



Summit Themes & Outcomes

The theme of the 2016 Planning Summit was “Supporting Student Success”, reflecting an emphasis on ensuring El Camino College’s planning process focuses on fostering and promoting opportunities for students to succeed at the College. Fifty seven (57) employees and students from El Camino College participated in the event, held on Friday, April 15, 2016. A complete list of attendees is found in Appendix A of this report (p. 3). Appendix B provides a summary of the Planning Summit evaluation Survey (p. 4).

The specific outcomes of the summit included:

1. Receiving the latest updates on the College’s planning process
2. Understanding where the College is with long-term planning, enrollment, and its Compton partnership
3. Understanding the College’s performance measures and being able to distinguish between Standards and Goals
4. Developing action plans in the event of lower performance outcomes
5. Understanding and further developing Actions for the College’s Master Plan

Outcomes 1 & 2: Understand the Planning Process & Current Plans

The first half of the summit focused on providing participants with updates on the College and its planning process. President Maloney kicked off the event with a review of the College’s mission, values, and Strategic Plan (strategic initiatives). The Mission and Strategic Plan serve as a foundation for the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) that is currently in development at ECC. The Superintendent/President described the purpose and components of a CMP. Finally, she highlighted the parallel planning process at Compton Center. This is the first year since the partnership that Compton Center participated in a separate planning summit in support of its master planning process that is currently underway.



Vice President (Academic Affairs) Jean Shankweiler provided an update on enrollment trends and future enrollment plans, highlighting the strategies of the Enrollment Management Plan to address anticipated shortfalls in enrollment (as measured by FTES, or the Full Time Equivalent Students accounting measure).

Outcomes 3 & 4: Understand the College's performance measures & Develop Strategies for Underperformance



The College now reports a number of performance indicators related to student achievement and institutional health. College constituents help to select the most meaningful performance measures (IE Outcomes), establish performance floors (Institutional Standards), and set aspirational goals for the future. At the summit, Vice President (Student & Community Advancement) Jeanie Nishime and Irene Graff reviewed our [Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes](#), which are global measures of our [Mission & Strategic Plan \(Board Policy 1200\)](#).

This presentation was followed by the first group activity, which involved developing Action Strategies that could directly address lower performance in Successful Course Completion, Persistence, Degrees, Certificates and Transfer.

Participant ideas and feedback will be used to develop underperformance action plans and to further enhance strategies for the Comprehensive Master Plan. Notes from the group discussions of this activity are posted to the [Institutional Effectiveness Staff page on MyECC](#).



Outcome 5: Develop Action Plans for the Educational Master Plan

Finally, participants had the opportunity to contribute to the development process of the Educational Master Plan. Groups were asked to expand on and suggest additional Action Plans focused on two aspects of Institutional Process Improvement: Improving Processes for Students and Improving Other Internal Processes. Each table included at least one student which helped to identify roadblocks in campus processes for students. The major ideas that emerged from these group discussions are posted to the [Institutional Effectiveness Staff page on MyECC](#).

Next Steps

The planning process will continue with Educational Master Plan development this summer, followed by a full consultation process in fall. In parallel, teams will develop drafts of Underperformance Action Plans for review by campus representative and content experts.

Institutional Effectiveness is often defined as a process of 1) review & assessment; 2) goal setting for student & institutional improvement; and 3) discussion & strategizing to meet those goals. But the ultimate goal of this process is to **Support Student Success!** Please join us on this important road to improvement for the benefit of all our students.

APPENDIX A – Attendees

Invitation to the Planning Summit was based on one of the following criteria: 1) member of a collegial consultation committee; 2) College or Center leadership; 3) plan leadership (BSI, SSSP, or SEP); 4) program review, curriculum, or SLO faculty leadership; 5) student leadership; or 6) recommendations from Classified staff.

Fifty-seven employees and students from El Camino College participated in the event. Representation included 11 students, 10 Classified staff, 10 faculty, and 26 managers. Special acknowledgement goes to Mattie Eskridge; IRP staff; Julieta Ortiz; and the Student Ambassadors from ECC for their logistical support; as well as to Amy Hanoa of Community Relations for photography services.

ATTENDEES

Allen, Stacey	Graff, Irene	Natividad, Rory
Anaya, Jose	Gutierrez, Edith	Nelson, Lucy
Barrios, Mary Beth	Higdon, Jo Ann	Neumann, Katie
Beam, Linda	Jackson, Lavonne	Nishime, Jeanie
Brown, Tom	Jeffries, Chris	Ortiz, Julieta
Carey, Ryan	Katz, Beth	Park, Gina
Carr, Allison	Key, Kenneth	Perez, Gema
Castellanos, Victor	Kunisaki, Sheryl	Preston, Colin
Dalili, Eman	Kushigemachi, Scott	Renolayan, Reyno
Daniel-DiGregorio, Kristie	Lozano, Rene	Reyes, Idania
Davidson, Eldon	Maloney, Dena	Rodriguez, Araceli
Dreizler, Robin	Mardesich, Nicole	Sala, Andrea
El Danaf, Diaa	Mednick, Lisa	Shankweiler, Jean
Ely, Janice	Mendez, Jose	Shenefield, Cheryl
Fitzsimons, Constance	Miranda, Gloria	Smith, Luukia
Flores, Marysol	Mosqueda, Cynthia	Suekawa, Lori
Garcia, William	Mulrooney, William	Warren, Will
Geraghty, Elise	Mussaw, David	Williams, Jaren
Gonzalez, Briana	Myers, Marci	Zuniga, Andres

APPENDIX B – Evaluation Survey & Learning Outcomes Assessment

Participants were asked to evaluate the planning summit and assess its intended outcomes. A total of 31 participants responded to the survey (54% response rate). Frequencies for each question are found on the following pages.

A high percentage of participants found the Updates portion of the summit helpful (Q1). Questions 2 and 3 asked participants to evaluate each of the two group activities. Responses to these questions and Question 11 will be used to evaluate content and logistics for future summit planning. Question 4 asked participants about the degree to which they felt they had personally contributed to summit goals. Most felt that they had contributed greatly to the process but a few felt their contribution was minor. Two thirds felt that the summit content connected with the theme of Supporting Student Success (Q5).

Participant Learning Outcomes

Questions 6-10 were part of a learning outcomes assessment for the day. Out of 5 questions, the average number correct was 3, with correct responses ranging from 2-5. Eighty percent answered 3 or more questions correctly. All respondents were able to correctly identify the first line of the Mission Statement (*El Camino College makes a positive difference in people's lives.*) and the Statement of Values acronym (*PRIDE*). The most challenging questions were 9 and 10 involving the definition of an Institution-Set Standard (“A performance floor...”) and contents of the Educational Master Plan, respectively. These results suggest that more effort needs to be made to ensure all employees understand the new “minimum standard” reporting requirement and the master planning process that is currently underway.

Overall, participants were very satisfied with the 2016 Planning Summit with an average rating of 6.21 out of 7 (1=low; 7=high). About 35% of attendees who responded to the evaluation survey indicated that this was their first planning summit.

Comments & Feedback

A total of 11 comments were recorded from the survey. The following summary reflects these comments in addition to feedback shared in person with summit organizers. Comments revealed that the best part of the event was the high level of student participation. One respondent noted that a wider variety of students (not just ambassadors and student leaders) would be desirable for future events. More front line staff and faculty were also recommended.

The aspect of the event needing most improvement was the temperature of the room (Alondra Room) which was too cold for some. Several also had concerns about the activities, suggesting that the Summit agenda was too ambitious and attempted to accomplish too much. Overall, respondents were satisfied with the opportunity to participate, meet new people, and work toward a common goal.

Planning Summit

N=31

Spring 2016

How helpful was each aspect of summit in terms of planning for institutional improvement?

1A. President's Welcome/Charge (President Maloney)

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.71
Not Helpful	1	3.23	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Somewhat Helpful	2	6.45	
Very Helpful	27	87.10	
Not sure or Not Present	1	3.23	

1B. Enrollment Trends & Futures (Dr. Shankweiler)

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.77
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Somewhat Helpful	3	9.68	
Very Helpful	27	87.10	
Not sure or Not Present	1	3.23	

1C. Institution Set Standards, Goals, & Outcomes (Dr. Nishime & Irene Graff)

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.71
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Somewhat Helpful	5	16.13	
Very Helpful	25	80.65	
Not sure or Not Present	1	3.23	

1D. Master Planning (Dr. Nishime & Irene Graff)

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.81
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Somewhat Helpful	6	19.35	
Very Helpful	25	80.65	
Not sure or Not Present	0	0.00	

1E. Student Success Plans Presentations (SSSP, SEP, BSI)

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.39
Not Helpful	1	3.23	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Somewhat Helpful	12	38.71	
Very Helpful	17	54.84	
Not sure or Not Present	1	3.23	

Please rate your satisfaction (Activity 1).

2A. Clarity of project objectives

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.87
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	0	0.00	
4	4	12.90	
5	7	22.58	
6	8	25.81	
7	11	35.48	
Invalid	1	3.23	

2B. Usefulness of supporting materials

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.70
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	2	6.45	
4	3	9.68	
5	7	22.58	
6	8	25.81	
7	10	32.26	
Invalid	1	3.23	

2C. Satisfaction with the outcomes

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.76
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	2	6.45	
4	2	6.45	
5	8	25.81	
6	6	19.35	
7	11	35.48	
Invalid	2	6.45	

Please rate your satisfaction (Activity 2).

3A. Clarity of project objectives

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.60
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	2	6.45	
4	2	6.45	
5	9	29.03	
6	10	32.26	
7	7	22.58	
Invalid	1	3.23	

3C. Satisfaction with the outcomes

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.70
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	2	6.45	
4	2	6.45	
5	9	29.03	
6	7	22.58	
7	10	32.26	
Invalid	1	3.23	

4B. Understanding where we are with long-term planning, enrollment, and the Compton partnership

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.70
Not at all	0	0.00	
Not so much	2	6.45	
Somewhat	5	16.13	
Greatly	23	74.19	
Not sure or Not present	0	0.00	
Invalid	1	3.23	

4D. Being able to distinguish between Standards and Goals

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.59
Not at all	0	0.00	
Not so much	3	9.68	
Somewhat	6	19.35	
Greatly	20	64.52	
Not sure or Not present	0	0.00	
Invalid	2	6.45	

3B. Usefulness of supporting materials

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.50
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	2	6.45	
4	3	9.68	
5	11	35.48	
6	6	19.35	
7	8	25.81	
Invalid	1	3.23	

You helped achieve the following summit goals:

4A. Receiving the latest updates on our planning process

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.67
Not at all	0	0.00	
Not so much	2	6.45	
Somewhat	6	19.35	
Greatly	22	70.97	
Not sure or Not present	0	0.00	
Invalid	1	3.23	

4C. Understanding our performance measures

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.53
Not at all	0	0.00	
Not so much	2	6.45	
Somewhat	10	32.26	
Greatly	18	58.06	
Not sure or Not present	0	0.00	
Invalid	1	3.23	

4E. Developing action plans in the event of lower performance outcomes

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.47
Not at all	0	0.00	
Not so much	2	6.45	
Somewhat	12	38.71	
Greatly	16	51.61	
Not sure or Not present	0	0.00	
Invalid	1	3.23	

4F. Understanding and further developing Actions for the Master Plan

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.47
Not at all	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>
Not so much	4	12.90	<input type="text"/>
Somewhat	8	25.81	<input type="text"/>
Greatly	18	58.06	<input type="text"/>
Not sure or Not present	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>
Invalid	1	3.23	<input type="text"/>

6. Which of the following are plans that support the Educational Master Plan? (Check all that apply)

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: -
Staffing Plan	26	83.87	<input type="text"/>
Facilities Master Plan	27	87.10	<input type="text"/>
Food Service Plan	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>
Technology Plan	29	93.55	<input type="text"/>
Campus Sculpture Plan	2	6.45	<input type="text"/>
Invalid	2	6.45	<input type="text"/>






5. The theme of the summit was Supporting Student Success. How well do you think the summit content connected to this theme?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.63
Not at all	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>
Not so much	2	6.45	<input type="text"/>
Somewhat	7	22.58	<input type="text"/>
Greatly	21	67.74	<input type="text"/>
Not sure or not present	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>
Invalid	1	3.23	<input type="text"/>







7. Which of the following is the first line of the EI Camino College Mission?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.00
More ECC students from our diverse communities will attain educational success and achieve their academic goals.	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>
ECC will be the college of choice for successful student learning.	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>
ECC aspires to deliver quality and excellence in all we do.	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>
ECC makes a positive difference in people's lives.	31	100.00	<input type="text"/>
ECC strengthens quality educational and support services to promote and empower student learning success and self-advocacy.	0	0.00	<input type="text"/>







8. The acronym of our Statement of Values spells out an English word. What is that word?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.00
PRIDE	31	100.00	
RESPECT	0	0.00	
WARRIORS	0	0.00	
QUALITY	0	0.00	
EXCELLENCE	0	0.00	

10. All of the following are Focus Areas of the forthcoming Educational Master Plan, EXCEPT (select one)









Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.71
Access Progress & Completion	2	6.45	
Community Stewardship	16	51.61	
Enrollment Management	3	9.68	
Institutional Process Improvement	2	6.45	
Teaching & Learning	5	16.13	
Invalid	3	9.68	

9. Which of the following meets the definition of an Institution-Set Standard?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.83
The El Camino College flag	0	0.00	
A performance floor that the college commits to remain above	17	54.84	
An aspirational goal for which the college commits to strive	7	22.58	
A classroom floorplan that is developed by the college	0	0.00	
A vision statement developed in consultation with campus constituents	6	19.35	
Invalid	1	3.23	

Please rate satisfaction with event logistics.

11A. Invitation clarity

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.24
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	0	0.00	
4	4	12.90	
5	1	3.23	
6	8	25.81	
7	16	51.61	
Invalid	2	6.45	

11B. Check-in process

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.69
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	0	0.00	
4	0	0.00	
5	2	6.45	
6	5	16.13	
7	22	70.97	
Invalid	2	6.45	

11C. Location comfort

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.11
1	0	0.00	
2	2	6.45	
3	0	0.00	
4	1	3.23	
5	2	6.45	
6	8	25.81	
7	15	48.39	
Invalid	3	9.68	

11D. Supporting materials at the table

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.14
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	1	3.23	
4	1	3.23	
5	4	12.90	
6	10	32.26	
7	13	41.94	
Invalid	2	6.45	

11E. Food quality

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.61
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	2	6.45	
4	5	16.13	
5	5	16.13	
6	6	19.35	
7	10	32.26	
Invalid	3	9.68	

11F. Overall Satisfaction

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.21
1	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
3	0	0.00	
4	2	6.45	
5	2	6.45	
6	12	38.71	
7	12	38.71	
Invalid	3	9.68	

12. Please describe yourself:

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.80
Student	4	12.90	
Staff	9	29.03	
Faculty	6	19.35	
Supervisor Manager or Administrator	11	35.48	
Other	0	0.00	
Invalid	1	3.23	

13. Is this your first Planning Summit experience?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 0.35
Yes	11	35.48	
No	20	64.52	