

## **STANDARD ONE INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS**

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

### **A. Mission**

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

#### **A1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.**

##### **Descriptive Summary:**

Hartnell College clearly states its commitment to student learning in its Mission Statement, part of which reads, “. . . all students shall have access to a quality education and the opportunity to pursue and achieve their goals and productive participation in a changing world.” Further, the Mission Statement emphasizes the importance of serving its local student population, in stating, “We are responsive to the learning needs of our community and dedicated to a diverse educational and cultural campus environment . . .” (Hartnell College Mission Statement).

To determine the learning needs of its community members and students and to ensure that it is meeting these needs, Hartnell College regularly surveys community members and students (2001 North County Educational Needs Assessment Final Report; 2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report; 2002 Graduate Survey Final Report; 2002 Customer Satisfaction Survey Final Report; 2004 Digital Divide Survey Final Report). Skills needed by employees and employee training needs of local employers are also assessed through advisory committees (Advisory Committee Minutes); interviews conducted by Workforce and Community Development (WFCD) staff (WFCD Interview Summaries); and surveys (2001 North County Educational Needs Assessment Final Report; 2002 Employer Survey Final Report).

Student learning programs and services are regularly developed, reviewed, and revised through the work of the Curriculum Committee, Student Services Council (Curriculum Committee Minutes; Student Services Council Minutes); Programs and Services Review committee (Instructional Program and Services Review Committee Minutes; Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Responsiveness (PEER) reports); and the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Work Group (SLOAWG). In addition, discussions about the Hartnell College student population, their learning needs, and the programs and services provided to support them occur at meetings of the Academic Senate, College Council, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group, Management Team, Executive Team, and Instructional Administrators (Academic Senate minutes, College Council minutes, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group minutes, Management Team agendas, Executive Team agendas, Instructional

Administrative agendas). The goals and plans developed as a result of this work are recorded in the Educational and Facilities Master Plan (E&FMP).

Faculty, staff, students, and community members have also engaged in focused discussions about Hartnell College's core values (Core Values Group), purposes, mission, and vision (Flex Days Agendas 2004, 2005). They have also participated in the Mission Statement Survey (2003 Mission Statement Survey).

**Self-Evaluation:**

Hartnell College continues to strive toward understanding the changing needs of its local community members, employers, and students, as evidenced by its ongoing evaluation processes. It uses this information to develop and revise programs and services. For example, the agricultural program has significantly grown from four classes to two degree programs to better meet the needs of the agricultural community, which is the largest contributor to the local Salinas Valley economy. One of the AA degrees articulates with a BA in agribusiness at California State University Monterey Bay (Curriculum Committee Minutes; Hartnell College 2006-07 Catalogue). In addition, online courses and student services, such as Personal Access Web Services (PAWS), have been added to better serve students, many of whom do not live close to campus. The College recognizes that distance education development is needed and continues to develop vocational as well as general education online offerings. The Administration of Justice program, which offers an extensive array of classes and an online degree program, is an example (Hartnell College 2006-07 Catalogue; Personal Access Web Services (PAWS)). The results of recent surveys also show that 88% of the community respondents agree that Hartnell course offerings meet community needs, and 53% of the student respondents are satisfied with course availability and times offered (2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report; 2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report).

**Planning Agenda:**

To assure that Hartnell College's programs and services will meet the needs of its communities and students in the future, the following plans will be implemented:

1. Management will continue to conduct regular community, employer, and student needs assessments.
2. Management will institute regular, focused forums with Hartnell College students, community members, and employees related to meeting learning needs and fulfilling the College's mission and purposes.
3. Management will utilize the existing committee and organizational structure to align programs and services with the community and student needs.
4. Management and faculty will continue to make distance education a focus of future instructional planning.

**A2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.**

**Descriptive Summary:**

The current Mission Statement was approved by the Board of Trustees on February 2, 1998 and reaffirmed on June 6, 2006 (Board of Trustees minutes). The mission statement is published in the Hartnell College Catalogue, Educational and Facilities Master Plan (E&FMP), Schedule of Classes, Institutional Planning, Accountability, and Performance Reports, and on the College's web site (Hartnell College Web Site).

**Self-Evaluation:**

Hartnell College is currently meeting this standard.

**Planning Agenda:**

1. Following review by the Hartnell College community, management will ask the Board of Trustees to approve the Mission Statement during the next accreditation cycle.
2. Management will publish the Mission Statement in both paper and electronic formats.
3. The Mission Statement will continue to be a focus of philosophical discussion among all shared governance committees on campus.

**A3. Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.**

**Descriptive Summary:**

In Fall 2003, the Institutional Planning Committee surveyed Hartnell College employees, students, and community members to assess the College's Mission Statement (2003 Mission Statement Survey). Survey results showed that 85% of the respondents agreed that the current Mission Statement reflects the mission of the College and supported retaining it as written. Survey results were discussed with the shared governance groups representing the College's constituencies and they supported reaffirming the Mission Statement (Institutional Planning Committee minutes; Executive Team agendas; Academic Senate minutes).

**Self-Evaluation:**

The Hartnell College community reviewed the Mission Statement and the statement was reaffirmed. While the vast majority of constituents believe that the Mission Statement reflects the mission of the College, the Mission Statement Survey results show that a minority of survey respondents believe that the College is not adequately implementing its mission. In response to this criticism, the Institutional Planning Committee organized discussions with constituent groups in Fall 2004 to assess how well the mission was being implemented and how implementation could be improved. These results were then shared with the campus community (Mission Statement Implementation Dialogue Summary).

**Planning Agenda:**

1. The Institutional Planning Committee will review the Mission Statement through the shared governance structure during the next accreditation cycle.
2. The Institutional Planning Committee will continue to monitor the degree to which the College's constituencies believe that the Mission Statement is being implemented, and make recommendations for changes, if needed.

#### **A4. The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.**

##### **Descriptive Summary:**

The Mission Statement serves as the centerpiece for the College's planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes. When the Educational and Facilities Master Plan is updated, academic, administrative, and student support units are directed to relate their goals to the Mission Statement, vision statement, and institutional goals. Similarly, the Administrative Services Review Process is also tied to the Mission Statement. In addition, the College's Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan was developed to assess the degree to which the Mission Statement, vision statements, college purposes, and institutional goals are being met.

While the vast majority of constituents believe that the Mission Statement reflects the mission of the College, the Mission Statement Survey results (2003 Mission Statement Survey) show that a minority of survey respondents believe that the College is not adequately implementing its mission. In response to this criticism, the Institutional Planning Committee organized discussions with constituent groups in fall 2004 to assess how well the mission was being implemented and how implementation could be improved. These discussions resulted in numerous suggestions for better implementing the College's mission, which were then shared with the campus community (Mission Statement Implementation Dialogue Summary).

The Institutional Planning Committee annually facilitates the process for developing institutional planning and budgeting priorities by seeking input from each of the administration units. These priorities, which are linked to the Mission Statement, vision statement, and college goals, are used by the budget committee to allocate budget augmentations.

##### **Self-Evaluation:**

The Hartnell College Mission Statement is the focal point for institutional planning and decision-making. Results of the dialogue with the campus community about the degree to which the College is implementing its mission and vision statements provides useful information concerning areas of strength, as well as areas that could be improved. College constituencies are encouraged to use these results in discussions at various meetings on campus and in their planning processes. Similarly, Hartnell faculty, classified staff, managers, and students will be encouraged to use the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan assessment results in planning and decision-making, as those results are published.

##### **Planning Agenda:**

1. The Institutional Planning Committee will disseminate the assessment results of the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan, and recommend that divisions, departments, and programs use them in planning and decision-making.
2. Management will ask developers of unit and college-wide plans to develop goals that reflect the College's mission.
3. The Institutional Planning Committee will more actively monitor and assess how the Mission Statement is used in institutional planning processes, and will produce a regular report summarizing its assessment.

## **B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness**

The Institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidences of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

### **B1. The institution maintains ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.**

#### ***Descriptive Summary:***

The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group (SLOAWG) was established in Spring 2003 to develop processes and plans for establishing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course, program, and degree levels, and to develop methods to assess these outcomes (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group minutes). The faculty, managers, and staff who comprise the membership of the SLOAWG have conducted discussions about student learning related to both instruction and student services. The Assessment Coordinator, who is a faculty member, and other SLOAWG members have also led discussions about SLOs at area and unit meetings (Unit Meeting Agendas). These discussions, as well as other SLO training (SLO Training Outlines; Agendas for External Workshops agendas), have resulted in faculty developing SLOs for selected courses (Student Learning Outcome Assessment Course Summaries). In addition, student learning has been the focus of several Flex Day training activities (Flex Day agendas).

Instructional programs and support services staff undergoing Program and Services Review have also engaged in dialogue about student learning and processes related to improving student learning. These discussions resulted in the development of objectives directed toward improving instruction and support services, including the development of SLOs in student services areas (Program Review Committee Minutes; Instructional Program Review Reports; Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Responsiveness (PEER) reports).

College governance committees, planning committees, and individual units regularly engage in dialogue about student learning, institutional processes, and methods for improvement. This is documented by agendas and/or minutes of the following bodies:

- Curriculum Committee;
- Program Review Committee;
- College Council;
- Executive Team;
- Management Team;
- Academic Senate;

- Classified Senate;
- Student Senate;
- Student Services Council;
- Datatel Core Group;
- Institutional Planning Committee;
- Facilities Planning Committee;
- Technology Master Plan Team;
- Distance Education Committee;
- Accreditation Focus Group Summaries;
- Enrollment Management Team.

Discussion topics have included: collaborative learning; using technology to enhance the learning environment; improving the registration process; improving access to courses; better utilizing classroom facilities; communicating across disciplines; and implementing enrollment management. These discussions have resulted in developing and revising college-wide and unit plans that address the improvement of student learning and institutional processes. These plans are part of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan (E&FMP).

Dialogue among Hartnell College faculty and staff also occurs in response to the results of survey research, such as the 2002 Graduate Survey Final Report, 2002 Employer Survey Final Report, 2002 Customer Satisfaction Survey Final Report, and 2004 Digital Divide Survey Final Report. These discussions have, in turn, led to changes impacting student learning and institutional processes. For example, more emphasis was placed on assisting older students in using technology after results of the Digital Divide Survey showed that this was an area needing improvement.

Participants in meetings involving Hartnell College faculty and staff, K-12 and university educators, and local employers have also stimulated dialogue. As a result of these discussions, new programs and partnerships have been developed in agriculture, teacher education, medical lab technician preparation, emergency room nursing, and construction, as well as new and revised courses that better satisfy student, employer, and transfer institution needs (Agendas and/or minutes: Occupational Advisory Committees, President's Agriculture Steering Committee, College Connection Initiative; and Hartnell College Catalogue). Each new program developed incorporates learning outcomes and assessment plans.

**Self-Evaluation:**

Hartnell College's work in developing student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the course, program, and degree levels is still in the early stages of development, having been implemented in 2003. The College has maintained ongoing dialogue about student learning and ways to improve it, as evidenced in the activities listed above. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group has been especially active in initiating dialogue and facilitating training concerning student learning outcomes (SLOs) and methods to assess them among faculty and others.

Student Learning Outcomes and methods to assess them have been developed for several courses (including math, Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S), and computer science and information systems), many student services programs, and general education. In addition, results of the Student Opinion Survey show that respondents “mostly agree” that faculty adequately explain student learning outcomes for their courses (2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report). Thus, the College has established a model (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan) for campus-wide application and is making steady progress toward meeting this standard.

**Planning Agenda:**

The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Work Group will facilitate: (1) faculty and staff training; (2) development and assessment of student learning outcomes at the course, program, and degree levels; and (3) setting specific targets for achieving its objectives. On-going dialogue will occur through the shared governance system of the College.

**B2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed collaborative toward their achievement.**

**Descriptive Summary:**

Hartnell College establishes goals at several levels, based upon the College’s Mission and Vision, as well as internal and external needs as identified through surveys and advisory groups. The Board of Trustees and President/Superintendent annually collaborate to establish institutional goals. In addition, college-wide planning committees, such as the Technology Master Plan Team and Enrollment Management Team, and individual units/departments regularly establish goals related to the mission, vision, and institutional goals (Minutes: Technology Master Plan Team; Program Review Committee). All of these goals are recorded in the Educational and Facilities Master Plan (E&FMP), which is updated every two years.

Results from community needs assessments help identify needs that are later translated into college-wide and/or unit goals by programs, divisions, and units. Pertinent community needs assessment surveys include:

- 2001 North County Educational Needs Assessment Final Report;
- 2002 Employer Survey Final Report;
- 2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report.

Student and employee surveys used for assessment include:

- 2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report;
- 2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report;
- 2002 Customer Satisfaction Survey Final Report;
- 2005 Graduate Survey Final Report;
- 2004 Digital Divide Survey Final Report.

To facilitate understanding of institutional goals by the College's constituencies, goals are regularly discussed at planning meetings (Agendas and Minutes: Institutional Planning Committee, Technology Master Planning Team, Enrollment Management Team, and Management Team). Goals are discussed at college-wide meetings, including Convocation, Flex Days, and faculty meetings (Convocation, Flex Day, and Faculty Forum agendas). Information is also distributed in electronic and paper form (paper and email memos).

Objectives derived from the goals are made operational in the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan and Program and Services Review plans so they can be assessed, and the results used for dialogue and program improvement (Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan; Instructional Program Review reports; Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Responsiveness (PEER) reports; Administrative Services Review plans and assessments).

### **Self-Evaluation:**

Hartnell College develops goals to improve programs and services at many levels and on an ongoing basis, as evidenced by the reports and activities documented above. Many of these goals are written in measurable terms and are assessed to determine the degree to which they have been implemented. For example, both the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan and Administrative Services Review plans specify: (1) intended outcomes; (2) how the outcomes will be assessed and the criteria for success; (3) assessment results; and (4) how the results are used for improvement (Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Assessment Summary (when completed) and Administrative Services Review Plans and Assessment). In addition, units have documented the achievement of Educational and Facilities Master Plan goals and how the outcomes have impacted Hartnell College (Educational and Facilities Master Plan Goals Assessment and Ports of Call). However, not all goals are assessed on a regular basis. In addition, goals developed by college-wide planning committees and individual units are not always integrated with one another.

Despite the efforts outlined above, only 37% of all respondents to the Accreditation Employee Survey “strongly agree” or “mostly agree” that the administration provides effective leadership to define goals, develop plans, and establish priorities for the institution (2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report). However, the proportion of part-time faculty and managers who “strongly agree” or “mostly agree” with this statement is significantly higher (77% and 71% respectively) than the proportion of full-time faculty and classified staff who feel the same (22% and 26% respectively).

### **Planning Agenda:**

1. The Institutional Planning Committee will facilitate a process to assure that institutional plans and unit plans are better integrated.
2. Units will integrate Program and Services Review goals into the Educational and Facilities Master Plan to help reduce duplication of effort.
3. Management will determine why full-time faculty and classified staff do not believe that the administration provides effective leadership to define goals, develop plans,

and establish priorities for the institution, and improve planning processes to reflect the results of this assessment by facilitating forums to shared governance.

**B3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.**

**Descriptive Summary:**

The Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) has established a cyclical institutional planning process, which incorporates planning, resource allocation, implementation, and evaluation. The process also outlines the institutional planning principles, IPC responsibilities, and other planning components (Institutional Planning Process).

The degree to which the College meets its goals is assessed in four primary ways. First, the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan (IEAP) identifies how outcomes in 12 areas are assessed and the criteria for success:

- Transfer education;
- General education;
- Career preparation;
- Development education;
- Workforce development and community development;
- Access;
- Retention;
- Campus diversity;
- Student goal attainment;
- Technology;
- Personnel.

Assessment occurs on an ongoing basis. The findings of these assessments provide valuable information for making improvements to programs and services. Publication of the results helps demonstrate how well Hartnell College is fulfilling its mission and institutional goals.

Second, as part of the process to update the Educational and Facilities Master Plan, unit staff periodically document accomplishment of their goals, and then use this information to modify existing goals and/or add new goals (Educational and Facilities Master Plan Goals Assessments).

Third, the Program and Services Review processes require that the instructional, student services, and administrative units collect assessment data to determine the degree to which they have been successful in providing instruction and support services. Results of these assessments are included in each academic, administrative and student services units' reports and are used to add new goals and/or modify existing goals (Instructional

Program Review reports; Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Responsiveness (PEER) reports; Administrative Services Review plans and assessments).

Fourth, the student learning outcomes assessment process specifies that the College identify and document: (1) student learning outcomes (SLOs); (2) ways to assess these outcomes; and (3) criteria for determining if the outcomes have been achieved at the course, program, and degree levels. After SLOs have been assessed, assessment results and how the results have been used for making improvements will be documented on summary forms (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Course and Program Summary Forms).

Other institutional research and program evaluation results are also used to help assess goals and develop plans. These include satisfaction and opinion surveys, such as the Career Prep Survey, Customer Satisfaction Survey, Digital Divide Survey, and Accreditation Surveys (Career Prep Survey Report; 2002 Customer Satisfaction Survey Final Report; 2004 Digital Divide Survey Final Report; 2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report; 2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report; 2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report). Assessment also occurs through program evaluation studies, such as those conducted for Title V, EOP&S, and Gear Up projects and the Enrollment Management Team (Title V Annual Reports; EOPS Annual Report; Gear Up Evaluation Report). Likewise, ad hoc studies are used for evaluation and decision-making. These include: the Enrollment by Zip Code Analysis; FTES Analysis; King City Enrollment Analysis; Indices of Student Enrollment and Success; and Survey for Private Fund Raising Needs (specified reports). In addition, College decision-makers have access to the Executive Information System (EIS), an automated computer program, and the Hartnell College Fact Book to access information about students, employees, and resources.

Information developed from the research and evaluation results specified above is analyzed and distributed to decision-makers and others in several different ways. The Institutional Research and Planning Office (IRP) develops reports for major research studies in two formats: a four-page summary, called a Research Brief, which is distributed to the entire campus community and external community leaders; and a longer, detailed report, which is distributed to decision-makers and other interested persons. Both types of reports are available in both electronic (Institutional Research and Planning web site) and paper versions. In addition, discussions about the research results and how they might be used are often conducted with the Board of Trustees and constituent groups, such as the Management Team, Instructional Administrators, Academic Senate, and units (Meeting agendas and/or minutes).

When budget augmentations become available, units have an opportunity to request additional funds through the Budget Committee, based upon the Institutional Planning and Budgeting Priorities that are established annually by the campus community (Budget Committee Minutes). In addition, requests for reallocating existing funds are made through the President and Vice President's Council, based upon institutional priorities and needs (Block Grant Allocations Recommendations).

**Self-Evaluation:**

As indicated above, Hartnell College has utilized both quantitative data (e.g., student outcomes results, as detailed in the Hartnell College Fact Book), student ratings of programs and services (2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report) and qualitative data (e.g., discussions about programs and services as documented in Program and Services Review Committee minutes) to assess goal achievement. However, plans are not always integrated with one another, and resources are not always linked to established goals. These are ongoing topics of discussion of the regular Management Team meetings.

**Planning Agenda:**

1. The Institutional Planning Committee will facilitate a process to assure that institutional plans and unit plans are better integrated.
2. The Institutional Planning Committee will facilitate implementation of a process to better link resources to support college goals using established institutional priorities.

**B4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.**

**Descriptive Summary:**

The Institutional Planning Committee (IPC), which is a shared governance committee co-chaired by a faculty member and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, serves as Hartnell College's primary planning group. Its members include representatives from faculty, classified staff, managers, and students, who are encouraged to communicate with their constituent groups about planning issues. The IPC's primary responsibility is to facilitate the planning process at the College, including development of the Educational and Facilities Master Plan. In doing so, the IPC regularly seeks input from the College constituencies before finalizing processes or documents. For example, when developing the annual Institutional Planning and Budgeting Priorities, the IPC requests input regarding priorities, writes a draft, and then solicits feedback on the draft before finalizing its recommendations to the College Council (Institutional Planning Committee minutes).

Other committees, which also include representatives from all of the major constituencies, are responsible for developing college-wide plans. These include committees responsible for: the Technology Master Plan; Facilities Master Plan; Matriculation Plan; Human Resource/Diversity Plan; Distance Education: Online Learning Best Practices; and Student Equity Plan (committee minutes). These committees also seek input from the entire campus community as plans are developed and revised.

Plans developed through Program and Services Review utilize input from all constituencies within the discipline or unit being reviewed (Instructional Program Review reports; Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Responsiveness reports). Goals are

assessed by representatives of these disciplines or units on a regular basis (Administrative Services Review plans and assessments).

The recently established Enrollment Management Team, which has strong and active participation by faculty, managers, and classified staff, has been very successful in establishing and implementing measurable goals. For example, the Team was able to secure additional resources to fund computer software and support staff to enhance student recruitment (Enrollment Management Team minutes and year-end reports).

The Educational and Facilities Master Plan (E&FMP), which is updated every two years, serves as the primary document that incorporates all college-wide and unit plans. Each committee or unit (administrative, academic, or student services) responsible for part of the E&FMP reviews its portion of the plan with all of those impacted by the plan and makes changes and additions based upon input from their constituencies. For example, area Deans meet with their faculty and staff to review and revise the portions of the plan addressing their specific disciplines (Unit agendas and minutes).

When plans are reviewed, reviewers on each appropriate committee document accomplishments and improvements made as a result of implementing plan objectives. For example, reviewers of the unit portions of the E&FMP summarized accomplishments and the impact of these accomplishments (Educational and Facilities Master Plan Goals Assessment). Similarly, as part of the Administrative Services Review process, reviewers assess each objective and indicate how these assessment results have been used by their unit (Administrative Services Review plans and assessments).

Academic, administrative, and student services units use existing funds in their budgets to fund unit priorities, based on the annual budgeting and review process. When budget augmentations become available, units have an opportunity to request additional funds through the Budget Committee, based upon the Institutional Planning and Budgeting Priorities that are established annually by the campus community (Budget Committee Minutes). In addition, requests for reallocating existing college funds are made through the President and Vice President's Council, based upon adjustments or changes in institutional priorities and needs (Block Grant Allocations Recommendations).

The Hartnell College administration encourages and supports the acquisition of additional funds to support college priorities and plans through grants and fund raising. Grant development involves conducting program needs assessments, which include a careful review of existing plans and intended outcomes. As a result of this emphasis, the College has been very successful in securing external grant funding, such as the Title V, Student Support Services (TRIO), Gear Up, USDA Hispanic Serving Institutions Program, and the Center for Teacher Education grants (Summary of Grants Obtained). In addition, the College raises additional funds through the Hartnell College Foundation, an auxiliary organization. Recently, the College and Foundation hired a development director, whose primary responsibility is to help secure community donations to support needed facilities, equipment, programs, and services.

**Self-Evaluation:**

As specified above, college-wide and unit planning committees are broad-based and composed of representatives of constituent groups impacted by the plans. Planning objectives are regularly assessed, and assessment results are used to make improvements. Recent survey results show that 68% of employees and 54% of community members “agree” that they have had sufficient opportunity to participate in the planning process. In addition, 68% of the employees “agree” that the College adequately publicizes the planning process (2005 Accreditation Self-Study Employee Survey Final Report).

Planning information is disseminated through newsletters (Institutional Planning, Accountability, and Performance Report), paper copies, and by posting documents on the College’s web page (Institutional Research and Planning web site). The College also convenes forums to discuss plans and planning activities (Flex Day agendas; Faculty Forum agendas). In the 2005-06 year, the President’s Agriculture Steering Committee was established to gather input and resources from the agricultural community of the Salinas Valley in order to enhance Hartnell’s agricultural program (committee agendas).

The College has also been very effective in securing grants to support important institutional and community needs (Grants include: Title V; Gear Up; Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM); and Student Support Services (TRIO) (Summary of Grants Obtained)). Over the last 10 years, Hartnell has secured more than \$30 million in state, federal, corporate, and private foundation grants.

There is an established process for linking augmented funds to established priorities as outlined in the Institutional Planning and Budget Development calendar. However, a parallel process for reallocating existing resources to support institutional priorities is not well documented. Thus, it is not clear to everyone how new initiatives are funded within current budget structure. Consequently, the College needs to document this latter process.

**Planning Agenda:**

1. The Institutional Planning Committee will facilitate development of a more comprehensive process for linking planning goals to institutional priorities and to both augmented and existing resources.
2. Management will provide resources and support for the Enrollment Management Team.

**B5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.**

**Descriptive Summary:**

Hartnell College collects assessment information from many sources using a variety of assessment approaches, and distributes assessment results to constituent groups using a variety of media. First, the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan (IEAP) identifies how outcomes in 12 areas are assessed and the criteria for measuring success. The results of these assessment results, when completed, will provide valuable information for

making improvements to programs and services. Publication of the results will also help demonstrate how well Hartnell College is fulfilling its mission and institutional goals.

Second, results from community needs assessments help identify needs that are later translated into college-wide and/or unit goals by programs, divisions, and units. Pertinent community needs assessment surveys include: the 2001 North County Educational Needs Assessment Final Report; 2002 Employer Survey Final Report; and 2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report. Student and employee surveys used for assessment include: the 2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report; 2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report; 2002 Customer Satisfaction Survey Final Report; 2002 Graduate Survey Final Report; and 2004 Digital Divide Survey Final Report.

Third, Program and Services Review processes require that the instructional, student services, and administrative units collect assessment data to determine the degree to which they have been successful in providing instruction and support services. Results of these assessments are included in the units' reports (Instructional Program Review reports; Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Responsiveness (PEER) reports; Administrative Services Review plans and assessments).

Fourth, the student learning outcomes assessment process specifies that the College identify and document: (1) student learning outcomes (SLOs); (2) ways to assess these outcomes; and (3) criteria for determining if the outcomes have been achieved at the course, program, and degree levels. After SLOs have been assessed, assessment results and how the results have been used for making improvements are documented on summary forms (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Course and Program Summary Forms).

Information gleaned from the research and evaluation results specified above is analyzed and distributed to decision-makers and others in several different ways. Reports for major research studies are developed in two formats: a four-page summary, called a Research Brief, which is distributed to the entire campus community, the Hartnell College Foundation Board, Western Stage Board, and community leaders. A longer, detailed report is distributed to decision-makers and other interested persons. Both types of reports are available in both electronic (Institutional Research and Planning web site) and paper versions. In addition, discussions about the research results and how they might be used are often conducted with constituent groups, such as the Board of Trustees, Management Team, Instructional Administrative, and Academic Senate (Meeting agendas and/or minutes). Assessment results are also made available to the external public through: press releases to the media (Press Releases); the Linking Up newsletter (Linking Up); during meetings with Occupational Education Advisory Committees (minutes and agendas); other community groups (including the Measure H Bond Oversight Committee); and through responding to ad hoc requests.

How effectively the College communicates matters of quality assurance to its internal and external constituencies are primarily assessed through the community, student, and employee accreditation surveys (2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report;

2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report; 2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report), and informal feedback received from individuals and groups.

**Self-Evaluation:**

As specified above, Hartnell College has implemented ongoing processes to assess community, student, and employee needs, and the degree to which the College is fulfilling its mission and goals. The results of these assessments are communicated to both the College's internal and external communities. One source of evidence that the community believes the College provides quality programs and service was the passage of a \$131 community-financed bond measure in 2002 by 66% of local voters (Measure H Election Results).

While some assessment of how effectively the College is communicating this information to the public has occurred, additional feedback would be useful.

**Planning Agenda:**

Management will develop additional methods to assess how effectively the College is communicating information about institutional quality to the public.

- B6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.**

**Descriptive Summary:**

Hartnell College reviews and modifies its planning and resource allocation processes in several ways.

First, the Institutional Planning Committee, in consultation with the College's constituencies, regularly reviews planning processes to determine that they meet the College's planning needs, and make revisions as needed. For example, the overall institutional planning process was recently updated to reflect organizational changes and to place more emphasis on integrating college plans and assessing the degree to which they have been implemented. As another example, the institutional planning and budgeting calendar was revised so that the development of annual planning and budgeting priorities occurred closer to when augmentation funds are received (Institutional Planning Committee Minutes).

Second, the Program and Services Review processes are also regularly reviewed and updated. The Instructional Program Review process was modified in 2004 to include more relevant assessment data and a procedure for reviewing plans developed through the process (Program Review Committee minutes).

Third, institutional planning and budgeting priorities are linked to allocated budget augmentations and are periodically documented through documents like the President's

Memo Showing Budget Augmentation Allocations and Priorities (Block Grant Allocations Recommendations).

Fourth, the Institutional Research Agenda outlines institutional research projects, timelines, and persons responsible for agenda items. It is regularly reviewed by decision-makers and others to assure that it reflects the College's research and evaluation needs. The Agenda is revised, as needed, published, and made available to the entire campus community in paper and electronic forms (Institutional Research Agenda; Minutes: Executive Team, Management Team, Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Subcommittee, Academic Senate).

Fifth, community members, Hartnell students, and employees are regularly surveyed to help assess the effectiveness of planning and resource allocation processes (2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report; 2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report; 2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report).

The College also assesses and documents improvements made through implementing institutional and unit plans. As part of the institutional planning process, the Educational and Facilities Master Plan is reviewed every two years, and the impacts of achieved goals are periodically summarized and distributed to the campus community (Educational and Facilities Master Plan Goals Assessment). The Program and Services Review reports also document improvements made as a result of implementing objectives and assessing outcomes (Instructional Program Review reports; Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Responsiveness (PEER) reports; Administrative Services Review plans and assessments). In addition, the 2004 Mission Statement Survey results (Mission Statement Survey) showed that a minority of survey respondents believed that the College is not adequately implementing the mission. To address this, the Institutional Planning Committee organized discussions with constituent groups to assess how well the mission was being implemented and how implementation could be improved (Mission Statement Implementation Dialogue Summary).

**Self-Evaluation:**

As outlined above, procedures are in place to regularly review and modify the College's planning and resource allocation cycle. Recent survey results show that Hartnell College employees believe that many of these processes are effective. Survey results show that: 76% of the respondents "agree" that evaluation results from Program and Services Review are used to improve instructional programs and support programs; 75% "agree" that Hartnell has clearly defined processes for reviewing all of its educational programs; 68% "agree" that the College adequately publicizes the planning process; and 66% agree that the College effectively evaluates how well it accomplishes its mission and purposes. However, only 49% of respondents "agree" that the College budget reflects institutional priorities and planning goals (2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report).

**Planning Agenda:**

The Institutional Planning Committee will facilitate development of a more comprehensive process for linking planning goals to institutional priorities and to both augmented and existing resources.

**B7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.**

**Descriptive Summary:**

Hartnell College assesses instructional programs and support services on a regular, ongoing basis using multiple methods. It subsequently uses these assessment results to make improvements and documents improvements made. The following four methods are used to assure evaluation mechanism.

First, Program and Services Review processes require that the instructional, student services, and administrative units collect assessment data to determine the degree to which they have been successful in providing instruction and support services. Results of these assessments are included in the units' reports and are used to develop new goals and/or modify existing goals (Instructional Program Review reports; Productivity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Responsiveness (PEER) reports; Administrative Services Review plans and assessments).

Second, other program evaluation research for Title V, Gear Up, and EOPS programs has helped to assess program effectiveness and document improvements made (Title V, Gear Up, and EOPS Evaluation Reports).

Third, the student learning outcomes assessment process specifies that the College identify and document: (1) student learning outcomes (SLOs); (2) ways to assess these outcomes; and (3) criteria for determining if the outcomes have been achieved at the course, program, and degree levels. After SLOs have been assessed, assessment results and how those results have been used for making improvements will be documented on summary forms (SLOA Course and Program Summary Forms).

Fourth, results from survey research, including surveys of student and employee satisfaction, graduates, and technology, are used to help assess and make improvements to instructional programs and support services. In addition, employee and community survey results are used to help assess how well the College's evaluation processes contribute to improving programs and services (2002 Customer Satisfaction Survey Final Report; 2002 Graduate Survey Final Report; 2004 Digital Divide Final Report; 2005 Student Opinion Survey Final Report; 2005 Accreditation Community Survey Final Report; 2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report).

Administrative Services Review reports and focus group summaries from governance committees document what improvements have been made resulting from assessment results (Administrative Services Review plans and assessment; Accreditation Focus Group Summaries).

**Self-Evaluation:**

Hartnell College uses a variety of evaluation approaches to assess the effectiveness of programs and services, as outlined above. Many units use evaluation results to make improvements, as documented in evaluation reports and focus group summaries (Administrative Services Review plans and assessments; Accreditation Focus Group Summaries). In addition, recent survey results show that most employees believe that many of these processes are effective. Results show that: 76% of the respondents “agree” that evaluation results from Program and Services Review are used to improve instructional programs and support programs; 75% “agree” that Hartnell has clearly defined processes for reviewing all of its educational programs; and 75% “agree” that faculty use student learning outcomes assessment results to influence curriculum and program development (2005 Accreditation Employee Survey Final Report).

**Planning Agenda:**

1. Management will review how well evaluation processes contribute to improving instructional programs and support services on a regular basis.
2. Management will monitor and report the results of implementation strategies and outcomes from the academic divisions.