MEMO TO: Dr. Thomas Fallo, Superintendent/President
             El Camino College
             16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
             Torrance, CA 90506

RECEIVED. DEC 12 2012

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President

DATE: December 11, 2012

SUBJECT: Enclosed Report of the External Evaluation Team

Previously, the chairperson of the External Evaluation Team (Evaluation Team) that recently visited El Camino College sent you a draft External Evaluation Report (Report) affording you the opportunity to correct errors of fact. We assume you have responded to the Team Chair. The Commission now has received the final version of the Report, a copy of which is enclosed for you. Please examine the enclosed Report.

- If you believe that the Report contains inaccuracies, you are invited to call them to the attention of the Commission. To do so, you should submit a letter stating recommended corrections to the ACCJC President. The letter should arrive at the Commission office by end of day **December 14, 2012,** in order to be included in Commission materials. The letter may also be sent electronically as a PDF.

- ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the Report. The Commission requires that the institution notify the Commission office **by noon on Monday December 17, 2012,** or earlier, of its intent to attend the meeting. This enables the Commission to invite the Team Chair to attend.

- If the institution also wishes to submit additional material to the Commission, it should exercise care, keeping in mind the Commission cannot read and absorb large amounts of material on short notice. Material should arrive at the ACCJC office with the written notification that the CEO has accepted the invitation to address the Commission, no later than December 17, 2012.

The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on **January 9-11, 2013,** at The Hyatt Regency Hotel, San Francisco Airport, 1333 Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, California. The enclosure, "Procedures for an Institutional Chief Executive Officer's Appearance Before the Commission," addresses the protocol of such appearances.

Please note that the Commission will not consider the institution as being indifferent if its chief administrator does not choose to appear before the Commission. If the institution does request to be heard at the Commission meeting, the chairperson of the Evaluation Team will also be asked to be present to explain the reasons for statements in the Report. Both parties will be allowed brief testimony before the Commission deliberates in private.

The enclosed Report should be considered confidential and not given general distribution until it has been acted upon by the Commission and you have been notified by letter of the action taken.

BAB/tl

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Jeanie Nishime, V.P., Student/Community Advancement/ALO, (w/o enclosure)

Procedures for an Institutional Chief Executive Officer's Appearance Before the Commission

The Commission considers accreditation actions institutional in January and June of each calendar year. ACCJC policy provides that when the Commission is deliberating or acting upon matters that concern an institution, it will invite the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the institution to meet with the Commission in Executive Session.[1] The appearance is for the purpose of discussing issues of substance and any Accreditation Standards deficiencies noted in the report. There is no requirement that the CEO attend the Commission meeting. If the Commission is considering institutional action as a result of an evaluation team visit, and if the CEO elects to attend the meeting, the Commission will also invite the Chair of the Evaluation Team (Team Chair) or designee to attend.

An institution must send written notification to the ACCJC office at least 15 working days before the scheduled Commission meeting if the CEO wishes to attend. If the institution wishes to bring written material to the meeting, it must send the material to the Commission at least 15 working days prior to the scheduled meeting, with the institution's written acceptance of the invitation to appear before the Commission. The institution should bear in mind the evaluation of the institution is based upon the conditions at the institution at the time of the team visit.

At the meeting, the institutional CEO will be invited to make a brief presentation, followed by questions from the Commission. The Commission reserves the right to establish a time limit on such presentations.
The CEO is expected to be the presenter, and should consult with Commission staff if there are plans to invite other representatives to join the CEO. On the day of the Commission meeting, ACCJC staff will escort the CEO (and additional representatives) to and from the designated waiting area to the meeting at the appropriate time. An institution's presentation should not exceed five (5) minutes.

The Team Chair or designee will also be invited to attend. The Commissioners may ask questions of the Team Chair after college representatives have exited. The Team Chair will then be excused, and the Commission will continue its deliberations in closed session.

The CEO will be notified in writing of the subsequent action taken by the Commission.

---

[1] Policies that are relative to this process are the *Policy on Access to Commission Meetings, Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions, Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Members Institutions, and Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of ACCJC and Member Institutions.*

Follow-Up Report

El Camino College
16007 Crenshaw Boulevard
Torrance, California 90506

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

El Camino College on

November 14, 2012

Visiting Team Members

Dr. Kindred Murillo, Team Chair	Superintendent/President	Lake Tahoe Community College
Ms. Sharon Lowry	Executive Vice President Academic Affairs and Student Services	Antelope Valley College
Mr. Kevin Fleming	Career and Technical Ed.	Norco College

Date: December 9, 2012

To: Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges

From: Kindred Murillo, Team Chair

Subject: Follow-Up Report and Visit,
                El Camino College, November 14, 2012

Background
In October of 2008, El Camino College (ECC) underwent a comprehensive accreditation review. This was the first review since ECC assumed responsibility for the Compton Education Center (Compton Center, formerly Compton College). In January of 2009 after a review of the findings of the visiting team and previous recommendations, the Commission acted to issue the status of Warning to the College. The College was required to prepare two follow-up reports, the first one due in April of 2009. The Commission action letter requested the College "demonstrate efforts toward resolution" of recommendations 1 and 3. The second follow-up report was due on October 15, 2009, requesting resolution of Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The recommendations from the 2008 Comprehensive Visit are as follows:

Recommendations 1: As cited in previous (1990, 1996, and 2002) accreditation recommendations the college should complete the full implementation of its process for tracking planning, program review, budgeting, and evaluation process and complete the cycle to assure that all the departments and sites (including the ECC Compton Center) of the college participate in the program review process, and that the results clearly link to institutional planning and the allocation of resources. (I.B.3; I.B.3; II.A.2.e; II.a.2.f; III.B.1; III.B.1.a; III.B.2.a; III.B.2.b)

Recommendation 2: The college should immediately define and publish a timeline in respect to how it will develop and implement student learning outcomes at the course, program and degree levels, establish systems to assess student learning outcomes and use the results of such assessments to make improvements in the delivery of student learning, to ensure that the College shall attain, by 2012, the level of *Proficiency in the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness ---Part III: Student Learning Outcomes* (II.A.1.b; II.A.2; II.A.2.a.2; II.A.6; II.A.7).

Recommendation 3: The college should revise its curriculum review processes and cycles so that all curriculum across the college is reviewed consistently, that the cycle of review assures the currency of the curriculum, and that the curriculum review and program review processes are integrated so that an important element of program review (the determination that program curriculum needs revision, addition or deletion to remain current) will be part of the actual program review process. (II.A.2; II.A.2.a; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.c; II.A.2.d; II.A.2.e)

Recommendation 4:

The college needs to assure that online courses and programs are consistent in meeting the same level of rigor as on campus programs, that all services available on campus are available online, that student learning outcomes are incorporated into these offerings and that this information is clearly communicated to students taking these courses. (II.A.1.b; II.A.2; II.A.2.a.2; II.A.6; II.A.7)

Recommendation 5:
El Camino College and the ECC Compton Center need to fully integrate SLO Assessment into the faculty evaluation process. The ECC Compton Center must implement its faculty evaluations and use the results of these evaluations to encourage instructional improvements and faculty development plans (III.A.1.b; III.A.1.c)

Recommendation 6:
The El Camino College must develop a fiscal management plan for all sites, matched to its revenues, to assure the fiscal soundness of the institution. (III.D.2.c; III.D.2.d; III.D.2.g; III.D.3)

Recommendation 7:
The El Camino College must develop a staffing plan for all sites, which assures the effectiveness of human resources, includes written criteria for all personnel, and assigns individuals to duties appropriate to their expertise and the needs of the institution. (III.A.1.a; III.A.1.b)

Recommendation 8:
The El Camino College must develop a facilities master plan for all sites, linked to educational planning, and integrate this plan with the institution's overall planning process. (III.B.1.a; III.B.2.a; III.B.2.b)

Recommendation 9:
The Board of Trustees of El Camino Community College District must include in its code of ethics a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates this code. (Standard IV.B.h)

At the June 2009 meeting, the Commission accepted the April 2009 Follow-Up Report and continued the status of Warning. On October 27, 2009 a small team visited ECC to determine if ECC had fully addressed the recommendations as noted in the January 2009 action letter and the October 15, 2009 Follow-Up Report.

At the January 29, 2010 the Commission took action to remove Warning and reaffirmed accreditation based on a Follow-Up report due on October 15, 2010 and the visit. The Commission requested that ECC address the resolution of the partially fulfilled Recommendations 1, 2, 5, and 6. The Commission added the following requirements in the January 2010 action letter:

o Commission Concern 1: El Camino College should reevaluate its online course offerings and submit substantive change proposals where 50% or more of a program can be achieved online. (ER 21; Substantive Change Policy) the College may risk losing federal financial aid for programs that have not received substantive change approval.

o Commission Concern 2: El Camino College should shorten its timeline for program review so there is a mechanism to support a closer integration of the program review, planning and resource allocation processes (II.B.3; II.B.4; II.B.6)

In November 2010 ECC provided a Follow-Up Report and a visit was conducted at the college. The team verified that Recommendation 1, 2, 5, and 6 as well as the Commission Concerns were resolved. The Commission met in January and accepted the follow-up report and noted resolution of the items the team verified.

ECC submitted a Midterm Report on October 15, 2011 and at its January 2012 meeting, the Commission took action requiring the College to complete a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit in October 2012. The action requested the College demonstrate the institution has addressed Recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. The Commission also requested that deficiencies are resolved and the Accreditation Standards are met, and noted the College has been given additional time to correct deficiencies for "good cause" and must correct the deficiencies noted in the recommendations.

November 14, 2012 Follow-Up Team Visit
On November 14, 2012 a small team visited the College and Center to validate the Follow-Up Report submitted in October 2012. The results of this visit are detailed as follows. This report summarizes the findings of the visiting team and notes a couple of commendations.

Prior Recommendations

Recommendations 1:
As cited in previous (1990, 1996, and 2002) accreditation recommendations the college should complete the full implementation of its process for tracking planning, program review, budgeting, and evaluation process and complete the cycle to assure that all the departments and sites (including the ECC Compton Center) of the college participate in the program review process, and that the results clearly link to institutional planning and the allocation of resources. (I.B.3; II.A.2.e; II.a.2.f; III.B.1; III.B.1.a; III.B.2.a; III.B.2.b)

General Observations
Overall the College has made substantial improvements in their processes for assessing institutional quality and using the results to improve programs and services. The College has implemented a complete cycle of program review, budgeting, and evaluation. Many programs and services are in their second or third cycle of review. The college has also implemented annual plans at the program, unit, and area levels that tie to the Comprehensive Master Plan. Based on the unit level annual plans, funding recommendations are submitted to the Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC) by Vice Presidents of the College. These annual plans are tied to the College's mission and strategic initiatives. The processes were validated at both the College and the Center.

Progress toward meeting goals is tracked through the alignment to the College's strategic initiatives and a system that provides tracking by the unit, program, and area levels. Institutional Research provides data for program reviews and reviews are posted online.

Findings and Evidence
The College evaluates all courses and programs through an ongoing systematic review and engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning. The College has established a planning cycle based on a four-year cycle for program review (revised from a six

year cycle in 2009-10), strategic initiatives on a three-year cycle, curriculum review on a six-year cycle and annual plans. Program reviews and annual plans tie to the Comprehensive Master Plan and to Strategic Initiatives, and curriculum review and student learning outcomes feed into the program review cycle. The College has developed and maintains a clear planning cycle and funding cycle upon which planning, staffing, and funding decisions are made. The College has established a calendar of program review processes by semester and provides orientation workshops. (II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.B.3)

Program review recommendations feed into the program plan, then to the unit plan and area plan. Vice Presidents conduct a prioritization process and requests flow to the Planning and Budget Council and Executive Cabinet. The recommendations for funding allocations are then made to the President and Board of Trustees. Computer equipment is on a 5-year replacement cycle; Compton Center is on a separate schedule. The process of linking budget to planning is evident in the Colleges' Plan Builder software.

The updated Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) includes an Educational, Technology Facilities, and Staffing plan. The CMP is used to drive decision-making and resource allocation and is the result of program review and assessment processes conducted at both the College and the Compton Center. Each location conducts its own process and then requests are prioritized together to develop an overall college budget. (III.B.1.a; III.B.2.a; & III.B.2.b)

The evidence demonstrates ECC has established a tracking and evaluation system for ensuring institutional effectiveness. The Academic Program Review Committee reviews all academic program reviews. The Student and Community Advancement Committee review the program reviews for the Student and Community Advancement areas. The cycles are in the second full year of operation. The team verified program reviews on the College website are from an older cycle and that updated program reviews with assessment information including SLOs are located inside the CurricUNET program. It is noted that the College responded to the Commission's request to move to a four-year cycle for program review and has published a calendar of that cycle as well as converted program reviews to the four-year cycle. The team validated program reviews in CurricUNet were completed per the published calendar. (II.A.2.f)

Documents provided to the team along with interviews of key personnel established that the program review, planning, and budget have been integrated into the college culture. There is notable improvement in the processes at the Compton Center, which was acknowledged by the Planning and Budget Committee. Transparent and valuable information is provided, in which the Center faculty and staff have confidence. This is a significant improvement from the 2008 Comprehensive Team Visit and meets "Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement" per the Institutional Effectiveness Rubric.

Conclusions
ECC has fully responded to this recommendation, is proficient, and operates at a sustainable continuous improvement level. The College has established and sustained systematic processes to evaluate all courses and programs at both the main campus and the Compton Center. Student services, administrative services, and human resources have timelines now established for each of the area program reviews. The Academic, Administrative, and Student and Community Advancement areas have also established and sustained systematic processes to assess and improve student learning and achievement. The College has also reviewed and refined its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.

The team commends the main campus and the Compton Center for working together to create a culture at both locations that understands the reality and importance of accreditation as a tool to ensure continuous improvement. Academic program reviews reflect a shift in culture at both the main campus and the Compton Center.

Also, of note is the culture that is inclusive of student involvement in the participatory governance processes. The students were involved and felt valued in the process, and this was evident at both locations.

The College has fully met this recommendation.

Recommendation 2:
The college should immediately define and publish a timeline in respect to how it will develop and implement student learning outcomes at the course, program and degree levels, establish systems to assess student learning outcomes and use the results of such assessments to make improvements in the delivery of student learning, to ensure that the College shall attain, by 2012, the level of *Proficiency in the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness --- Part III: Student Learning Outcomes* (II.A.1.b; II.A.2; II.A.2.a.; II.A.6; II.A.7).

General Observations
The College has made considerable strides in the assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs) since the 2008 Comprehensive Visit. The College defined and published a timeline for the development and implementation of SLOs. The College also developed systems to assess student learning outcomes and is in the process of using those assessments to improve the delivery of student learning. The college continues to progress in assessing SLOs and using data to implement changes to improve courses and programs. The college's Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC) meets regularly on course, program and institutional level SLO assessment – all of which are on a published four-year cycle. CurricUNET is being utilized to store and link assessment reports. Currently, all Student Services programs are transitioning to CurricUNET.

Some degree programs have only one student learning outcome; while a specific number is not required, having one seems inadequate to accurately reflect the totality of a student's learning.

Findings and Evidence
The college defined and published a timeline for implementing student learning outcomes at the course, program and degree levels, as well as developed systems to ensure the implementation of student learning outcomes. Instructional programs are delivered in appropriate systems and modes of instruction that appear to be compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and needs of the El Camino student population. Appropriate resources are allocated to SLO assessment as demonstrated by the videos, newsletters, meetings, and trainings provided. A Vice President of Instructional Effectiveness position was created in the Academic Senate to facilitate communication between the Academic Senate and the Assessment Learning Committee, and the Academic Program Review Committee. The College has established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver and evaluate courses and programs. The College has established and uses the *Guidelines of Evaluating SLO Assessment Proposals* assessment principles, timelines, and a handbook for reference. Tutorials are made available and used by the faculty. (II.A.1.b; II.A.2; II.A.2.a)

The College ensures that students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with the College's approved course outline. The team verified inclusion of student

learning outcomes and course objectives on the syllabi of courses. The team also verified that the College publishes and makes public the board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs and world views through verifying board policies, catalog, and website information. (II.A.6; II.A.7)

Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments have been identified for most courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees as noted above. There are model disciplines/programs that have documented mapping of course to program SLOs, program to institutional SLOs, and course to institutional SLOs. However evidence was not available to indicate 100% alignment of course SLOs and PLOs, although 77% are fully aligned and 97% partially aligned.

From 2011 to 2012, the College has increased course SLO assessment from 37% to 55%; and program assessment from 84% to 95%. During the same time period, the Compton Center cites an increase in course SLO assessment from 32% to 98%. Only 38% of program learning outcomes have been assessed at the Center. Student Learning and Support Activities have an ongoing assessment of learning outcomes at 84%. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) have an ongoing assessment of three out of six ILOs. (II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f)

Both the main campus and the Compton Center demonstrated a widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and closing the gaps that are identified through the assessment process. The dialogue is becoming institutionalized throughout the organization.

The College overall demonstrates most of the characteristics of the development level of SLO implementation and some of the proficiency level characteristics noted in the *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes.*

The team acknowledges and commends ECC and the Compton Center for the resources directed toward SLO development and institutionalization. Staff resources have been allocated to the SLO process, including an associate dean position in Academic Affairs, three faculty coordinators, and facilitators for each division. There is also reassigned time for this responsibility for the faculty.

Conclusions
The College defined and published a timeline for implementing student learning outcomes at the course, program and degree levels, as well as developed systems to ensure the implementation of student learning outcomes. The College is at a high level development stage and will require some additional work to meet proficiency.

The College has substantially met the recommendation.

Recommendation 4:
The college needs to assure that online courses and programs are consistent in meeting the same level of rigor as on campus programs, that all services available on campus are available online, that student learning outcomes are incorporated into these offerings and that this information is clearly communicated to students taking these courses. (II.A.1.b; II.A.2; II.A.2.a.2; II.A.6; II.A.7)

General Observations
ECC has an extensive online program. The 2008 visiting team identified concerns about the ability for students to complete a degree online. The college diligently responded with an

approved substantive change proposal in March 2011 for 13 certificates and 14 degrees which provide 50% or more of required courses through online delivery.

Findings and Evidence
The Learning Resources Unit coordinates the College's Distance Education program. While several Course Management Systems (CMSs) are used, most instructors choose Etudes-NG to communicate with their students.

The College Curriculum Committee must approve the online delivery method for any course to be taught online ensuring its rigor. Each instructor is required to complete a "Principles of Good Practice for Effective Online Instruction Worksheet," which is reviewed by the Distance Education office and Academic Dean for approval. Each online syllabus contains SLOs and they are regularly spot-checked for accuracy and completeness. Online courses are integrated into the college's 4-year assessment cycle. The team reviewed curriculum for online courses and validated the college had a rigorous process that ensures academic rigor is maintained and consistent across the unique online formats. (II.A.1.b; II.A.2; II.A.2.a.2)

Course Outlines of Record are the same for on-ground and online class offerings. Online students have comparable services as students on campus. Examples of available online services for students include: admission, financial aid, library services and resources, plagiarism evaluation and textbook sales.

Students are connected to virtual and on-campus resources through the college's website. The College states that online tutoring began in spring 2012, but no evidence of this is found online through the LRC Tutoring webpage, the Distance Education information provided to students, or the Student Handbook. The College should take steps to ensure online students are aware of this available service. The team also validated online counseling. (II.A.6; II.A.7)

Conclusions

The College has fully met this recommendation.

Recommendation 5:
ECC and the Compton Center need to fully integrate SLO Assessment into the faculty evaluation process. The ECC Compton Center must implement its faculty evaluations and use the results of these evaluations to encourage instructional improvements and faculty development plans (III.A.1.b; III.A.1.c)

General Observations
Both the College and Center have achieved substantial progress since the concerns were raised by the 2008 visiting team. The Compton Center faculty evaluations have been implemented as noted in their published timeline. The ECC evaluation process is made of four major components:
1. Self-evaluation report
2. Classroom observation reports
3. Student survey results
4. Dean's evaluation

SLOs are included in the evaluation form as part of the faculty self-evaluation, which must be reviewed by the Dean and the evaluation panel.

Findings and Evidence
As part of the process, the faculty evaluation includes a self-evaluation that reports on progress in four areas:
1. Observations for continued improvement of instruction and SLOs
2. Analysis of the student surveys
3. Professional growth
4. Analysis of previous objectives for the improvement of instruction and SLOs

An evaluation panel reviews the self-evaluations. Faculty are asked to connect the assessment of student learning outcomes in their courses and programs with changes made to improve instruction. An evaluation panel ensures all four components of the self-evaluation are addressed

The Compton Center has developed and maintains a comprehensive faculty evaluation schedule that is more closely aligned to the ECC process. All faculty members are required to include an assessment of SLOs in their Self-Evaluation and to document assessment, reflection, and changes to pedagogy.

The College noted in the report that the "quality of assessment varies." However, there is a notable level of institutional discussion and dialogue related to the importance of SLO's as part of the faculty work that reaches across the Compton Center. Assessment of student learning is embedded into the culture of the college which is significantly different than 2008. (III.A.1.b; III.A.1.c)

Conclusions
The College has fully responded to the recommendation and continues to improve the faculty evaluation processes in the area of SLOs. The direct supervisor of a faculty member and human resources staff review the evaluation, as does an evaluation panel. If there is insufficient information on SLOs, the evaluator returns the evaluation to be rewritten to reflect adequate coverage of SLOs. ECC and the Compton Center can continue to improve the process by ensuring greater consistency in the quality of assessments.

Recommendation 6:
The El Camino College must develop a fiscal management plan for all sites, matched to its revenues, to assure the fiscal soundness of the institution. (III.D.2.c, III.D.2.d, III.D.2.g, III.D.3) (there is not an III.D.2.g)

General Observations
The financial arrangement for ECC with the Compton Center is outlined in AB 318 and includes financial oversight of the Compton Community College District under the direction of a Special Trustee. The institution has a five-year financial projection based on flat FTES for the Center until FY 2015-16. A $30 million emergency loan from the State of California was drawn down $18 million but has not been accessed since 2009. This demonstrates that finances have been stabilized at the Compton Center.

Findings and Evidence
The team reviewed evidence and conducted interviews with appropriate planning and budgeting committees. The team verified that appropriate financial information is provided throughout both the main campus and the Compton Center in a timely and understandable manner. The College has developed five-year planning documents for both the main campus and the Center.

El Camino Community College District (District) began taking proactive steps to develop a strong ending balance in FY 2008 with the implementation of $5.1 million in expenditure reductions. The current Special Trustee for the Compton Community College District has worked with the ECC Superintendent/President to develop a five-year *Fiscal Management Plan* that covers fiscal years 2012-13 through 2016-17. Based on the conservative plan the Compton Center should be able to maintain a reserve balance over 5% throughout the five-year period. The plan is conservative, as it does not include any growth funding until FY 2015-16 and includes continued workload reductions. Noteworthy is the emergency loan of $30 million has not been drawn down since 2009, and that repayment of the $18 million previously drawn down is built into the financial plan.

The governance groups and the Compton Community College District Special Trustee have approved a planning and budget calendar. Overall fiscal trends for the District are positive as the ending balance has increased from 12.8% to 21.5% over the last five years. The Compton Center has also continued with positive financial trends with reductions in expenditures and relatively stable revenues over the past five years. (III.D; III.D.1.a; III.D.2.c; III.D.2.d; III.D.3)

Conclusions

The College has fully met this recommendation.

Closing Remarks
Since the 2008 Comprehensive Team Visit, the overall tone, dialogue, and culture have changed at ECC, including the Compton Center. In 2008 there existed a fair amount of resentment, distrust, and lack of cooperation between the two sites. The team validated a different dialogue than in 2008. While in 2008, the Compton Center clearly demonstrated resentment toward ECC, it has been replaced with an attitude of cooperation and an institutional dialogue focused on institutional effectiveness. There exist some pockets of distrust, but the culture of the Center has turned the corner to cooperation.

The ECC constituencies have accepted their role and have become focused at raising the level of competency and educational excellence at both sites. There is a sense of much greater involvement, a spirit of cooperation, and a respect for the importance of accreditation in the continued improvement of ECC and the Compton Center. The Compton Center is stable both financially and culturally and appears to have risen above the crisis-to-crisis operation that once characterized its existence. Most impressive was the attitude at the Compton Center that they are a better college for having been through all the trials and struggles, and most importantly their association with ECC.