effective Fall 2015
8.5 Position Descriptions for New Administrative Positions

Recommendation 9
9.1 Inventory of Programs, Services & Offices Designated for Review-Starting Fall 2013 or Later
9.2 Organizational Chart for Hartnell Community College District
9.3 Annual Program Planning & Assessment – Components of Continuous Improvement
9.4 Comprehensive Program Review – Components of Continuous Improvement
9.6 Number of Program Reviews Completed – Fall 2013
9.7 Number of Program Reviews Completed – Spring 2014 (Revised)
9.8 Contributors to Academic Program Reviews – fall 2013 & Spring 2014
9.9 Contributors to Non-Instructional Program Reviews – Fall 2013 & Spring 2014
9.10 Academic PPA Report Template – Spring 2014
9.11 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template – Spring 2014
9.12 Academic Affairs Council Handbook
9.13 Administrative Services Council Handbook
9.15 Facilities Development Council Handbook
9.16 Student Affairs Council Handbook
9.17 Technology Development Council Handbook
9.18 College Planning Council Handbook
9.19 Timeline for 2014 PPA Process
9.20 Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014
9.21 Non-Instructional PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014
9.22 Access to 2014 Program Planning and Assessment Reports
9.23 Information and Technology Resources Annual Action Plan - fall 2013
9.24 Continuous Improvement of Integrated Planning 2010-2015
9.25 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 6, 2013
9.26 Minutes for Academic Affairs Council Meeting November 13, 2013
9.27 Minutes for Student Affairs Council Meeting November 26, 2013
9.28 Program Review Resource Requests for FY 2014-15
9.29 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting April 2, 2014
9.30 Timeline for 2013 PPA Process
9.31 2014-15 Budget and Resource Allocation Decisions Email from Superintendent - President September 5, 2014
9.32 Minutes for Academic Affairs Council Meeting October 8, 2014
9.33 Program Review Resource Requests for FY 2015-16
9.34 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014
9.35 Draft Facilities Master Plan
9.36 Timeline for Approval of Facilities Master Plan
9.38 Number of Program Reviews Completed - Spring 2015
9.39 Academic PPA Reports by Items - Spring 2015
9.40 Non-Instructional PPA Reports by Items - Spring 2015
9.41 Integrated Planning - Continuous Improvement 2010-2016
9.42 Position Description for PPA Specialist
9.43 Draft Revised Academic PPA Template November 20, 2015
9.44 Draft Revised Non-Instructional PPA Template November 20, 2015
9.45 Timeline for PPA Template Improvement
9.46 Draft Timeline for 2016 PPA Process
9.47 Programs in eLumen Pilot - Spring 2016
9.48 Rollout of eLumen for Program Review
9.49 Email on FY 2014-15 Resource Allocations
9.50 FY 2014-15 Resource Allocation Expenditures
9.51 Email on FY 2015-16 Funding Decisions
9.52 FY 2015-16 Resource Allocation Requests
9.53 FY 2015-16 Funding Decisions - Personnel

Recommendation 10
10.1 Policy and Procedure Review Schedule as of 2015-16
10.2 BP 2410
10.3 Agenda and Minutes for Board of Trustees Meeting December 13, 2013
10.4 AP 2410
10.5 Minutes of CPC meeting November 6, 2013
10.6 BP-AP Routing Form (Part of AP 2410)

Recommendation 11
11.1 Report from Governance Planning Retreat November 19, 2012
11.2 Agendas Minutes Documents for Governance Planning Task Force
11.3 Governance Model
11.4 Handbooks for Governance Councils
11.5 Town Hall Presentation May 22, 2013 on Planning and Governance
11.6 Fall Flex Day Presentation August 16, 2013, announces implementation plan
11.7 Governance Web Site
11.8 Governance Councils Master Meeting Calendar
11.9 College Planning Council Handbook
11.10 Sample of Instrument for Assessing Council Effectiveness
11.11 Minutes of CPC Meeting April 23, 2014
11.12 Inventory of CPC Agenda Items-Responsibilities 2013-14
11.13 **Instrument for Assessing Overall Governance Effectiveness**
11.14 **Academic Affairs Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.15 **Administrative Services Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.16 **Accreditation Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.17 **Advancement Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.18 **CPC - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.19 **Facilities Development Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.20 **Student Affairs Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.21 **Technology Development Council - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.22 **Overall Governance Model/System - Assessment Results and Summary of Effectiveness**
11.23 **Minutes of CPC Meeting February 5, 2014**
11.24 **Timeline for 2013 PPA Process**
11.25 **Budget Development Calendar FY 2014-15**
11.26 **Budget Development & Funding Decision Processes**
11.27 **Timeline for 2014 PPA Process**
11.28 **Annual Budget Development Calendar**
11.29 **Schedule of Annual & Comprehensive Reviews 2013-2018 - 12-11-13**
11.30 **Annual Program Planning & Assessment - Components of Continuous Improvement**
11.31 **Comprehensive Program Review - Components of Continuous Improvement**
11.32 **Integrated Planning Model Diagram**
11.33 **Minutes for CPC Meeting April 15, 2015**
11.34 **Recommendations from Faculty Hiring Committee for 2015-16**
11.35 **Minutes of CPC Meeting October 15, 2014**
11.36 **Highlights of CPC Meeting October 15, 2014**
11.37 **Communication to Campus - Highlights of October 15, 2014 CPC Meeting**
11.38 **Minutes for CPC Meeting September 2, 2014**
11.39 **Minutes of CPC Meeting December 17, 2014**

**Recommendation 12**
12.1 **BP 1055 - Ethical Conduct of the Governing Board**
12.2 **Board of Trustees Resolution June 2011 (Docs re: BOT warning resolution)**
12.3 **Board of Trustees Ethics Discussion August 2008 (page 5)**
12.4 **Board of Trustees Meeting January 15, 2013 Minutes**
12.5 **Survey Results from January 15, 2013 Self-Evaluation**
12.6 **Board of Trustees Meeting May 28, 2013 Minutes**
12.7 **Survey Results from May 28, 2013 Self-Evaluation**
12.8 **Summary of May 28, 2013 Self-Evaluation**
12.9 **Board of Trustees Meeting August 6, 2013 Minutes, follow-up**
12.10 **Board of Trustees Meeting May 20, 2014 Minutes**
12.11 **Survey Results from May 20, 2014 Self-Evaluation**
12.12 **Inventory of Meeting Agenda Items Linkage to Strategic Plan and Accreditation**
Standards 2013-14
12.13 Summary of Self-Evaluation May 20, 2014
12.14 Board of Trustees Meeting June 16, 2015 Minutes
12.15 Survey Results from June 16, 2015 Self-Evaluation
12.16 Inventory of Meeting Agenda Items Linkage to Strategic Plan and Accreditation Standards 2014-15
12.18 Board of Trustees Meeting July 21, 2015 Minutes, follow-up
12.19 Board of Trustees Agenda Item October 6, 2015
12.20 Board of Trustees Agenda Item December 8, 2015
Appendix B: Master List of Self-Identified Improvement Plans Evidence

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
I.B.1 Strategic Plan 2013-2018
I.B.2 Recommendation 2
I.B.3 Recommendation 9
I.B.4 Recommendation 2
I.B.5 Recommendation 9
I.B.6 Recommendation 2
I.B.7 Recommendation 3
I.B.8 Recommendation 9
I.B.9 Recommendation 3
I.B.10 Recommendation 9

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services
II.A.1 CC Minutes 12-5-13
II.A.2 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013
II.A.3 Recommendation 2
II.A.4 Recommendation 9
II.A.5 Strategic Plan 2013-2018
II.A.6 Community Research Environmental Scanning - Components of Continuous Improvement
II.A.7 Draft Facilities Master Plan
II.A.8 Strategic Planning Advisory Group Handbook
II.A.9 Strategic Planning Advisory Group Membership December 2014
II.A.10 Notes of Strategic Planning Advisory Group Meeting April 9, 2014
II.A.11 Agenda for Strategic Planning Advisory Group Meeting December 4, 2014
II.A.12 Institutional Data Analyst Job Description
II.A.13 Survey Results on Data Needs for Academic PPA Reports
II.A.14 Recommendation 4
II.A.15 HCFA Appendix DE2013(4.46)
II.A.16 Hartnell College Mail - Assessment Workshop Using Online Technologies
II.A.17 HCFA-District CBA appendix DE2013, DE eval process
II.A.18 Academic PPA Report Template—Spring 2014
II.A.19 Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014
II.A.20 Instructions for Core Competency Survey Activity (8.14)
II.A.21 Course Outcome Assessment Report Samples
II.A.22 3rd Annual Student Success Conference (Flex Day) Agenda 1.16-17.14
II.A.23 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation
II.A.24 Side-by Side Comparison document
II.A.25 Elumen PPT
II.A.26 Program Outcome Assessment Report Samples
II.A.27 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 1
II.A.28 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 2
II.A.29 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 3
II.A.30 Adding an SLO Assessment Part 4
II.A.31 Academic PPA Report Template—Spring 2014
II.A.32 Academic PPA Reports by Items—Spring 2014
II.A.33 Current DE Practices Survey
II.A.34 DE Policies Progress
II.A.35 Sample DE Minutes
II.A.36 Recommendation 2
II.A.37 Recommendation 9
II.A.38 Recommendation 11
II.A.39 Recommendation 2
II.A.40 Recommendation 9
II.A.41 Recommendation 2
II.A.42 Recommendation 9
II.A.43 BP 4025 (Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education)
II.A.44 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012
II.A.45 Senate Minutes Approved 2-26-13
II.A.46 Draft of AP 4025
II.A.47 Fall Convocation agenda (8.15.14)
II.A.48 Core competencies-CCSSE survey results (convocation f14)
II.A.49 Hartnell College Mail - Results from Table Discussion at Convocation
II.A.50 O&A Minutes 11.25.13 - (O&A Committee Approval)
II.A.51 Academic Senate Minutes
II.A.52 Assessment Specialist Position Description
II.A.53 Outcomes and Assessment Committee Handbook Template v2
II.A.54 O&A Emails to Faculty Members
II.A.55 Flex Day Agenda for January 17, 2013
II.A.56 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2012
II.A.57 Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013
II.A.58 CC minutes 11-21-13
II.A.59 CC minutes 3-6-14 approved
II.A.60 CC minutes 05-15-14 (History)
II.A.61 Board minutes 06-03-2014 (History)
II.A.62 CC minutes 10-16-14 (Spanish)
II.A.63 Board minutes 11-04-14 (Spanish)
II.A.64 CC minutes 12-04-14 (Economics)
II.A.65 Board minutes 01-13-15 (Economics)
II.A.75 BP 4021 Establishing, Revitalizing, or Discontinuing Academic Programs
II.A.76 AP 4021 Establishing, Revitalizing, or Discontinuing Academic Programs
II.A.77 Minutes for College Planning Council Meeting November 5, 2014
II.A.78 Academic Program Establishment, Revitalization Discontinuance Components of Continuous Improvement
II.A.79 Web committee membership
II.A.80 Web committee spreadsheet for essential features completed for go-live
II.A.81 Board agenda
II.A.82 Shared Governance committee agendas
II.A.83 Concept images/Screen shots
II.A.84 CC minutes 11-20-14 (Music)
II.A.85 Board minutes 12-09-14 (Music)
II.A.86 CC minutes 03-27-14 (Theatre Arts)
II.A.87 Board minutes 05-06-14 (Theatre Arts)
II.A.88 CC minutes 10-15-15 (Biology)
II.A.89 Board minutes 11-10-15 (Biology)
II.A.90 CC minutes 11-05-15 (Chemistry)
II.A.91 CC minutes 11-19-15 (Geology)
II.A.92 Board minutes 12-08-15 (Chemistry & Geology)
II.A.93 Board minutes 04-08-14 (Kinesiology)

II.B.1 SALT Meeting Minutes - April, 2013
II.B.2 SALT Meeting Minutes - May, 2013
II.B.3 Student Affairs Summary of Priority Needs, 2013-14
II.B.4 Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews 2013-18
II.B.5 List of 2013 Student Affairs Program Planning and Assessment Documents
II.B.6 Recommendation 2
II.B.7 Recommendation 9
II.B.8 ASHC Officer Development Training, June 3, 2014
II.B.9 ASHC Retreat Agenda, Fall 2014
II.B.10 CCCSAA Fall 2014 Student Leadership Conference Program
II.B.11 Student Leadership Conference Agenda, Fall 2013
II.B.12 General Assembly Program, Fall 2014
II.B.13 Training Program for New and Current Student Senate Members
II.B.14 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template - Spring 2014
II.B.15 SALT Meeting Minutes - April, 2013
II.B.16 SALT Meeting Minutes - May, 2013
II.B.17 Non-Instructional PPA Report Template - Spring 2014
II.B.18 Schedule of Annual and Comprehensive Reviews 2013-18
II.B.19 List of 2013 Student Affairs Program Planning and Assessment Documents
II.B.20 Recommendation 2
II.B.21 Recommendation 9

II.C.1 Budget 4 Student Equity Plan
II.C.2 Library PPA Spring 2014
II.C.3 RFID Implementation Plan
II.C.4 RFID - Side by Side Comparison
II.C.5 January 2015 Board Minutes
II.C.6 Hartnell College e-mail Regarding reference@hartnell.edu
II.C.7 LibGuide Sample Page (Library Web Page)
II.C.8 Library Flyer of Remote Services
II.C.9 Hartnell Library Online Orientation
https://sites.google.com/a/hartnell.edu/orientation/
II.C.10 Draft Facilities Master Plan
II.C.11 Financial Statements of District Funds September 30, 2014
II.C.12 January 2015 Board Minutes

Standard III: Resources
III.A.1 Recommendation 7
III.A.3 Strategic Plan 2013-2018
III.A.4 Budget for Employee Professional Development FY 2014-15
III.A.5 Recommendation 7

III.C.1 2013 Faculty Members IT Surveys Administrators
III.C.2 2014 Faculty Members IT Survey Staff
III.C.3 2013 Student IT Survey
III.C.4 IT iSupport Survey Feedback
III.C.5 2013 Faculty Members IT Surveys Administrators
III.C.6 2013 Student IT Surveys
III.C.7 2014 Faculty Members IT Survey Staff
III.C.8 IT iSupport Survey Feedback
III.C.9 Cumulative Customer Satisfaction Exit Survey Results
III.C.10 List of Supported Applications
III.C.11 Calendar of training classes
III.C.12 PDC Staff Bios

III.D.1 Projection Worksheet
III.D.2 PowerPoint Presentation
III.D.3 2015-2016 FA Required Documentation
III.D.4 Reporting Verification Tracking Flags V4 and V5
III.D.5 2015-16 Policies and Procedures Section 3.6 Verification
III.D.6 Ability to Benefit Procedures
III.D.7 Financial Aid Disbursement Procedures with the Business Office and Higher One
III.D.8 Employing Federal Work Study Student Worker Handbook 2015-2016
III.D.9 SAP Policy 2015-2016
III.D.10 Disbursement Deadlines for 2015-2016
III.D.11 Approved Default Prevention Plan submitted to DOE 12-19-13
III.D.12 Default Management Task Force Agenda 10-17-14
Midterm Report
March 15, 2016

III.D.13 Default Management Task Force Minutes 10-17-14
III.D.14 Final Default Cohort Rate for 2012 as of 9-30-15
III.D.15 HC Default Cohort Rates from 2009-2012
III.D.16 HC Total Withdraw Form and Process 7-15-15
III.D.17 Default Management Activity Calendar 2015-2016
III.D.18 Budget Worksheets

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance
IV.A.2 Recommendation 11
IV.A.3 Recommendation 11

IV.B.1 Recommendation 11