Goal 4A:  To support its mission, Hartnell College is committed to the effective utilization of its human resources.

Plan:

1. Employees at Hartnell College will be evaluated at specified intervals, and the performance evaluations will, in accordance with collectively bargained requirements and/or Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, focus on continued improvement so that the college and its employees can meet its mission to serve students and the community.

2. Hartnell will use appropriate opportunities, (e.g., when pursuing grants, when employees retire or leave employment, when enrollment data and trends provide additional information), and planning to continually assess whether its staffing levels and structure continue to meet needs, and make adjustments accordingly.

3. Hartnell will ensure that employees’ job descriptions are clear, current, and accurate, through a periodic process of review, which will include the opportunity for classification groups or individuals to request a review of their positions or classifications.
**Goal 4A:** To support its mission, Hartnell College is committed to the effective utilization of its human resources.

**Progress:**

1. **Evaluations that lead to improvement:** The District’s collective bargaining agreements with the CSEA and the HCFA both provide that one element of the evaluation process is for each employee to identify specific goals that would improve their professional performance, and an assessment of progress toward previous goals. For the CSEA group, the evaluation process language now requires, rather than permits, that the employee and supervisor identify three specific goals, the means by which the employee will reach those goals, and the ways that the supervisor will assist them in that effort. For the HCFA, tenured faculty members must now submit one to three goals that will assist them in improving in one of the specified areas: teaching, other academic matters, or student success. They also will identify strategies and timelines for achieving those goals. The management evaluation process was developed in 2012 to include a yearly goals and goal assessment process, regardless of whether a complete evaluation is due.

To improve the usefulness of this process, and the goals setting process for all evaluations, two managers gave a workshop on SMART goals during the monthly meeting of the administrators in May 2016, and this presentation will be repeated.

To improve the value of performance evaluations overall, the college volunteered to be a demonstration site for the Performance Management module of the new State-Wide Association of Community Colleges (SWACC) series of offerings to reduce EPL (Employment Practices Liability) claims among member institutions. All Hartnell managers took a 31-minute online course on Performance Management in October 2016, given through the Keenan SafeColleges system, and then were required to attend a live interactive presentation at Hartnell on November 9, 2016, given by attorney Laura Schulkind.
Completion of evaluations: Contract (probationary) faculty evaluations are done on a yearly cycle, each year for four years. All such evaluations during each year of this plan were timely completed. Full-time temporary faculty are treated like probationary faculty with regard to their evaluations during the first four years. They, too, were all timely completed.

Regular (tenured) faculty are evaluated on a three-year cycle. Nearly all of these evaluations were completed on time. During 2015-16, one faculty evaluation was not completed because the faculty member was on 100% reassign time to a non-teaching position, and so there was no traditional faculty work to evaluate. One other faculty member was not evaluated because she refused to be evaluated by a new supervisor. Both evaluations were postponed for one year. During 2016-17, all scheduled regular faculty evaluations were conducted except for one faculty member who was out on medical leave for most of the evaluation window.

Part-time faculty are evaluated during their first year of employment and then at least once every 6 semesters thereafter. These evaluations may be done during any semester that the faculty member teaches. During 2015-16, approximately 78% of these evaluations were completed on time. In 2016-17, that percentage remained unchanged.

Classified staff members have slightly varying schedules of evaluations, depending on their work groups, but all must be evaluated during their probationary period (some only once, and some three times), and then at least once every two years. These evaluations occur throughout the year, depending on each employee’s anniversary date, or the date of the last evaluation. Because the District made a big push to timely complete evaluations during the the 2013-14 academic year, the bulk of classified evaluations were due again in 2015-16, and this, combined with a blip of turnover in administrator/supervisor ranks contributed to a decrease in timely completion rates to only 65%. In 2016-17, that completion rate improved. As of September 1, 2017, 99% of classified employee evaluations had been completed. With
approximately 175 classified employees, some of whom are still in their probationary period, there can be anywhere from 5 to 15 employees whose evaluations are due in any given month.

Finally, managers and supervisors in their first two years participate in a full evaluation. After that period, they participate in a full evaluation at least once every three years, but complete a goals and goal assessment period every year, with a due date of June 30. All evaluations were completed during the 2016 cycle, and as of September 1, 2017, 83% of manager evaluations had been completed.

2. Hartnell continues to conduct a needs assessment of staffing levels and types at every opportunity that arises—when a vacancy is created through attrition or grant activity. Every request to fill a vacancy goes to the Cabinet for discussion and assessment before being advanced for recruitment. Additionally, the Cabinet reviews the organizational structure at least once annually.

3. Hartnell was scheduled to complete its full cycle of classification reviews for the CSEA group in the summer of 2017, and by September, initial recommendations were complete for all positions except those in IT. That work should be completed during the upcoming year.

In August and September 2016, the new L39 classification review process was completed, which resulted in the addition of a new classification, lead custodian, a reclassification of an employee from one classification to another, and a reallocation of both of the food services classifications.

The confidential job categories underwent a classification and compensation review with the assistance of an outside consultant. This process resulted in updated job descriptions, two new classifications, several reclassifications, and a reallocation for one class of employees.
Finally, the District engaged the services of an outside consultant to do a classification and compensation study of the management work group. Position Description Questionnaires were due from each manager by May 5, and were submitted to the consultant approximately two weeks later. Interviews were scheduled for some of those managers in mid-June. The recommendations from this study will be processed during the 2017-18 academic year.

In each of these cases, the classification study is conducted first, and a compensation study is conducted next, as two parts of a unified process.