



**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative
Partnership Resource Teams
College Innovation and Effectiveness Plan
Date: March 8th, 2017 (Status Report)**



Name of Institution: **El Camino College Compton Center**

Area of Focus	Objective	Responsible Person	Target Date for Achievement	Action Steps	Measure of Progress	Status As of Date: 03.08.2017
A. Planning Process (Integrated Planning)	1. Better integrate/align planning, program review, SLO assessment and budget 2. Monitor and evaluate planning processes for effectiveness 3. Obtain and introduce better planning software 4. Promote a culture of planning and ownership of institutional outcomes	1. Strategic Planning Committee (SPC); Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC); Planning and Budget Committee (PBC); CEO 2. SPC; IEC 3. CEO & CBO (with input from faculty, committees, and other stakeholders) 4. CEO; Professional Development (PD)	Start Fall 2016 (achieve by Spring 2017)	a. Revisit role and functioning of IEC; possible restructuring to include faculty co-chair (maybe even program review faculty coordinator) b. Improve communication in all forms (verbal, written) of important institutional topics (i.e. ILOs and their significance, but also regular updates of campus developments) c. Add feedback stages to the Compton Planning Model d. Research possible planning software and test the fit for our campus e. Disseminate documentation and offer campuswide trainings (e.g., FLEX Days) about integrated planning, program review, SLOs, and budget allocation, including any aspects revised as a result of implementing this Plan f. Provide incentives and support for completing institutional tasks (promote a culture of appreciation and support) g. Align the timing of program review communications/decisions with institutional budget communications/decisions	a. Meeting minutes b. Evidence of communication; possible Institutional Awareness survey or questionnaire c. Published redesigned model d. Purchase/implementation of new software e. Training evaluations and/or awareness surveys f. Established incentive system; employee or stakeholder satisfaction surveys g. Revised calendar/schedule of institutional communications and decisions	a. [COMPLETE] Faculty co-chair and PR faculty coordinator are both mandatory components of the current IEC; subcommittees were created to facilitate reviews across different areas b. [IN PROGRESS] Frequency of newsletters and informational sessions has increased, but content hasn't yet covered all types of institutional topics (e.g., ILOs and their significance). Institutional Awareness survey still needs to be developed if it will be used to evaluate this. c. [NEAR COMPLETE] Model is redesigned but not published outside of accreditation report d. [IN PROGRESS] Initial research (requesting feedback and suggestions from other campuses) has begun; list of potential vendors still needs to be decided on e. [IN PROGRESS] More documentation and trainings have been provided, but the focus has been on program review. A planning summit is currently being organized for the Spring 2017 semester. f. [NOT STARTED] Accreditation teams and helpers received explicit support and thanks. Otherwise, intangible support and appreciation is offered, but no explicit incentive system exists yet. The next campuswide Stakeholder and Student satisfaction surveys are scheduled for Fall 2017. g. [DEVELOPMENT] An Integrated Planning calendar is in development and will provide a timeline of the activities connected to planning throughout the Strategic Planning cycle (2022). A process of aligning decisions and communications is still TBD.

Area of Focus	Objective	Responsible Person	Target Date for Achievement	Action Steps	Measure of Progress	Status As of Date: 03.08.2017
B. Program Review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete monitoring and evaluation of programs and service areas 2. Improve participation in the program review process (writing, discussion, training, etc.) 3. Improve understanding of the program review process 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IEC 2. IEC & Faculty Coordinator; PD 3. IEC & Faculty Coordinator; PD 	July 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Restructure of IEC to include 3 subcommittees (with leads from IEC) b. Hire Faculty Coordinator with reassigned time (role = provide support for data analysis; clarify process and document expectations; review of document with dean; align with resource allocation cycle) c. Advertise process deadlines/timelines/cycle – well communicated (example - fall semester training/orientation, first draft due in spring) d. "Restart" the program review cycle on a clean slate (forgive outstanding reviews) e. Offer better and more opportunities for program review training f. Train all stakeholders on review process; can also be trained to provide support g. Review the program review template to see if questions are generating the answers desired. h. Offer data processing training for working with program review info (making charts, working with software, simplifying data) i. Implement a smaller annual "program review" that can feed into the 4-year report j. Ensure initial PR is the foundation for all other unit/area planning 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Restructured IEC; meeting minutes b. Established position; progress on percent of program reviews completed; faculty coordinator evaluation c. Established and published schedule of process deadlines d. Development of new program review schedule e. Increased Flex Reporter offerings and enrollment; training evaluations f. Improved training evaluations; awareness surveys g. Updated program review template and/or guidelines h. Established training programs; Research Brown Bags i. Published library of annual program reviews; percent of reviews completed annually j. Established protocol; evaluation or verification of unit/area plans 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. [COMPLETE] IEC has been restructured with subcommittees for specific institutional areas. b. [COMPLETE: NEEDS MEASURES] The PR Coordinator position has been created and filled, and the Coordinator currently performs the duties listed in the Action Steps. c. [IN PROGRESS] New schedule has been established. Program Review page on the website now lists updated schedules and processes. An updated PR handbook is in development. d. [COMPLETE] The new schedule is established and published on the website. e. [IN PROGRESS] Very few training opportunities (for credit) have been provided so far, but this is due to the time needed to make changes to the review process and IEC. f. [IN PROGRESS] Various meetings and informal trainings have occurred, but this has not extended far beyond the IEC and the authors of a given program review. New/adjunct faculty will receive training and orientation, but others currently receive as-needed. g. [IN PROGRESS] PR templates are being reviewed. Only one area (Administrative Services) will potentially need to update the template used. h. [COMPLETE] Software training and meeting with IR about data is offered on an individual-need basis. Research Brown Bags and Professional Development offer opportunities to larger groups but cannot guarantee stakeholder participation. i. [NOT STARTED] IEC has not yet determined how/if annual reviews will be implemented. j. [COMPLETE: NEEDS MEASURES] New protocol for PRs and planning has been established so that all unit/area recommendations must come from PRs. Prioritized recommendations in any unit/area are only to be considered if the associated PR was officially accepted.

Area of Focus	Objective	Responsible Person	Target Date for Achievement	Action Steps	Measure of Progress	Status As of Date: 03.08.2017
C. SLO Assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Examine and possibly deploy better tool(s) for reporting SLOs and assessment data 2. Better integrate/align planning, program review, SLO assessment and budget 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SLO Coordinator and Facilitators; All SLO Committees 2. IEC, SPC, and PBC; SLO Coordinator & Committees 	Start Fall 2016 (achieved by Spring 2017)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Revisit TracDat inputting and report generation to show complete data b. Increase SLO discussions on "why, what is the significance" c. Increase training and discussion on making SLOs more meaningful d. Increase discussion on importance of documentation e. Obtain new software for SLO assessment f. Make SLO assessment and tracking processes more efficient by integrating entry of SLO results for individual students into instructors' existing grading procedures and tools (e.g., gradebook software) g. Provide incentives and support for the timely completion of SLO tasks, and recognize progress on the SLO completion rate as it occurs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Progress on program plans and SLO assessments completed through TracDat b. Meeting minutes; guidelines, brochures, and/or updated Course Outlines of Record and tutorials c. Training evaluations; meeting minutes; updated SLO assessment processes d. Meeting minutes; upgraded library of SLO assessments e. Purchase/availability and use of new software f. Updated SLO process and availability of individual course SLO assessments g. Established protocol for SLO assessment and reporting 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. [IN PROGRESS] Faculty input and report generation has increased due in part to SLO Timeline Worksheets and streamlined TracDat administration so reports only go through one channel b. [IN PROGRESS: NEEDS MEASURE] Discussions occur during division and department meetings, but it is difficult to determine whether they have increased faculty understanding of SLO assessment significance c. [IN PROGRESS] Workshops, meetings, and communications have been provided, but SLO Coordinators and Facilitators are considering receiving more training to get ideas on alternative ways to make the process more meaningful and communicated to faculty campuswide d. [IN PROGRESS] SLO Coordinator is searching for more methods to: document faculty's positive progress, provide incentives for meeting and sharing best practices with faculty, and provide alternative assistance to faculty rather than just workshops e. [IN PROGRESS] Initial research for new software has begun, but a list of potential vendors still needs to be decided on f. [IN DEVELOPMENT] Compton is considering methods for how to submit and retrieve disaggregated SLO data. Using gradebook software seems to be the best compromise, but not all faculty use the software. More faculty training on software like the gradebook needs to be offered at Compton before this method of SLO disaggregation can be attempted g. [IN DEVELOPMENT] Repercussions exist, but incentives do not. There are incentives for Facilitator- or Division-specific processes, but more ideas are needed for incentives and recognition related to faculty completing individual SLO tasks

Area of Focus	Objective	Responsible Person	Target Date for Achievement	Action Steps	Measure of Progress	Status As of Date: 03.08.2017
D. Budget Development	1. Better integrate/align planning, program review, SLO assessment and budget 2. Better communication throughout college about process (and why choices are made)	1. PBC; CBO; IEC and SPC 2. CEO; PR; PBC; Committee Chairs and Department Leaders (as appropriate)	Started Fall 2016 (achieve by Spring 2017)	a. Communicate back to program faculty, staff, and administrators as part of the process b. Develop criteria/guidelines for prioritizing budget allocations that can be clearly communicated (up front) to the campus constituents. c. Make the linkage to budget development more transparent d. Communicate final resource allocation decisions widely	a. Meeting minutes; communications (e-mail newsletters, flyers, etc.) b. Established and published criteria for prioritizing budget allocations c. Meeting minutes; (published) communications; reporting system d. Reports of final resource allocation decisions	a. [COMPLETE] The CEO regularly gives updates on budget issues and proposals during his monthly Tartar Talks and newsletter b. [COMPLETE] Program recommendations are based on completed/accepted PRs that come from faculty/staff/managers. Unit recommendations prioritized by a Dean or Director are based on all recommendations from the programs and departments within the unit. Area recommendations are finalized by a combination of VPs, Deans, and Directors before being sent to the CEO's cabinet for approval. However, criteria for prioritization at higher levels is implicit in discussion of institutional needs and environmental factors rather than explicitly documented. c. [COMPLETE] All PBC meeting minutes are approved and published on the website d. [IN PROGRESS] Reports of funded projects are sent from the VP to the Deans/Directors and then to the related faculty/staff. Efforts are being made to include this reporting information in TracDat so everyone can access it at their convenience

Request for IEPI Resources to Support College Innovation and Effectiveness Plan

Applicable Area(s) of Focus <i>(Copy from table above.)</i>	Applicable Objective(s) <i>(Copy from table above.)</i>	Description of Resource Needed <i>(Refer to Action Steps above as appropriate.)</i>	Cost of Resource
Program Review SLO Assessment	A.2, A.4, B.1, B.2, B.3, C.1, C.2	Faculty coordinator (40% release time 1 st and 2 nd years; 20% subsequent years), including intersession.	\$25,000
Integrated Planning and Budget Development Program Review and SLO Assessment	A.1, A.3, B.2, C.1, C.2, D.1, D.2	Planning software purchase (including licenses, training, and continued maintenance); Will need to have the planning capabilities of PlanBuilder and the SLO assessment capabilities of TracDat	\$80,000
Integrated Planning	A.1 – A.5, B.2, B.3, C.1, C.2, D.1, D.2	Professional development and training related to planning	\$30,000
Integrated Planning	A.1, A.2, A.4, A.5	Planning consultant hiring/fees/payment	\$50,000
Integrated Planning	A.1, A.2, A.4, A.5, C.2, D.1, D.2	Planning summit and meeting costs (off-site venues, catering, food services, etc.)	\$10,000
Integrated Planning	A.1 – A.5	Miscellaneous supplies used in planning (copies, manuals, brochures, etc.)	\$5,000
Total IEPI Resource Request (not to exceed \$200,000 per college)			\$200,000