ECC Planning Summit
Friday, May 6, 2011
Alondra Room
7:30a-12p

Attendees: Jose Anaya, Thomas Brown, Joshua Casper, Susie Dever, Kristi Daniel DiGregorio, Janice Ely Vicente Fernando, Ann Garten, Katie Gleason, Christina Gold, Don Goldberg, Alice Grigsby, Briita Halonen, Jasmine Hormati, Vito Iaia, Moon Ichinaga, LaVetta Johnson, Tom Lew, Jessica Lopez, Luis Mancia, Donna Manno, Dave McPatchell, Rodney Murray, Rory Natividad, Thomas Norton, Michael Odanaka, Julieta Ortiz, Dipte Patel, LaVonné Plum, Estina Pratt, Emily Rader, Dawn Reid, Rachelle Sasser, Cheryl Shenefield,David Simmons, Maria Smith, Lynn Solomita, Claudia Streipe, Debbie Turano, Gary Turner, Danny Villanueva, Chris Wells, Marcia Williams

Co-Facilitators: Michelle Arthur, Irene Graff, Dr. Jeanie Nishime

Opening Remarks, Introduction of co-facilitators, and overview of today's agenda – Dr. Arvid Spor

Introduction – Dr. Thomas M. Fallo
Tuesday @ 2: changes to a facilities request as an example of how planning has become second nature.

Summary and detailed analysis of the surveys of both Torrance and Compton campuses noting highlights, similarities and challenges. Personally, I noticed themes: an overwhelming need for content training, technical training, effective written communication, as well as a primer in manners and maturity with respect to the comments submitted.

While reviewing the surveys, questions emerged from the participants including thoughts, observations, and concerns:
R. Murray commented about the challenge of SLOs being evaluated every 2 years yet he had only adjuncts to assist with this process.

L. Mancia stated that involvement seems to be at the department level and (some) staff fail to see how this planning process affects them and/or the entire campus.

E. Rader requested an overview of what was to be accomplished in today's retreat. Arvid stated that the goals of today's gathering as: review the planning process survey results, talking about aligning timelines, reviewing SIs and creating metrics to assess how well we are doing. A. Spor reminded the group that an evaluation of today's event will be sent out either this afternoon or early Monday morning.

D. Vakil expressed concern about the institutional planning timelines transitioning to alignment to a 5 year cycle as some planning items may be duplicated and some elided from examination altogether. Furthermore, how does this transition affect the following if, Strategic Initiatives are on a 3 year timeline Program Review and SLOs are on a 4 year cycle Comprehensive Master Plan and Mission statement is examined every 5 years Curriculum and Accreditation are on a 6 year review with a chunk of curriculum reviewed annually.

ECC Planning Summit
Friday, May 6, 2011
Alondra Room
7:30a-12p

E. Rader inquired about streamlining the planning process as there seems to be a lack of awareness and a need for additional training. A. Spor explained that just when I think I have streamlined the process there is a need for awareness training as this process "really depends on who's in the room".

Dr. Arce further added, "The SLOs and program review process is a new level of analysis---a new way of looking at ourselves---and California is having a particularly difficult time".

A. Spor reminded all to remember that the college's Mission statement and the Strategic Initiatives are intentionally global so that they are a living breathing document and one may write to the SI depending on one's interpretation.

E. Rader expressed concern about faculty buy-in as well as a perceived lack of acknowledgement from administration about the current crisis and how it is affecting staff and students. Moreover, E. Rader expressed concern about how staff and faculty were required to adhere to this fairly new process given the dire economic straits and somehow implied that perhaps this process could wait and/or that our collective response would be different if we had been doing this for 10-15 years and we were doing this process in a better economic climate.

A. Spor reiterated that we need, as they do in private industry, to invest in planning in the good times as well as the tough times and remembering and reminding us to cut strategically versus cutting everything and risk making all programs and services mediocre. In other words, we must have the courage to evaluate and pare down (yes, even eliminate) programs and services without viewing these actions as a personal affront.

C. Gold stated that the SLO process seems to be a personal process of using SLOs in planning to directly impact students. C. Gold stated that she was confused about where core competencies lie. A. Spor replied that core competencies are being evaluated once or even twice per year for relevancy and that core competencies can be used to evaluate strategic initiatives.

Break – 10 minutes.

Dr. Nishime provided an overview and definition of SMART Goals:
Specific
Measureable
Attainable
Realistic
Timely
as well as lead us in a group exercise of reviewing, evaluating, and reporting on the sample goals from Industry & Technology (MTT), Humanities (English) and the Foundation.

Our group included Dipte Patel, Christina Gold, Jasmine Hormati, Vito Iaia, and Irene Graff.
Strategic Initiative G: Convert 25% of all SRC required documents, forms and other items to electronic and adaptive formats and post them to the ECC student portal and on the SRC webpage thereby eliminating the use of SRC paper forms by 10% by December 2012.

The group noted the foreseeable challenges because before implementation can occur, consultation with ITS must occur as issues of accessibility were discussed as well as implementing these goals incrementally versus "cold turkey". Finally, all agreed that perhaps the biggest question and challenge was, "How do we take this to the next level?"

Break – 10 minutes.

I. Graff presented and lead group exercise in writing to the SLO and creating metrics.
My group included Dr. Arce, Fernando Vicente, Luis Mancia, and Christina Gold.

Metrics for Strategic Initiative A
Data Driven: Quantitative and Qualitative

1. What kinds of activities are we doing?
Using clickers, learning teams, FIPP, attending conferences, seminars, webinars, office hours, flex days/activities, workshops, BSI (Basic Skills Initiative), online/on-ground office hours, distance education, et al.

2. What broader outcomes might we expect from these activities? (Specific)
Demonstrated increase knowledge, skills, and expertise of faculty
Improvement in student learning, success (defined by C, CR, P, or better!), retention, persistence, transfer, graduation, certificates attained.
Review student evaluations, track trends by discipline (1-5 years), and SLO assessments.

3. What is our starting point now? How can we set a baseline for comparison?
Beginning fall 2011 and using current data.

4. How will we know we are meeting or progressing on this initiative? There will be an increase and/or improvement in successful course completion, student participation, engagement, persistence, retention, transfer, graduation, and certificates attained (we could even add: student employment post program completion, wage comparison, etc…).

5. Is this information easy to acquire? (Attainable/Specific) Yes.

6. How much of an improvement might we expect in the next 2, 5, or 10 years? (Realistic/Timely)
Provided there is institutional support for these types of studies and research, I/we believe there could be a significant and steady increase in successful course completion, student participation, engagement, persistence, retention, transfer, graduation, and certificates attained (we could even add: student employment post program completion, wage comparison, etc…).

During this exercise a lively discussion arose about the challenges of trying to teach a particular discipline to students who are emergent learners and have not taken English 1A; As English 1A is not an enforced pre-requisite but rather a recommended preparation for some disciplines. When I asked about why English 1A is not an enforced pre-requisite many answers were offered: lengthens the time of a student's program completion, a student's right to try and a student's right to fail which is what many seasoned faculty will offer as a primary reason while others noted that there appears to be two schools of thought on this matter: some faculty teach from a content/memorization of facts based method while others teach from a logic and critical thinking perspective in that students ought to be able to analyze writing, documents, and texts, as well as facts within a culturally specific context of a particular time and space.

Quantitative:
-Use SLO Assessment s to evaluate impact on student learning and on instructor teaching
-Student evaluation of faculty
-Trend tracking:
      grades, successful completion, retention, persistence, graduation, transfer and certificates
      attained.
-Annual survey of faculty on what they are doing:
-Use collaborative teaching
-Online teaching methods
-Writing across the curriculum
-Measure impact of SLCs
-Use existing FIPP data of On Course

Qualitative:
Program self-evaluation
Narrative in SLO process
Impact of participation in professional development programs such as Great Teachers Seminar and Faculty Inquiry Partnership Program (FIPP).

Dr. Arce cited the example of the Art historians who may protest the loudest but they still have adopted these measures and meet regularly, and have even changed their syllabus to reflect this process as it is becoming internalized and institutionalized.

Dr. Arce offered: "How do we add value to the student? And, what if we could survey those who withdrew? What would they say about why they withdrew?" Moreover, I would add, "What would it say about us as individuals and as an institution of learning?"

SI A – Dr. Goldberg (presenter)
Effective integration of technology and learning (extent of integration and effectiveness) (NICENET, SMART, online office hours, et al).

Student participation in and out of class activities, tutoring, lab use, writing center, etc…

SI C – Dr. Rader (presenter)
Broke down the statement in the following manner:
1. Positive learning environment
2. Sense of community
3. Sense of cooperation
4. Effective process of collaboration and collegial consultation
And finally, what does this look like?
Suggestions included:
Collect effectiveness surveys (created by any group with IR oversight & input).
    Using a baseline
    ID strengths and weaknesses
    Track each year and establish goals based on responses
Use online and meetings to report out results and discuss.
Program plans would have more information.
Short, brief surveys, Likert scale, using surveys, to implement and affect change in a positive and productive manner.
Measuring intergroup communication.

Strategic Initiative D – Jose Anaya (presenter)
Tri-partite approach: Academic Affairs, Foundation, and EWD (Economic Workforce Development)
1. Number of partnerships: new/ongoing
2. Level of engagement:
    Needs
    Impact: advertising, serving on boards, committees, commissions, training, contract education, donations, funding, schools, and number of students trained/placed, curriculum development, grants, and partnering.

3. Access/Viability of Partnerships
    Measure of impact.

ECC Planning Summit
Friday, May 6, 2011
Alondra Room
7:30a-12p

Strategic Initiative E – Unknown presenter

1. Number and/or percentage of program review plans received, recommended, and funded.

2. Number and/or percentage of plan builder plans evaluated.

3. Periodic (subjective--need to define "periodic") surveys that assess planning.

Strategic Initiative F (for Facilities) – Unknown presenter

Climate survey – IR

Strategic Initiative G (for Green and Graff!) ASO Students Jessica Lopez & Jasmine Hormadi

Create and implement a campus wide recycling program similar to those at ELAC & SMC.

Environmentally sustainable buildings

What are we doing or what can we do?

      Use technology: id est debit cards.

      Designate ECC as a smoke free campus

What can we expect as a result of these activities:

      Decrease in paper expenses

      A cleaner environment

What is our starting point?

      NOW!

      Check recycling reports. (Example: 15% increase of on campus recycling over 5 years).

How will we know we are meeting or progressing on this initiative?

      Incremental cost savings realized.

Is this info easy to acquire?

      Yes.

How much improvement might we expect in the next 2, 5, or 10 years?

      Increased awareness

      Behavioral change in staff and students

      Cleaner air

      Lower health insurance

      Healthier staff

      Healthier environment

Concluding Remarks – Dr. Fallo

Impressed by comments, level of participation, engagement of staff, and thanked us for what we do and will continue to do.

Retreat adjourned at 12:05pm.