



# California Community Colleges Institutional Effectiveness

Partnership Resource Teams Summary of Initial Visit Date of Visit: 10/11/2019

Name of Institution: Hartnell College

Partnership Resource Team Members: Gregory Anderson (Lead), Anu Khanna, Thais Winsome, Kasey Gardner, Deirdre Weaver

Area of Focus	Point Person Group	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Expressed by the Institution	Other IEPI Resources Needed?
<p><b>Area of Focus 1: Employee Engagement / Plan for Engagement.</b> Assist with key components of our newly established Plan for Engagement. Maximize the number of engaged employees and minimize the number of actively disengaged employees, and identify the issues at play. Engage increasingly larger numbers of folks in the college redesign process as part of a more encompassing aim of ensuring that employee engagement in governance and the workplace is a critical driver to more fully transitioning to a high performance organization.</p>		<p>President:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>committed to helping drive the plans the college has underway</li> <li>is meeting with governance groups and leadership to hear their plans</li> </ul> <p>Faculty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>many faculty leaders are committed to the need for structural change and committed to increased engagement of all faculty members</li> </ul> <p>Classified and Confidential Employees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>participated in engagement survey</li> <li>try to attend college redesign meetings but workload issues often prevent full participation</li> <li>working to ensure that retention of new employees is a priority</li> <li>very engaged and committed to their college; many grew up in the area and attended Hartnell before joining the staff. The Classified Staff pointed out a number of successes the college had enjoyed, of which the Classified were very proud, and stated that it was their belief that everyone at Hartnell was acting with good intent.</li> </ul> <p>Students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>participated in providing feedback on engagement survey and the student senate is committed to working with institutions to outreach to larger student community and get more involvement. Student senate is hosting initiatives or activities that help students in need and also show students how to get involved on their campus.</li> </ul>	<p>President:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committed to shared governance but aware of the challenge that many stakeholders are not engaged and progress must be made regardless of engagement level.</li> <li>President has a lot of expectations on her to unite all stakeholders around a vision for true and sustained engagement in shared governance and decision-making.</li> </ul> <p>Faculty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic Senate expressed concerns about ongoing issues with marginalization, citing as an example the Engagement plan itself. The Senate did not appoint the faculty who worked on the plan, nor was it formally approved through the Senate.</li> <li>Program Review is another area where the Senate-approved process was set aside in favor of another process that had not been vetted by the Senate.</li> <li>There is little in the way of faculty onboarding, with the exception of a mandated learning-strategies training that is coordinated by the administration and is not level appropriate (apparently includes mostly K12 material), and thus is perceived by some faculty as insulting.</li> <li>The college provides a lot of opportunities for stipends for faculty participation on specific projects, but does not incentivize participation on shared governance committees.</li> <li>Senior faculty reported that they felt as if they were perceived as a burden for being active at the college, while newer members of the faculty expressed concern that the college would experience loss of institutional knowledge and an inevitable culture shift as the more senior faculty stepped away from active participation.</li> <li>Other concerns: lack of recognition on the part of administration of the role of faculty and the need to respect their workload (scheduling key votes during peak faculty workload periods), and a disregard for faculty expertise and the value of the faculty voice.</li> <li>Counseling faculty expressed somewhat different concerns, which mirrored to some extent those expressed by the Classified staff (below). They feel very excluded from the Guided Pathways process in general, with their participation limited in many areas to receiving reports from Counselor "designees" who are selected (not by the department, apparently) to work directly with the GP planning group. Counselors who work with particular groups were assigned to work groups on GP that seemed reasonable in terms of their title but in fact did not reflect their actual role in working with students; thus they were not able to provide needed expertise to the work in these areas.</li> </ul> <p>Classified and Confidential Employees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns: engagement is present but not acknowledged by administration; the Classified leadership is not included in decision-making at the ground level but is only present to "rubber stamp" policies and procedures that have already been worked out at other levels. One comment: "We have compliance shared governance."</li> <li>Another comment: "Actively disengaged does not mean that you're not engaged; you were never brought to the table in the first place."</li> <li>Other concerns: without a clearly defined release time or overtime policy it is very difficult for Classified to participate in shared governance because it is never clear whether they will be given the time to participate.</li> </ul> <p>Managers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear on the details of the plan for engagement.</li> </ul> <p>Students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly engaged, interested in overcoming barriers to student participation.</li> </ul>	<p>CCCCO Vision Resource Center, Guided Pathways Community</p>

IA. Most effectively improve communication and communication flow.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All campus forums and meetings for Accreditation</li> <li>2. Weekly email updates from President</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Communication that comes from email is often lengthy and classified and confidential employees do not have the time due to workload issues to read it or attend the meetings they are invited to.</li> <li>b. Primary reliance on just email for communication is not effective, and other means of communication need to be established.</li> <li>c. Need to seek better technology solution to bridge the multiple campus divide, as physical distance is a barrier to participation.</li> <li>d. A general lack of awareness exists across multiple campuses so there is a concern that the communication channels being used are not effective.</li> </ol>	
IB. Boost participation in institutional dialogue about strategic priorities.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creating informal places for dialogue and empowering members of constituency groups to share</li> <li>2. Planning a review of the College Planning Council position paper with college roles/responsibility</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Engage probationary faculty in governance roles. (Previously were not allowed in those roles pre-tenure)</li> <li>b. Onboarding of new employees needs to be improved in order to orient them to institutional initiatives early on so they can participate in institutional conversations.</li> <li>c. Specialized CTE programs and grants and other specialized areas need to be included more, regardless of campus location.</li> </ol>	
IC. Strengthen cooperative interactions.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A general awareness of the challenges of the distances among geographical challenges of multiple campuses and inadequacy of technology for solving these challenges.</li> <li>2. College Redesign process has been authentic and inclusive</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Simplifying the governance structure to identify key meetings to attend when most relevant to nature of role.</li> <li>b. Roles and responsibilities for collaborations and leadership support for cooperative interactions need to be more explicit.</li> <li>c. Concern that while managers are supportive of staff participation in College Redesign process, if workload and deadlines or other obstacles come up, then previously valued participation is suddenly devalued and deprioritized. There needs to be firm commitment and transparency with follow-through as evidence so contributions are seen as valued and important.</li> </ol>	
ID. Increase employee responsiveness.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Employee Engagement survey was initially completed by a consultant.</li> <li>2. A new survey will also be distributed to find out about levels of engagement. All employees are being encouraged to participate in the survey.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Enhance new employee orientation for a sense of community. Planning is underway in HR to improve onboarding, though currently participation is limited and voluntary.</li> <li>b. More specific onboarding processes and expectation-setting for new employees could increase engagement and responsiveness.</li> </ol>	
IE. Align activities with institutional goals and strategic priorities.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The college has four institutional goals that it is trying to communicate college wide. Governance committees are starting to include these goals on meeting agendas in order to be more transparent on how meeting/agenda activities align directly with institutional goals.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Classified also expressed concern over lack of clarity in goal setting, and a need for the college to do a better job of aligning goals across the various levels of organization. One comment was a request for a goal setting process that entails better integration and alignment of priorities to avoid scope creep. Competing/conflicting priorities impede institutional effectiveness and lead to tension.</li> <li>b. Concern that initiative fatigue could set in if not better clarity on how meeting and engagement activities further institutional goals.</li> </ol>	
IF. Best expand shared leadership.			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Co-chair structure (Academic Senate/President) could be expanded to include Classified.</li> </ol>	

<p><b>Area of Focus 2: Restructuring and Streamlining the Governance System.</b> Consider re-structuring and streamlining the governance system to focus more strategically on the collaborative work of the College, which may involve re-structuring divisionally-based governance councils, consolidating committees, and/or embedding the ongoing work of college redesign into a more effective governance system. Consider alternative governance structures that may additionally contribute to greater collaboration and ensuring a high performance organization.</p>		<p>1. Classified staff are represented through the lens of a public sector union.</p>	<p>President:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committed to shared governance and looking forward to better understanding and using the existing system to move the college forward.</li> </ul> <p>Classified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified reported that there had been a Classified Senate at one time but it had dwindled in size such that it was no longer representative of the Classified, yet it was charged with making decisions that affected all Classified. The Classified felt that the union leadership structure was more representative and better suited to contribute to college governance.</li> </ul> <p>Confidential employees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wish to participate more in governance activities but need the time, leadership support and likely the structural support of a classified senate in order to facilitate their more involved participation.</li> </ul> <p>Managers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New managers generally unaware of the governance structure and unclear how to interact with the planning system.</li> </ul> <p>Students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly engaged, interested in overcoming barriers to student participation.</li> </ul>	
<p>IIB. Ensure that governance bodies—including but not limited to councils and committees—are structured to most effectively contribute to the work of the College. Consider whether a strategic governance agenda is needed to guide yearly governance activities.</p>			<p>General consensus is that there are silos across campus which are difficult to cross for collaboration.</p>	
<p>IIC. Ensure that agenda items and time spent at governance and operational meetings are proportional to the priority of issues facing the College. Ensure that meetings are best planned and facilitated to both encourage engagement and allow for productive outcomes, that is, to ensure that the voices of participants are welcomed and heard, and that the agenda items and deliberations are action-oriented.</p>		<p>1. The college has four institutional goals that it is trying to communicate college wide. Governance committees are starting to include these goals on meeting agendas in order to be more transparent on how meeting/agenda activities align directly with institutional goals. This is helping to determine priorities and time allocation for meeting agenda items.</p>	<p>College redesign team views their smaller model as more nimble and cross-collaborative. In some ways, they are operating in a complementary way to the regular strategic planning processes and participatory governance bodies. Thus, the work of the College Redesign Team is perceived as being more nimble and able to respond quickly to needs.</p>	