

Standard Three: Institutional Effectiveness

The institution, appropriate to its mission and purposes as a higher education institution, develops and implements a broad-based and integrated system of research, evaluation, and planning to assess institutional effectiveness and uses the results for institutional improvement. The institution identifies outcomes which can be validated by objective evidence.

A1. Institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional planning and evaluation.

Descriptive Summary:

In January, 1997, the college established a new Division of Planning, Research and Development to coordinate district planning, research and evaluation, and grant activities. The division dean reports directly to the Vice President for Student and Community Advancement. Two years later, the Office of Institutional Research was established. The Director of Institutional Research reports to the division dean.

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) developed and disseminated guidelines for assigning priority levels to incoming research requests (3.1). Research that is designed to assist in major planning or evaluation efforts (such as program review, Partnership for Excellence (PFE), and accreditation) is assigned a higher priority than most other requests and is subordinate only to research required to fulfill state or federal reporting mandates, or to ensure the integrity of data.

The Dean of Planning, Research and Development and the Director of Institutional Research work together to integrate research and planning activities. Both serve as active members of the District Planning Council (DPC) and, when needed, attend Budget Development Committee meetings to provide the necessary link between planning and budgeting activities. The Director of Institutional Research serves on other college committees

involved in more specialized planning activities (the Technology Committee and the Enrollment Management Task Force). The Office of Institutional Research also provides research to support the decision-making and planning activities of other college committees (the College Curriculum Committee, the Calendar Committee, and the Academic Deans Council).

Self Evaluation:

Since the last Accreditation Self Study, El Camino College has made progress integrating institutional research, planning, and evaluation. The Office of Institutional Research provides an important function for planning and evaluation and serves as a reliable source of data, information, and analysis. Examples of the type of research and evaluation provided by the OIR are the reports entitled, *College Performance on Partnership for Excellence Goals through 1998-1999* and *College Performance on Partnership for Excellence Goals through 1999-2000* (3.2 and 3.3). These reports present data that evaluate the college's progress toward achievement of its local PFE target goals and compare the data to systemwide performance. The reports serve as performance evaluation tools and provide important data used for planning as well as for determining future PFE priorities.

The Office of Institutional Research serves all segments of the college (3.4) through the primary functions of designing and conducting institutional research and analysis of data from sources, such as student and faculty/staff opinion and satisfaction surveys, reports on college

performance, institutional effectiveness, program effectiveness, and demographic trends.

A2. *The institution provides the necessary resources for effective research and evaluation.*

Descriptive Summary:

During the 1999—2000 academic year, the college substantially increased its commitment to institutional research by establishing in the Division of Planning, Research and Development three new positions: the Director of Institutional Research and two full-time research analysts. A full-time administrative assistant supports all division personnel. The Office of Institutional Research is centrally located in two rooms of the Administration Building. Resources supporting OIR operations come from three primary sources: Partnership for Excellence, Matriculation, and a Department of Education (Developing Hispanic Serving Institutions) Title V grant.

Self Evaluation:

The college has made significant improvements. In less than one year, it filled three new OIR positions with experienced personnel, who hold at least a master's degree in a related field. The district swiftly recognized the need for and secured appropriate resources (including new office facilities, computers, and software) for the new research personnel. The director and researchers each received special training in relevant data retrieval and reporting techniques on the new Datatel system. Further, the college supports professional growth activities for these personnel to attend conferences and workshops provided by organizations such as the California Community College Research and Planning Group and the National Association for Institutional Research.

In addition to skilled personnel, appropriate data storage and retrieval systems are crucial

resources for effective research and evaluation. The college provides staff with state-of-the-art hardware and software.

The college's implementation of the Datatel system in Fall, 1999, resulted in both improvements and setbacks for the college. Prior to Datatel implementation, researchers had no access to live data, relying instead on querying a static database of student records. Researchers now have access to live data on the Datatel system, which integrates academic, fiscal, student, and staff records. Unfortunately, the scope and structure of the Datatel system severely limits the ability of researchers to perform queries and produce research reports as quickly as desired. Although all research personnel have sufficient access to Datatel records, the cumbersome nature of the Datatel database requires extensive computer time for querying, extracting records, and aggregating data and has had a detrimental impact on productivity. Efforts have been made to alleviate these problems through data warehousing using COGNOS software. Data retrieval and manipulation are significant obstacles to efficient research and evaluation on the campus.

A3. *The institution has developed and implemented the means for evaluating how well, and in what ways, it accomplishes its mission and purposes.*

Descriptive Summary:

The primary means for evaluating how well El Camino College accomplishes its mission and purposes is through program review and annual reporting processes. While the annual report format (3.5) is standardized and consistent for all college divisions and departments, the program review process and format varies somewhat in each of the three vice presidential areas. On January 25, 2001, the college distributed institutional key performance indicators (3.6) to all managers and supervisors at a workshop (conducted by the Vice President of Student of Student and Community Advancement) focusing

on the preparation of annual reports. The key performance indicators are measures used to evaluate how well the college accomplishes its mission and purposes as defined in the master plan. The OIR routinely reports college performance on key institutional effectiveness indicators, including transfer rates, degree attainment, certificate attainment, course success, and retention rates. These reports allow planners and decision makers to do both longitudinal comparative analysis and latitudinal studies with other California community colleges (3.7 and 3.8). They may also serve additional functions, such as ensuring that the college meets accountability and reporting requirements associated with the Student Right-to-Know Act, the PFE initiative, and Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System (IPEDS) reports.

In addition to college-level performance reports, the college has a number of processes that assess the effectiveness of individual programs and departments. In June, 2001, the Vice President of Academic Affairs compiled and published all of the annual reports for 1999-2000 (3.9). This work documents the college's program activities and outcomes and how they are evaluated and linked to institutional mission, purpose, and goals.

The college participates in a number of categorically funded and/or grant-funded programs, such as Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOP&S), Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S), Matriculation, VTEA, CalWORKs, and the First Year Experience. It evaluates these programs via cyclical performance reports to the funding sources and through compliance audits conducted internally and externally. Since these types of programs support the institutional mission and purposes, the reports and evaluations are incorporated into the college's program reviews and annual reports.

Self Evaluation:

Primarily through assessments conducted through annual reports and program reviews,

El Camino College conscientiously evaluates its mission, purpose, unit functions, and performance on both the global (institutional) level and at the unit (program-specific) level. During 2000, the District Planning Council, College Council, and Board of Trustees reviewed the mission statement. The District Planning Council developed a revised version, which all college constituents reviewed. Following this process, the Board of Trustees adopted an expanded college mission statement on January 16, 2001 (3.10).

In addition to ongoing monitoring activities, cyclical reports, and program reviews, the college has a variety of processes in place to ensure that the institution reviews its performance and effectiveness and plans accordingly. Such processes include regular meetings of the President's Cabinet, College Council, the District Planning Council, the Budget Development Committee, the College Curriculum Committee, and the Technology Planning Committee. The college records committee minutes and publishes them on the college Infonet.

A4. The institution provides evidence that its program evaluations lead to improvement of programs and services.

Descriptive Summary:

The college conducts three types of program evaluation: division annual reports, department and division program reviews, and Chancellor's Office site visits of categorical programs.

All divisions submit annual reports for each department and program within the division. The college revised the annual reporting process in the Summer, 2000, and the new format is standardized and consistent. It has trained all administrators and many program coordinators in the process. The format requires an explanation of improvements in programs and services. The reports document progress toward achieving the institution's master plan and Partnership

for Excellence goals and goals from previous program reviews, and/or site visits, and annual reports. The annual reports conclude with the development of new goals and objectives and the selection of key performance indicators for the current year. The Dean of Planning, Research and Development recently reviewed all annual reports and developed an analysis of college accomplishments (3.11).

Chancellor's Office site visits, while conducted by an independent third party, are done in cooperation with the college and the categorical program. These visits require an intensive self-assessment. These site visits provide essential information, and recommendations become goals and objectives for improving programs and services. The college reports progress toward these goals and objectives in annual reports and in reports to the Chancellor's Office.

The nature and structure of program evaluations differ somewhat across three campus areas: Student and Community Advancement (SCA), Academic Affairs, and Administrative Services. Each area provides a descriptive summary and self evaluation.

Student and Community Advancement: Developed by a special Program Review Task Force in 1999, the program review process for SCA consists of assessing performance for nine core indicators: 1) service satisfaction, 2) communications, 3) employee development, 4) employee performance evaluation, 5) fiscal management, 6) unit planning, 7) physical facilities, 8) working environment, and 9) technology and equipment. The current process is flexible and permits the inclusion of unique, unit-specific measures. The process involves analysis of information stated in administrative reports and records, as well as from surveys of three unit constituencies: clients (usually students), employees, and peers.

To date, the college has reviewed twelve (12) units within SCA. Within the Admissions and Records Office these include Admissions and

Records, Registration, and International Students; within Community Advancement: the division office; within Planning, Research and Development: the Grants Development and Management Office; within Counseling Services: Counseling, the Career Center, the Transfer Center, and Assessment/Testing; and within Student Services: Student Development, Financial Aid, and Health Services. The college will review additional units in accordance with the established SCA program review cycle (3.12).

Academic Affairs: In the area of Academic Affairs, the instructional program review has been an evolving process. The El Camino College Instructional Program Review Guide for Self Study Teams, which was developed in 1992, has undergone several revisions. In 1998, a broad cross-section of faculty met with representatives of administration and staff to update and streamline the program review process. The Academic Senate approved A Guide for Academic Program Review (3.13) on May 26, 1998. The academic program review process involves a self study carried out by the faculty of the program, a validation report, and an executive summary modeling the accreditation process. Academic Affairs schedules a review for each program every six years with a midterm report in the third year. The Vice President of Academic Affairs gives a faculty member released time to support the program review process.

To complete the self study, the college asks the faculty to evaluate the following for the program: 1) purpose(s), need(s), and expected learning outcomes; 2) external factors, 3) curriculum review, 4) course requirements, 5) physical and fiscal resources, and 6) evidence of program effectiveness and efficiency. In the final section of the report, faculty identify recommendations for program improvement.

Administrative Services: Since 1995, the college has been developing a comprehensive program review process for the Administrative Services (AS) area. Managers have studied

several models, including the model currently used in the Academic Affairs area, an accreditation model, and the Student and Community Advancement model. To date, however, the college has no fully developed program review model for AS.

Currently, the various departments within the AS area rely on two methods of evaluation of their operations, as well as their plans for improvement. First, it conducts an internal evaluation where each department prepares an annual report that (1) identifies specific goals and objectives for the year, (2) assesses progress made toward the achievement of those goals and objectives, and (3) conducts an internal evaluation and determination of areas for improvement. Second, the college uses an external evaluation where the departments in the AS area employ a survey in which respondents rate services in terms of (1) need, (2) timeliness, (3) responsiveness, (4) feedback, (5) customer service, (6) completion and follow up, and (7) overall performance. The study identifies respondents as administrators, faculty, staff, or non-group. The Office of Institutional Research collects the surveys, analyzes the data, and integrates them into the annual reports for each department.

All managers from the Administrative Services area participated in a two-day planning session on March 22 and 23, 1999, where they developed an outline for a comprehensive planning model that included program review, performance indicators, and core quality indicators. The overall emphasis during the two-day planning session was on associating all area plans and activities with the El Camino College Educational Master Plan (3.14). One of the most significant products from the planning session is the working draft of the Administrative Services Program Review Cycle (3.15), which includes a flow chart with time lines for achievement of the various program review components.

Unfortunately, the college has not completely implemented this working draft. Further, it is

not clear how the college uses annual reports and surveys to improve programs and services.

Self Evaluation:

Institutional Review of Improvements in Programs and Services

The college has made significant improvements in this area. However, there is currently no uniform, systematic method to determine which plans receive available financial (or other) resources needed to implement plans for improvement presented in the annual reports. During the last two years, the annual reporting process has been standardized and now provides a comprehensive review of institutional accomplishments. These reports show evidence of improvements in programs and services. As administrators and coordinators who write these reports become more accomplished in writing measurable objectives and using key performance indicators, the reports will be even more helpful. The college should provide continued training in this area. It would also be beneficial to the college to come to consensus on a limited number of key performance indicators so that all divisions are focused on using the same measures of success.

Area Reviews of Improvements in Programs and Services

There is no consistent, standardized program review process in place for all areas of the college. Rather, each vice presidential area (Student Community Advancement, Academic Affairs, and Administrative Services) has developed its own process, which includes the following:

Student and Community Advancement: The program review process for this area is comprehensive, incorporating input from unit managers, employees, peers, and clients (primarily students). Additional features of this program review structure include both standard and unique measures. The college reviewed the Grants Development and Management Office

and the Admissions and Records Office last year. One of the outcomes of the review included a reorganization of both offices. The college will monitor improvements in efficiency and effectiveness through the process of annual reports and program review.

Academic Affairs: In 1999-2000, rather than start any new program reviews, the area made an effort to complete the outstanding studies. The college has identified 72 academic and vocational programs, of which 56 are somewhere in the process. Thirty-four have completed the entire process, and several have begun their second review cycle. There is some evidence that problems identified in the program reviews are being addressed. The anthropology program has expanded its curriculum offerings, and the number of full-time instructors has increased from one to three. The electronics program received funding to upgrade its equipment, and the cosmetology program secured VTEA funds to purchase needed equipment and began offering a developing evening program.

Eighteen programs are in the final stages and waiting for the executive summary. A major problem has been an inability to schedule executive summary meetings although the college is making a concerted effort to complete all summaries by the end of 2001. Due to a lack of sanctions, some programs have failed to initiate program review. Recent contract negotiations have included program review as a responsibility of faculty members to provide some accountability.

The instructional program review process needs to be improved in an effort to underscore its value. The current process is cumbersome as many faculty do not fully understand the accreditation process. Also a failure to request midterm reports hampers efforts to evaluate whether or not there has been measurable improvement in many of the programs. A meeting among the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Planning, Research and Development, and the Director of Institutional Research addressed the possibilities of tying the

program review process to the current planning process. The Vice President of Academic Affairs and President of the Academic Senate are reviewing several options.

Administrative Services: The internal and external components of the AS area program evaluation process contribute significantly to the preparation of annual reports and the development of plans for improvements. The Administrative Services Area Survey (3.16) is a valuable tool used to determine how various college constituent groups rate a department's services. The primary limitation of the current survey instrument appears to be that it does not identify any specific service, process, or product that may need improvement. Nonetheless, the survey allows respondents the opportunity to write comments, which often reveal patterns of strengths or weakness in a department's operations. Analysis of the comments, therefore, help identify specific services, processes, or products worthy of further attention. Despite implementation of this review process, the Administrative Services area has no evidence to present to indicate that its evaluation efforts lead directly to improvements in programs and services.

B1. The institution defines and publishes its planning processes and involves appropriate segments of the college community in the development of institutional plans.

Descriptive Summary:

The primary planning processes of El Camino College are defined in the Educational Master Plan. The District Planning Council (DPC) is charged with the responsibility of coordinating institutional planning for the college. Membership on the District Planning Council reflects all constituencies of the college community including faculty, management, staff, and students. All college plans relate to the Educational Master Plan as defined in the Dictionary of Planning Terminology (3.17). The college developed and reviewed the

Educational Master Plan through the collegial consultation process, as defined in Board Policy 3605 (3.18). The Board of Trustees adopted it in November, 1998. Currently, the basic building block for all college planning, from the unit level through the institutional level, is the unit action plan (3.19). Copies of unit action plans are on file in the Division of Planning, Research and Development. Copies of the Educational Master Plan have been distributed to all college division offices and are also available in several formats on the District Planning Council web page (<http://www.elcamino.cc.ca.us/PlanningWeb/Documents.htm>).

The Board of Trustees is committed to broad-based participation and provides every opportunity for individuals and groups to participate in the development of institutional plans. This commitment is clearly expressed in the Board's Collegial Consultation Policy.

Self Evaluation:

The district satisfies all parts of this accreditation standard.

B2. The institution defines and integrates its evaluation and planning processes to identify priorities for improvement.

Descriptive Summary:

Evaluation and planning processes vary slightly from area to area, division to division, and department to department. However, the basic evaluation process is fairly consistent throughout the college. The college conducts evaluations primarily through the process of program review, which generally includes the faculty, staff, and students involved in/with the program being evaluated. Program review typically includes the following steps: (1) identification of the program's goals and objectives, (2) delineation and collection of relevant data, (3) conducting surveys to gather employee and/or customer perceptions about the program, and (4) analysis of all the information gathered during

the evaluation period.

In the Academic Affairs area, instructional divisions and programs are evaluated on a six-year cycle. In the Student and Community Advancement area, evaluation may be conducted as often as annually, depending on the funding source or the nature of the specific functions of the program (e.g., grant-funded programs, such as the Workplace Learning Resource Center, usually submit midterm and annual reports to the funding agencies; admissions and records evaluate registration after each registration period.) The Administrative Services area reviews goals and objectives of each department via annual reports. Area personnel submit annual reports to the appropriate vice president. The annual report format is uniform and consistent throughout the college. Each program review and annual report contains sections for planning in the form of future goals and objectives, which, in turn, establish the basis for the next evaluation.

Self Evaluation:

Although the planning and evaluation processes are systematic and defined for each area, it is not clear how they directly impact institutional priorities for improvement. Each unit establishes its priorities based on the program review and evaluation processes. However, institutional priorities may be driven by political and/or economic priorities externally imposed upon the college by the legislature, the Chancellor's Office, or the economy.

B3. The institution engages in systematic and integrated educational, financial, physical, and human resources planning and implements changes to improve programs and services.

Descriptive Summary:

The Educational Master Plan provides the basic framework for integrating educational, financial, physical, and human resource planning.

During the budget development cycle, all segments of the college have the opportunity to develop unit action plans (UAPs). The UAP links the institutional goals of the master plan to unit goals and objectives that are linked to funding requests. This level of planning is synchronized with the Budget Development Calendar (3.20). Any individual or group may initiate an unit action plan and submit it to the division/department council for review and prioritization. Following division/departmental review, the department forwards UAPs to the to the appropriate vice president. After the vice president reviews the unit action plan, it is returned to the division/department for modification and then submitted to the Budget Development Committee for consideration and prioritization. The Budget Development Committee assesses UAP funding requests and prioritizes them according to the established budget development criteria (3.21) before making final budget recommendations to the college president.

From July 2000 through July 2001, the District Planning Council discussed methods by which the college could improve the planning and budgeting process in order to (1) utilize common planning terminology, (2) more closely link budgets with plans, (3) reduce paper flow and redundancy, (4) increase efficiency and effectiveness, (5) facilitate monitoring of plan implementation, and (6) facilitate reporting. Following an investigation, the college implemented Q-Builder, a network-based software for implementing strategic and operational planning. It contains the following features: (1) supports unit-level planning activities, (2) has the key elements to manage planning activities, such as action strategies, key performance indicators, evaluation reviews, (3) links specific objectives to budgets, (4) syntax wizards to help build objectives, and (5) report management through cumulative progress reviews.

The District Planning Council acknowledged that several critical factors would be necessary to assure the successful collegewide implementation of Q-Builder: (1) active support from the president and vice presidents, (2) pilot testing of

the software to iron out start-up problems, (3) training at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels, (4) establishment of user groups to encourage utilization of the software and share problems and solutions associated with implementation, and (5) continuous and on-going support from a campus expert who would up-date the organizational information and provide assistance to unit users. To meet these needs, the college purchased Q-Builder and conducted its first round of training with a pilot test group of 12 units (four from each vice president's area of responsibility) on May 1, 2001. Subsequent training sessions will be held until all units of the college are successfully using the Q-Builder software (3.22).

Self Evaluation:

The college initially developed the planning process to determine how to best allocate and distribute Partnership for Excellence funds. Thus, the Partnership for Excellence served as a catalyst and as the springboard for an in-depth investigation and subsequent purchase of Q-Builder. Implementation of the Q-Builder software marks a significant step toward systematizing and integrating planning and resource allocation for achievement of plans. The college is studying Q-Builder and will make necessary modifications in order to assure that planning and program improvement are intimately linked together and are universally implemented.

C1. The institution specifies intended institutional outcomes and has clear documentation of their achievement.

Descriptive Summary:

The El Camino College Educational Master Plan, Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, Student and Staff Diversity Plan, Injury and Illness Prevention Plan, Matriculation Plan, and other program specific plans all include intended outcomes of various levels and specificity. These plans state goals and objectives related to the college's mission and program goals.

Documentation of the achievement of the goals and objectives contained in these plans is in annual reports and/or program reviews.

Program reviews in the Academic Affairs area, for example, include a description of the program characteristics, objectives, and anticipated outcomes such as numbers of students enrolled, WSCH/FTE, completion rates, grade distributions, transfer rates, and student demographics. In the Student and Community Advancement area, programs such as the Counseling, Financial Aid, Assessment/Testing, Job Placement, and Student Development document their levels of achievement in a similar manner.

The college prepares annual program plans for categorical funding such as VTEA, EOP&S, DSP&S, matriculation, Tech Prep, and Staff and Student Diversity. The district also develops a districtwide Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, Five-Year Capital Construction Plan, and Scheduled Maintenance Plan.

The Chancellor's Office periodically conducts external program reviews every six years for categorically funded programs such as EOP&S, Matriculation, and DSP&S. In addition, several other programs such as CalWORKs, Tech Prep, Workplace Learning, CACT, VTEA, SBDC, and CITC also have program review processes (3.23).

Self Evaluation:

The establishment of the Division of Planning, Research and Development, which includes the Office of Institutional Research, is a significant step toward improvement of the evaluation process and the standardization of institutional outcome measures. The college engages in numerous planning, data collection, and reporting activities. Currently, however, they are not well coordinated or uniformly applied throughout the institution. Despite program review, annual reporting, and other assessment efforts, the evaluation of outcomes and recommendations for improvements lack consistent implementation, and the criteria for determination of which recommendations to implement (driven

by institutional priorities) need to be more effectively communicated throughout the college community.

C2. *The institution uses information from its evaluation and planning activities to communicate matters of quality assurance to the public.*

Descriptive Summary:

The college uses numerous vehicles to communicate planning activities and evaluation outcomes to the public. The Annual Budget, for example, includes historical data regarding achievement of Partnership for Excellence local targets in the areas of transfer, degrees and certificates, workforce development, basic skills improvement, and successful course completions. In addition, the college communicates quality assurance to the public through publication of the *President's Newsletter*, reports to various advisory bodies, and general information published on the El Camino College web site.

The VTEA and CalWORKs programs have prepared a videotape and binder that contain essential information about these programs, respectively. The VTEA binder provides information on the academic programs, potential career paths, and respective earning potential for careers. In accordance with the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act (P.L. 101-542), El Camino College makes available its completion and transfer rates to all current and prospective students. This information is updated on an annual basis and is posted to the college's public web site at the following location: <http://www.elcamino.cc.ca.us/demographics/right.html>.

The Public Information and Marketing Department communicates matters of quality assurance to the public. The office currently oversees an advertising campaign that includes information regarding the quality of academic programs and the availability of student services. In addition, the campaign highlights relevant statistics for the public, such as

student/teacher ratios and transfer rates to various public and private four-year institutions.

Self Evaluation:

In order to more effectively communicate matters of quality assurance to the public, the college enlisted the services of a research firm to conduct an intensive telephone survey of the community (3.24). This survey effort will assist Public Information and Marketing in selecting and presenting information that reflects the primary concern(s) of our community.

C3. *The institution systematically reviews and modifies, as appropriate, its institutional research efforts, evaluation processes, institutional plans, and planning processes to determine their ongoing utility for assessing institutional effectiveness.*

Descriptive Summary:

The college periodically reviews institutional research evaluation processes, institutional plans, and planning processes. The Division of Planning, Research and Development submits an annual report of such activities, which includes descriptions of major accomplishments, progress toward existing goals, and any areas of concern (3.25).

On February 1, 2000, the college held a one day workshop involving constituents from the Academic Senate, Federation of Teachers, El Camino Classified Employees, College Council, District Planning Council, Budget Development Committee, and Associated Students Organization to study a variety of models for linking budgeting and planning. One outcome of that workshop included the establishment of a task force with the assigned responsibility to develop a specific process and organizational model for El Camino College. The task force developed a set of parameters and criteria to be used in the El Camino model (3.26).

Self Evaluation:

The college established Guidelines for Assigning Priorities for Research Requests and published them as a tool for decreasing the number of research requests that were completed on a first come/first served or urgency basis and for increasing the number of requests that clearly supported major planning or evaluation of various aspects of institutional effectiveness (Refer to section A.4).

The college needs to improve faculty and staff participation in linking college planning to specific budget decisions. It needs to develop a better method of measuring the impact of resource allocation on the fulfillment of institutional goals.

For Academic Affairs, Student and Community Advancement, and Administrative Services, it will be necessary to develop a follow-up mechanism to ensure the fulfillment of any recommendations for improvement that result from program evaluations. In fact, the instructional program review process needs to be evaluated to assess its effectiveness and to make recommendations for any needed revisions.

Planning Agenda

¥ Complete the implementation of a new data warehouse to facilitate the college's ability to provide timely information. (3A.2)

¥ Assess program review processes and revise as needed to ensure that the review process provides relevant and timely information to assist areas to improve programs and services. (3A.4)

¥ Reach consensus on a limited number of key performance indicators in order to focus planning and evaluation efforts. (3A.4)

¥ Ensure that all managers and program coordinators develop expertise in writing goals and measurable objectives using key performance indicators. (3A.4)

¥ Develop a method of communicating institutional effectiveness measures to the campus and public. (3A.3, 3C.1, 3C.2)

¥ Design a comprehensive system that links all evaluation activities and integrates annual reports, program reviews, and Chancellor's Office reports and site visits. (3A.4)

¥ Design a process to provide reports and documentation regarding campus plans and progress to the staff, faculty, and community. (3C.2)

¥ Coordinate staff development activities to inform campus constituents of progress achieved toward goals and provide the opportunity for input to the establishment of new goals. (3A.3, 3B.2, 3B.3)

References:

- 3.1 Guidelines for Assigning Priorities to Research Requests
- 3.2 *College Performance on Partnership for Excellence Goals through 1998—1999*
- 3.3 *College Performance on Partnership for Excellence Goals through 1999-2000*
- 3.4 Annual Report, Division of Planning, Research and Development
- 3.5 El Camino College Annual Report Format
- 3.6 El Camino College Key Performance Indicators
- 3.7 Degree Completions, Transfer Rates and ECC's Top 10 Transfer Institutions
- 3.8 Student Right-to-Know Data
- 3.9 Annual Reports: 1999-2000
- 3.10 Board Policy 1200: College Mission Statement
- 3.11 Analysis of 1999-2000 Annual Reports
- 3.12 Student and Community Advancement Program Review Cycle
- 3.13 A Guide for Academic Program Review
- 3.14 El Camino College Educational Master Plan
- 3.15 Administrative Services Program Review Cycle
- 3.16 1998-99 Administrative Services Area Survey
- 3.17 Dictionary of Planning Terminology
- 3.18 Board Policy 3605: Collegial Consultation
- 3.19 Unit Action Plan ~ Budget Request Form
- 3.20 El Camino College 2001-2002 Budget Calendar (Revised)
- 3.21 El Camino College Budget Development Committee Criteria for Augmentations and/or Enhancements
- 3.22 Q-Builder Materials
- 3.23 Sample: EOP&S Program Review Summary Report
- 3.24 El Camino College 2001 Random Survey
- 3.25 Sample: Planning, Research and Development Annual Report
- 3.26 Planning and Budgeting Parameters