

# El Camino College Planning Summit 2017

---



## Summit Theme & Outcomes

The theme of the 2017 Planning Summit was “We’ve created our next Comprehensive Master Plan. Now what?”

Seventy (70) employees and students from El Camino College participated in the event, which was held on Friday, April 21, 2017. A complete list of attendees is found in Appendix A of this report (p. 4). Appendix B provides a summary of the Planning Summit Evaluation Survey (p. 5).

The 2017 Summit began with an icebreaker hosted by Dr. Jeanie Nishime, followed by President Maloney’s welcome message.

## Keynote Speaker: Dr. Sabrina Sanders

Dr. Sabrina Sanders, Director, Student Affairs Programs & Initiatives at California State University (CSU), Office of the Chancellor, presented on “Thinking Outside the Box for Planning & Student Success,” which included an overview of the Chancellor’s Office data dashboards. Dashboards allow universities and the CSU system office to access data easily and drill down to specific target groups, facilitating program changes to enhance student success. Dr. Sanders’ presentation on how the CSU is using data for planning served as a springboard for ECC employees to use data more often to inform planning and decision-making for student success.

## Understand the Context for the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP)

To provide participants with context for reviewing the Comprehensive Master Plan and preparing for the future, several updates and presentations were provided. These included:

- **Compton Center Partnership Update** (*Barb Perez, Vice President, Compton Center*) – accreditation process and move toward independent college status
- **Enrollment Management** (*Jean Shankweiler, Vice President, Academic Affairs*) – current enrollment trends, stabilization status, and goals for the coming year
- **Process Improvement**<sup>1</sup> (*Jeanie Nishime, Vice President, Student & Community Advancement*) – findings from the consultants who reviewed our entering college processes; initial plans for changes
- **Scorecard & Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Outcomes**<sup>2</sup> (*Irene Graff, Director, Research & Planning*) – review of recent in student progress and goal achievement that are linked to the college’s strategic plan

---

<sup>1</sup> Read more about Process Improvement findings on the [Vice President of Student Services webpage](#).

<sup>2</sup> Find the latest information on [student achievement](#) and [IE Outcomes](#) on the Research & Planning webpages.

## Understand and Determine the Next Step in the CMP Process

Developing a Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) is typically a two-year process and guides the focus of at least two college planning summits. The previous Planning Summit ([April 15, 2016](#)) focused on “Supporting Student Success” and helped to develop 1) action plans for lower performance outcomes and 2) action items for the Educational Master Plan (EMP), scheduled for finalization and approval in early 2017. The brainstormed Action Plans for lower performance outcomes were gathered and shared with an appropriate planning task force, such as the Certificates Task Force, charged with strategizing ways to increase the number of certificates awarded by facilitating processes. The EMP action items served as the foundation for the Educational Master Plan developed and organized by a faculty team during Summer 2016.

At this year’s Summit, an overview reacquainted attendees with the Educational Master Plan, as a part of a broader Comprehensive Master Plan that includes Facilities, Staffing and Technology Plans. The presentation specifically highlighted the EMP Initiatives and Action Items that Summit attendees developed in 2016.

Although the Action Items in the Educational Master Plan are numbered, they are not listed in order of priority. A first step in an implementation process is to prioritize which steps to take first. Planning Summit attendees participated in this initial prioritization process. Summit attendees reviewed EMP Initiatives in breakout sessions and prioritized the top three action items, providing rationales for each. For the highest priority action item, groups sketched a plan for completion, as a way to “operationalize” the plan. For the top priority, participants answered questions including why, who, what, when & how to help establish an action plan.

Action items (by initiative) that Summit participants identified as highest priority included:

- **Establish a long-range plan for distance education** (Curricular Innovations)
- **Institutionalize equity practices** by regularly scheduling [relevant] professional development programs (Empowering for Equity)
- **Evaluate ECC’s placement procedures** (Comprehensive Student Support)
- **Develop processes to ensure that students are not sent from one department to another** without satisfaction (Evaluation of Student Processes)
- **Evaluate college processes** to ensure they are efficient, effective, and up-to-date (Improving our Processes)

Recommendations from the Planning Summit 2017 will be shared and discussed during the CMP implementation process.

## Operationalize the CMP at the Department, Division, and College Level

As a final exercise at the Summit, attendees were asked to consider how they could personally contribute to improving the College over the next five years? A worksheet was distributed that

helped them build their own plan, a My Master Plan to take with them. Individual My Master Plans could be used after the summit for reflection and a reminder that we are all a part of the college improvement process to improve quality and student success.

## Next Steps

The Strategic Planning Committee will reconvene in Fall 2017 to begin work on an implementation plan for the Comprehensive Master Plan. The process will include prioritizing actions and identifying stewards to help guide implementation. The 2018 Planning Summit will include a brief progress report on CMP implementation.

## 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 leadership; 3) plan leadership (BSI, CMP, SSSP, or SEP); 4) program review, curriculum, or SLO faculty leadership; 5) member of PRIDE leadership development cohort; or 6) student leadership.

Seventy employees and students from El Camino College participated in the event. Representation included 8 students, 18 classified staff, 11 faculty, and 33 managers. Special acknowledgement goes to the Student Ambassadors (starred below) who provided logistical support in addition to general participation.






Allen, Stacey	Johnson, Alec	Ramirez, Maria
Anaya, Jose	Katz, Beth	Reyes, Idania
Bailey, Nina	Kjeseth, Lars	Rodriguez, Stephanie
Black, Dustin	Kunisaki, Sheryl	Rosales, Joshua
Brochet, Anna	Kushigemachi, Scott	Sala, Andrea
Brown, David	Leible, Arthur	Scott, DaVon
Brown, Tom	Ludwig, Lindsey	Shankweiler, Jean
Chaban, Monica	Maloney, Dena	Shenefield, Cheryl
Clowers, Linda	Mardesich, Nicole*	Sims, Jacquelyn
Cuadros, Isabella*	Marquez, Lissette	Smith, Maria
Dalili, Eman	Martinez, Arturo	Tejano, Ivan*
Davis, Randal	Martinez, Kristina	Ternes, Linda
Dominguez, Maria	McDermott, Patrick*	Toya, Gregory
Dreizler, Robin	Meredith, Julie	Ushijima, Tiffany
Fujiwara, Melissa	Mussaw, David	Van Buren, Starleen
Garcia, William	Natividad, Rory	von Stein, Breanna
Geraghty, Elise	Nishime, Jeanie	Warren, Will
Graff, Irene	Ortiz, Julieta	Watson, Vanessa
Greco, Gary	Park, Gina	Watts, Kareem
Gutierrez, Edith	Parnock, Heather	Wells, Chris
Hernandez, Arturo	Patel, Dipte	Whitney, Karen
Higdon, Jo Ann	Perez, Barbara	Williams, Jaren*
Hoang, Hieu	Pineda, Carolyn	
Jimenez, Cesar	Price, Berkeley	

# Planning Summit Evaluation






N=20

Spring 2017






### 1A. President's Welcome

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.90
Very Helpful	18	90.00	
Somewhat Helpful	2	10.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	0	0.00	






### 1B. Ice Breaker

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.50
Very Helpful	12	60.00	
Somewhat Helpful	7	35.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Not Helpful	1	5.00	
Not Present	0	0.00	






### 1C. Keynote Speaker

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.30
Very Helpful	9	45.00	
Somewhat Helpful	8	40.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	3	15.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	0	0.00	






### 2A. Compton Center Partnership Update

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.60
Very Helpful	12	60.00	
Somewhat Helpful	8	40.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	0	0.00	






### 2B. Enrollment Management

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.70
Very Helpful	14	70.00	
Somewhat Helpful	6	30.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	0	0.00	






### 2C. Process Improvement

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.35
Very Helpful	12	60.00	
Somewhat Helpful	5	25.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	2	10.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	1	5.00	

### 3A. CMP Overview

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.60
Very Helpful	12	60.00	
Somewhat Helpful	8	40.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	0	0.00	

### 3B. Facilities Master Plan

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.35
Very Helpful	10	50.00	
Somewhat Helpful	9	45.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	1	5.00	

**3C. Technology Master Plan**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.40
Very Helpful	9	45.00	
Somewhat Helpful	10	50.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	1	5.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	0	0.00	

**3D. Educational Master Plan**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.50
Very Helpful	9	45.00	
Somewhat Helpful	9	45.00	
Somewhat Unhelpful	0	0.00	
Not Helpful	0	0.00	
Not Present	0	0.00	
Invalid	2	10.00	

**4A. Clarity of project objectives**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.00
7	6	30.00	
6	7	35.00	
5	4	20.00	
4	1	5.00	
3	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	
Invalid	2	10.00	

**4B. Usefulness of supporting materials**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.83
7	6	30.00	
6	7	35.00	
5	2	10.00	
4	2	10.00	
3	1	5.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	
Invalid	2	10.00	

**4C. Satisfaction with the outcomes**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.61
7	4	20.00	
6	7	35.00	
5	3	15.00	
4	4	20.00	
3	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	
Invalid	2	10.00	

**4D. Collaborative Discussion**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.35
7	8	40.00	
6	7	35.00	
5	2	10.00	
4	0	0.00	
3	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	
Invalid	3	15.00	

**5. One of the objectives of the summit was identifying the next steps to bring the Comprehensive Master Plan to life. How well do you think the summit content connected to this objective?**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.40
Greatly	9	45.00	
Somewhat	10	50.00	
Not so much	1	5.00	
Not at all	0	0.00	
Not present	0	0.00	

**6. The My Master Plan handout: (check all that apply)**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: -
Clearly stated its purpose	10	50.00	
Helped me think about my personal role in our master planning process	16	80.00	
Wasnt relevant to me	1	5.00	
Invalid	1	5.00	

**7A. Invitation clarity**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.25
7	10	50.00	
6	7	35.00	
5	1	5.00	
4	2	10.00	
3	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	

**7B. Check-in process**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.55
7	16	80.00	
6	1	5.00	
5	1	5.00	
4	2	10.00	
3	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	

**7C. Location comfort**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.65
7	13	65.00	
6	7	35.00	
5	0	0.00	
4	0	0.00	
3	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	

**7D. Supporting materials**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.65
7	15	75.00	
6	3	15.00	
5	2	10.00	
4	0	0.00	
3	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	

**7E. Food quality**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 5.00
7	6	30.00	
6	3	15.00	
5	5	25.00	
4	1	5.00	
3	1	5.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	3	15.00	
Invalid	1	5.00	

**7F. Overall Satisfaction**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 6.25
7	11	55.00	
6	4	20.00	
5	4	20.00	
4	1	5.00	
3	0	0.00	
2	0	0.00	
1	0	0.00	

**8. Please describe yourself:**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.10
Student	1	5.00	
Staff	6	30.00	
Faculty	3	15.00	
Supervisor	10	50.00	
Manager or Administrator			
Other	0	0.00	

**9. Is this your first Planning Summit experience?**

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 0.35
Yes	7	35.00	
No	13	65.00	