

EL CAMINO COLLEGE

Progress Report

Submitted by

El Camino College
16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
Torrance, California 90506

to

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

March 19, 2007

Table of Contents

Page

i	Table of Contents
1	Statement of Report Preparation
2	Response to Team Recommendation 1
4	Response to Team Recommendation 2
5	Response to Team Recommendation 3
8	Appendices
	1. Academic Affairs Program Review Status
	2. Program Review – Data Availability from IR and Ways that IR Can Help
	3. SCA Program Review Timeline
	4. Administrative Services Program Review Timeline
	5. Proposed Planning and Budget Development Calendar
	6. Planning and Budgeting Committee Endorsements

STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION

Progress Report

March 19, 2007

This Progress Report is written in response to the June 29, 2006 letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) requesting a progress report of the College's response to three recommendations from the April, 2002 Accreditation Site Visit. The Progress Report is an update to the February 12, 2006 Progress Report submitted by El Camino College to the Commission. This Report responds to the Commission's request for the College to demonstrate progress in the remaining three recommendations listed below:

- 1. As cited in previous (1990, 1996) accreditation recommendations, the college must improve and implement effective program review processes. All segments of the college community need to collaborate to develop and implement a streamlined, meaningful, and timely program review process for Academic Affairs and Administrative Services and link the outcomes to planning and budget processes. (Standards 3A.4, 3B.3)*
- 2. The team recommends that the college review and establish a consistently applied, thorough, objective, and accountable system of classified staff performance review, focused on individual growth and performance improvement (Standards 3.A.4, 3.B.3)*
- 3. As cited in both the 1990 and 1996 accreditation recommendations, the budget development process needs to be structurally linked to the institutional planning and program review process. This linkage should include the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, staffing plan, and other institutional planning efforts. (Standards 9.A.1, 9.A.3)*

The College has made progress addressing the three recommendations listed above as were described in the February 12, 2006 Progress Report. The Vice President of Academic Affairs (Accreditation Liaison Officer) included some of the same members of the Accreditation Task Force to develop a response to the Commission's request for a progress report.

Progress Report Task Force:

Francisco M. Arce, Vice President of Academic Affairs

Susan Dever, Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair and President, Academic Senate

Jeffery Marsee, Vice President of Administrative Services

Arvid Spor, Administrative Co-Chair and Dean of Enrollment Services

Response to Recommendation 1

1. *As cited in previous (1990, 1996) accreditation recommendations, the college must improve and implement effective program review processes. All segments of the college community need to collaborate to develop and implement a streamlined, meaningful, and timely program review process for Academic Affairs and Administrative Services and link the outcomes to planning and budget processes. (Standards 3A.4, 3B.3)*

Description of Progress Made Toward Recommendation 1

The College has met the requirement of Recommendation 1 and continues to expand prior efforts.

Academic Affairs

Under the direction of the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Natural Sciences is primarily responsible for overseeing the program review process in the Academic Affairs area. The Dean meets regularly with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the President of the Academic Senate to discuss issues related to implementation. A committee comprised of three faculty members, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the Dean of Natural Sciences reviews completed program reviews and makes recommendations to the Vice President for prioritization and possible inclusion into the planning and budgeting process. The completed program reviews will be reviewed in three stages during the spring 2007 semester.

More than half of the sixty-six Academic Affairs programs are in some stage of program review. Seventeen have completed their first drafts and are ready to be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs (Appendix 1). The programs that started their reviews in 2005 – 2006 were the first to go through the review process as it was envisioned. Based on their progress, more emphasis will be put on preparing survey information and data collecting immediately after the orientation meeting. The Office of Institutional Research prepares a handout which informs chairs what resources are available in addition to the data packet each academic program receives (Appendix 2).

The following grid delineates the process for the next round of reviews beginning fall 2007:

<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Timeframe</i>	<i>Originator</i>
Notify Deans and Institutional Research which programs will be starting program review in the fall	January 2007	VP Academic Affairs, Dean of Natural Sciences
Identify program review chairs	February Flex Meeting	Deans

Provide basic program data	March	Office of Institutional Research
Hold orientation/training session with team chairs	March	Dean of Natural Sciences
Program review surveys conducted	Sept/Oct	Chairs & Institutional Research
First drafts due to Division Office for dissemination to faculty	December	Deans & Chairs
Reports due to Academic Affairs Office	March 2007	Deans & Chairs
Program Review Acceptance	April	VP-Academic Affairs, President of Academic Senate
Dissemination of completed reports	May/June	VP-Academic Affairs

An orientation is required for the lead faculty responsible for chairing the discipline program review. The College is organized into 8 academic divisions with several disciplines in each of the divisions. To date, the faculty participants in the required program review orientation acknowledge the value of the orientation program led by the Dean of Natural Sciences. The orientation program contributed to higher completion rates than in the past.

Student and Community Advancement:

The Student and Community Advancement (SCA) Area, under the direction of the Interim Vice President of Student Services, completed approximately 36 percent of all SCA program reviews by the summer of 2006. An additional 53 percent of SCA departments are currently in some stage of program review and are expected to complete in spring 2007. The remaining 11 percent are expected to begin in fall 2007 and completed by spring 2008 (Appendix 3).

The following SCA programs completed their program reviews by summer 2006: Admissions, Evaluations, Records, Registration, Veteran’s Affairs, International Student Program, First Year Experience, Assessment and Testing, Outreach and School Relations, and Financial Aid.

In fall 2006, the Interim Vice President of Student Services assembled a committee of faculty, classified staff, and management to review each of the completed SCA program reviews listed above. The committee met to hear program review recommendations presented by division managers which lead to committee discussions and ranking of the program review recommendations. The ranked recommendations were presented to the Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC) on November 9 and 16, 2006. The PBC endorsed \$100,000 funding for program review recommendations and tabled the

remainder of the recommendations until March, 2007 when the committee expects to receive and discuss program review presentations from other areas on campus. The PBC recommendations are forwarded to the Cabinet for endorsement and if approved, a budget augmentation is prepared for approval by the Board of Trustees.

Administrative Services:

Under the direction of the Vice President of Administrative Services, the Administrative Services area has created flow-charts for each department as a method to more clearly understand the processes involved in the delivery of services and to identify and implement needed changes to improve the processes. Flowcharting was the first step in the process to create program reviews for the Administrative Services area. The actual program review cycle began in 2006-2007 and will be completed by summer 2008 (Appendix 4). The Administrative Services unit used a campus wide electronic survey to evaluate staff satisfaction with each of the services. The responses will be collected and interpreted for future process improvements. The Administrative Services unit is in the process of adopting a modified version of the program review guidelines used by Student Services to address specific program areas such as staffing, facilities, equipment, budget, and program effectiveness.

Summary

As the program reviews are completed in each of the three service areas, the vice presidents in collaboration with their respective Area Councils will prioritize the recommendations generated by each department program review. The prioritized recommendations will be presented to the President's Cabinet for review and discussion. The newly prioritized recommendations will be presented to the Planning and Budgeting Committee for review and recommendation to the President. This review will occur during the planning cycle of the current budgeting process to identify programs and services that will receive new or increased funding in the following academic year.

Response to Recommendation 2

2. *The team recommends that the college review and establish a consistently applied, thorough, objective, and accountable system of classified staff performance review, focused on individual growth and performance improvement (Standards 3.A.4, 3.B.3)*

Description of Progress Made Toward Recommendation 2

The College has met the requirement of Recommendation 2 and continues to expand prior efforts.

The Human Resources Department alerts managers and supervisors of classified personnel evaluations that must occur within 30-days of the notice. Reminders will be sent two weeks before the due date and a day after the due date. Copies of the reminder will also be sent to the manager's vice president at the two week mark. A list of overdue performance evaluations will be given to the Superintendent/President and the three vice presidents every month. This system worked very well for the first six months of 2006 with an average 90.5 percent of the evaluations being given and submitted on time. The percentages of evaluations completed on-time dropped over the summer and early fall 2006, but are getting back on track again.

Response to Recommendation 3

3. *As cited in both the 1990 and 1996 accreditation recommendations, the budget development process needs to be structurally linked to the institutional planning and program review process. This linkage should include the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, staffing plan, and other institutional planning efforts. (Standards 9.A.1, 9.A.3)*

Description of Progress Made Toward Recommendation 3

The College has met the requirements of Recommendation 3. Currently the College is in the third year of the three-year planning and budgeting process that began in summer 2004. The College President and the Vice Presidents coordinate with the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) to develop a linkage between planning and budgeting on an annual basis. Institutionalization of the planning and budgeting process has evolved into a formal consultation process. More specifically, plans were developed, reviewed, and in a number of cases, endorsed for funding by the PBC. These were forwarded to the President's Cabinet for consideration and Board approval. Likewise, planning and budgeting priorities identified and prioritized by the Cabinet are sent to the PBC for consultation. The goal is to seek consensus on budgeting priorities for the academic year and future budget development. The approach is working well and allows for initiatives to evolve from the program/unit/division level and from the Cabinet.

To move away from implementing budgets that are based largely on prior year expenditures/budgets, the planning process tries to anticipate current and future institutional needs that correspond to instructional services, student services and operations, and discretionary programs (Appendix 5).

Instructional budgets reflect direct relationship between the student demand for instruction and the full time equivalent faculty (FTEF) allocations to each instructional division. The course scheduling process estimates the number of sections planned for the various terms and the required FTEF needed. Instructional planning assumptions include the following considerations:

1. full-time and part-time faculty FTEF
2. weekly, daily and positive attendance sections by term
3. anticipated cost of instruction by program area
4. acceptable instructional load by discipline and division
5. annual FTES goals for the college by instructional division/discipline/program (the college as noted is organized into 8 instructional divisions)

Student services and operations budgets are based on the level of support services and salaries that are needed to support the instructional effort. The costs consist of required expenditures to operate the college, such as utilities, full-time salaries, benefits, and debt service. The challenge is to more efficiently utilize limited resources. Planning efforts would include looking for new operational efficiencies and then developing action plans to revise the expenditures, such as reducing the cost of utilities.

Discretionary funds are critical to the quality of the programs, but can only be funded once the instructional and operational costs are budgeted. Budgets developed with discretionary funds are used to fund planning initiatives prioritized through program review and Cabinet planning priorities. Redirecting funds through this category creates the strongest linkage to the planning process as a mechanism for redirecting institutional resources. Some of these funds are allocated as one time augmentations and evaluated on an annual basis for continued funding.

This model gives the College the ability to review functions and efficiencies in each of the three program areas. It also requires collaborative efforts to ensure adequate funds are available to meet the institutional plans, goals and objectives. Finally, it places a reality check in place to help make the planning process budget driven.

Listed below are examples that illustrate the planning and budgeting processes used for institutional planning and budgeting efforts during 2006-2007.

Enrollment Management

In the summer of 2006, managers submitted fifty-three proposals with funding requests to the PBC that were based upon department plans designed to improve student recruitment and retention. The committee reviewed and ranked all of the plans and after much debate chose to support the top twelve plans. An official endorsement of the plans with recommended funding levels were forwarded to the President on December 4, 2006. The PBC recommended funding, recruitment and retention efforts estimated to cost \$575,750 and the Cabinet approved \$362,045. On December 18, 2006, the Board of Trustees approved the \$362,045 funding request (Appendix 6).

Under the direction of the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Interim Vice President of Student Services, the Enrollment Management Team developed recruitment and retention components in the 2006 – 2007 Enrollment Management Plan. The plan

was presented to the Academic Senate and the Council of Deans for review and comment before advancing to the PBC. A presentation was made before the PBC on November 9, 2006 with discussions that led to an immediate recommendation to fund \$50,000 of the \$476,000 requested in the plan while tabling the remainder of the plan's funding request until spring of 2007. The \$50,000 funding request was included in the December 4, 2006 PBC memo to President Fallo and subsequently approved by the Board on December 18, 2006.

Online Instruction

A third example of this process is a retention proposal from the Distance Education Committee to fund online instructional program growth. The committee brought their plan before the Academic Senate and Council of Deans for review and a recommendation to the PBC on November 16, 2006. The PBC endorsed the plan and recommended funding at \$112,000. The Cabinet accepted the recommendation and it was also approved by the Board of Trustees on December 18, 2007.

Program Review Recommendations

In fall 2006, the Interim Vice President of Student Services formed a committee to review the recommendations made in the eleven Student and Community Advancement program reviews that were completed from the 2005 – 2006 fiscal year. The committee evaluated, ranked, and forwarded the recommended requests to the PBC for consideration. The PBC recommended \$100,000 funding and to table the remaining requests until the spring semester when program review recommendations are expected to be presented from programs in Academic Affairs and Administrative Services. The PBC recommendation was forwarded to the Cabinet, which approved \$50,000. On December 18, 2006, the Board of Trustees approved the \$50,000 funding request.

In conclusion, the College is making significant progress in the three areas recommended for improvement by the Commission. Program review is institutionalized and used for planning and budgeting prioritizations. Better linkages exist between planning and budgeting and the process continues to be strengthened. Classified evaluations are timely and a process to ensure completion is in place.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Academic Affairs Program Review Status

Appendix 2: Program Review – Data Availability from IR and Ways that IR Can Help

Appendix 3: SCA Program Review Timeline

Appendix 4: Administrative Services Program Review Timeline

Appendix 5: Proposed Planning and Budget Development Calendar

Appendix 6: Planning and Budgeting Committee Endorsements