



Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
September 25, 2015, 10:00 am-3:45 pm
Sheraton Grand Sacramento
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Bandyopadhyay	Santanu	PD	Kovrig	Neill K.	PPP/TA
Brown	Aaron	TA	Lamanque	Andrew	PPP
Buckley	Jerry	PD	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Carr	Leslie	PD	Leong	Tim	PD
Chadwick	Jan	TA	May	Ginni	PPP
Christian	Sonya	PPP	Messina	Kimberlee	TA
Dain	Claudette	PPP	Meuschke	Daylene	PD
Dieckmeyer	Diane	TA	Randall	Meridith	PD
Druley	Jennifer	PD	Schardt	Jan	PD
Fiero	Diane	PD	Scroggins	Bill	PD
Garcia	Valentin	TA	Skinner	Erik	Ind
Goold	Grant	Ind	Sokenu	Julius	TA
Greaney	KC	Ind	Steenhausen	Paul	PD
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Tarman	Christopher	Ind
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Warren-Marlatt	Rebecca K.	Ind
Johnson	Joyce	PD			

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind	Orloff	Micah	PD
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Purnell	Rogear	NA
Booth	Kathy	NA	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Spano	Jeff	TA/PPP/PD
Fisher	Stacy	Ind	Stirling	Anna	PD
Kinney	Terry	NA	Todd	James	PD
Nguyen	Thuy	Ind	Van Ommeren	Alice	Ind

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Tyson	Sarah	Ind
Leufgen	Jillianne	Ind			

*Wkgrp: Ind = IE Indicators; PPP = Policy, Procedure, and Practice; PD = Professional Development; TA = Technical Assistance

I. General Session 1

- A. The session opened with introductions and Education Moments from Neill Kovrig and Diane Fiero.
- B. Matthew, Barry, Paul, and Theresa reported briefly on IEPI progress to date and answered questions as they arose; areas highlighted included the following:
 - 1. Technical assistance
 - a. We completed the Fall PRT Webinar on Sept. 4 with about 60 participants, and the first of the two PRT Workshops on Sept. 18 with 42 in nine PRTs. Bill Scroggins, Ginni May, and Tim Leong shared their observations as participants in the Workshop. All three had found it a very positive experience, in keeping with the colleagues-helping-colleagues approach that we have striven to maintain.

- b. We have PRTs initially assembled for all 17 Fall institutions, though scheduling difficulties, including those related to PRT vacancies and replacements, remain significant.
- c. Six institutions are tentatively identified for Spring initial visits.
- 2. Policy, Procedure, and Practice
 - a. The IEPI communications plan vendor has been identified: Interact Communications. Representatives of the company are in attendance today.
 - b. The CCCCO is working hard on the IEPI legislative/administrative update report, which is due Oct. 1.
- 3. Professional Development
 - a. The Enrollment Management workshops in August, held in conjunction with ACBO, were very successful, with over 400 in attendance. The Riverside workshop was recorded, and will be available as soon as captioning is complete.
 - b. Initial evaluations of the Student Support Redefined workshops were very positive. Two were held in May, four were held in September, and three more are scheduled over the next three months.
 - c. Additional workshops in the planning stages include the following:
 - i. Diversity in hiring
 - ii. Integrated planning
 - iii. Fiscal management and audit compliance
 - iv. Inmate education
 - d. The online clearinghouse has been christened the Professional Learning Network (PLN). Tools in the works include “My PD Plan,” which will facilitate identifying and checking off topics about which individuals want to learn, and ratings and feedback tools for PLN content. A soft launch is scheduled for November.
- 4. Indicators
 - a. The Workgroup will discuss a new report on targets that colleges set in Spring.
 - b. Minor changes for Year 2 have gone to Consultation Council and will be considered by the Board of Governors in November.
 - c. Ideas for the Year 3 Indicators include wage and employment data and access data.
 - d. Today’s Workgroup meeting and the next will focus in part on the current status of available data in the areas of most interest.
 - e. The aim is to have a complete set of Year 3 Indicators in time for the Academic Senate Spring Plenary.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

- 1. Alice provided a report on Year 1 Targets.
 - a. Most were as would be expected.
 - b. Quite a few colleges set more targets than required.
 - c. There were a few anomalies in the report.
- 2. Finalize Year 2 Indicators
 - a. There should be three indicators related to audit:
 - i. Opinion for the financial statement
 - ii. State Compliance (Yes/None)
 - iii. Federal Awards (Yes/None)
 - b. If there is no goal set, a blank should be displayed rather than a zero.
 - c. For the percent wage, the options for goals should be “increase, decrease or remain about the same” rather than a numeric goal.
 - d. Next accreditation visit should ask for term and year rather than a date.
 - e. Columns should be re-ordered with the historical data to the left and targets to the right.
 - f. Guidance on the disclosure requirements should be added to the FAQ.
 - g. Instructions should be added to the indicators site.

- h. Course completion rate (success rate) should be changed to fall rather than annual to match the ACCJC data.
 - i. Ensure all accreditation statuses are included.
 - j. A “college choice” indicator should be added in which colleges write in an indicator and result.
 - k. The current four targets should continue to be required, plus the additional audit indicators and one achievement indicator and one fiscal indicator at the colleges’ choice. For the new indicators, it can be either a short-term or long-term goal.
3. CTE Outcomes Survey
 - a. KC reviewed the CTE Outcomes Survey.
 - b. 40 colleges currently participate.
 - c. This is the fourth year.
 - d. Response rate is 25 percent.
 - e. Students who complete or leave complete the survey.
 - f. Employment, wage gain, and employment in field studied are included in the survey.
 - g. College get data back that can be disaggregated and analyzed in various ways.
 - h. There is interest in exploring making the survey available statewide.
 4. WIOA Common Measures
 - a. Jill provided an update.
 - b. Employment in the 2nd and 4th quarter after exiting programs is measured.
 - c. It includes median earnings.
 - d. Measureable skills gains is of interest but not fully defined yet.
 - e. With regard to the Eligible Training Providers List (ETPL), there will be a threshold for outcomes to remain on the list.
 - f. Common measures still TBD including threshold levels.
 5. CTE Accrediting Bodies. We need to think about data requirements from CTE accrediting bodies.
 6. We should investigate the feasibility of measuring unmet labor market needs on geographical areas for Year 3.
 7. Future Agendas
 - a. October
 - i. Review Examples of Reports: WED 2.0, Scorecard, Launchboard, Gainful Employment, EMSI, and Data on Demand.
 - ii. In order to identify strategies to reduce initiative and data fatigue, list all reporting requirements for CCCs.
 - iii. Invite people from SSSP, BSI and Student Equity to workgroup meeting to discuss possibilities for collaboration and coordination.
 - iv. Continue reviewing ideas for Year 3.
 - v. Discuss model research practices.
 - b. November
 - i. Invite people from Adult Education to participate in the workgroup meeting.
 - ii. Refine Year 3 recommendations.
 - iii. Discuss model research practices.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

1. Evaluation: General Comments
 - a. Surveys will need to be anonymous to adhere to research best practices and federal guidelines, so we will not have information at the detailed level that we expected. Instead, we will look at patterns of issues and themes that will help us evaluate the effectiveness of IEPI and the PRT process as a whole.
 - b. Matthew’s less formal debriefs with PRT Leads and client CEOs will be that much more important in gathering detailed information.

- c. The formal research is formative so far, but the survey after Visit 3 will focus on what worked well, and will ask for concrete examples of promising practices in both the PRT process and college processes related to the Areas of Focus. The plan is to talk to colleges to find out what they are doing differently after the conclusion of the PRT process, and then to talk with them again after a year to see what has happened as a result; at this point in our process, we have no such outcomes yet, because we have not completed work with any of the colleges.
 - d. Innovation and Effectiveness Plans (I&EPs) do have metrics of progress and achievement, and colleges will submit a status report on their objectives before Visit 3. In addition, financial status reports will be submitted quarterly to note track expenditures from the seed money grant. Funds must be used to implement the I&EP, which in turn must address the Areas of Focus.
 - e. PRTs provide a “menu of options for consideration,” and not recommendations or prescriptions per se, in keeping with our positive, colleagues-helping-colleagues approach.
 - f. Positive outcomes are often difficult to sustain due to staff turnover and other factors; PRTs are encouraged strongly to focus on changes that are sustainable.
 - g. At the end of each cycle, we must be able to say that PRT visits had specific results for participating colleges. We want to be able to craft narratives to describe key themes, what worked, and why—in part because we do not have many objective criteria to measure success. It is extremely difficult to determine causation.
 - h. It is part of the PRT’s task to pay attention to accreditation-related issues, recommendations, and sanctions, but making progress on the vast majority of those issues is primarily a matter of following sound practice, and only secondarily a matter of compliance with standards. Accreditation standards, no matter what body sets them, will surely reflect sound practices in integrated planning, enrollment management, governance, and so on, so the PRTs’ focus can and should remain on those sound practices.
 - i. RP Group will be focusing on Professional Development (PD) after its evaluation contract ends in November; CCCCCO was concerned about the appearance of RP providing PD and doing evaluation at the same time. We should know who will take over the evaluation task by the October meeting; there is an evaluation committee working on the matter.
2. PRT Webinar and Workshops
- a. Rogear walked very briefly through the evaluation Summary Reports (an earlier version of which the Workgroup had already reviewed), and the group discussed improvements in training that have already been made.
 - i. The webinar did not use application sharing this time, because some participants in Spring had technical difficulties with it.
 - ii. The workshop has been lengthened. It continues to offer the technical assistance dos and don’ts panel (Joe Wyse and Randy Beach were the panelists at the first workshop), and the appreciative inquiry session (facilitated again by Jeanne Costello of Fullerton, along with others).
 - iii. Julius noted that the Sept. 18 workshop had helped clarify for him how the PRT work is different from accreditation, and underscored that the focus is on listening, and not to be too prescriptive. In his opinion, the teams have a deep understanding of the Areas of Focus. The Appreciative Inquiry overview was helpful. He thought, however, that the Workshop could have been shorter.
 - iv. In the Fall workshops, there are five breakout groups – one-hour facilitated sessions – on key topics drawn from Areas of Focus included in Fall LOIs. Attendees use the breakouts to gain a greater understanding of topics that are outside their main areas of expertise, so that they can participate more meaningfully in team discussions of those topics.
 - v. We are now requiring the colleges to provide more detailed information about their Areas of Focus, with the participation of their Academic Senate President and others.

- vi. Products of the workshop for PRTs include developing a preliminary set of AI questions based on the available college documentation, scheduling the PRT phone conference, and assigning document review tasks to team members.
3. Cycle 1, Visit 1 PRT Process Evaluation
 - a. Rogear walked through an Executive Summary of the Cycle 1, Visit 1 PRT Process Evaluation. Highlights included the following:
 - i. PRT training, positive attitude, fit with the client institution, PRT communication, PRT leadership, and client receptiveness to assistance were all good.
 - ii. Colleges would have benefitted from better understanding of the purpose and the process, including the next steps, and broader college participation in the visit in some cases.
 - b. The group discussed some improvements that have already been made for the Fall cycle, based in part on the preliminary evaluation results. For example, information flow has improved (e.g., the model process is clearer; more information goes to the client CEO about how to prepare colleges better).
 4. Update on the Fall Cycle and Other Developments
 - a. Scheduling 17 institutions for Fall initial visits has proven much more difficult than anticipated. In many cases, the first set of date options provided by the college did not work, and we have had to go through one or two additional sets of options.
 - b. The 17 institutions in Fall represent the probable ceiling for given cycle, particularly given that the eight Cycle 1 teams are continuing.
 - c. The eight PRTs from the first cycle are expected to complete their third visits in Spring 2016. However, institutions can ask for more than three visits.
 - d. Matthew started the Fall cycle with larger tentative PRTs to compensate for likely attrition; so far that approach has been useful, though some cases required identifying new members to fill vacancies.
 - e. Matthew plans to put together a guidebook for PRTs, to use in lieu of sending out long emails to cover key tasks, responsibilities, etc.
 - f. Six institutions have submitted Letters of Interest for Spring 2016. We have six CEOs who have volunteered to serve in Spring, each of whom could lead one of these teams.
 - g. We will likely need to recruit additional PRT members for the pool. Common gaps to date include CBOs and CEOs. So far, the demand for faculty and CSSOs has been met.
 - h. Not just CBOs per se, but also other fiscal managers with appropriate expertise should be encouraged to volunteer for the PRT pool.
 - i. Three institutions so far have each requested \$150K seed money grants, having completed their Innovation and Effectiveness Plans. Recipients of the grants will file quarterly report of expenditures. Seed grant requests must all be tied to Areas of Focus through implementation of the Innovation and Effectiveness Plan. It should be no more than 30 days from submission of the forms to issuance of the check.
 - j. Matthew reviews all Innovation and Effectiveness Plans and makes suggestions before submission of the final version. He has revised the form to clarify it, in light of issues encountered so far.
 - k. Each college, in accord with the Model Process, will prepare a status report on its Innovation and Effectiveness Plan prior to the third PRT visit.
 - l. CCLC has asked for two sessions in their Annual Conference on the IEPI PRT process.
 - m. The group discussed a number of potential hitches in the PRT process, and made some suggestions.
 - i. Identify a co-lead to assist the Lead and back him/her up in case of absence.
 - ii. Interview the Lead and/or other PRT members to produce a draft report if undue delay is otherwise possible.
 - iii. In case of CEO turnover, suggest a hiatus followed by a date for the next PRT visit.
 - n. Matthew will send the Workgroup the updated model and typical process documents.

C. Professional Development (Paul)

1. Professional Learning Network (PLN)

a. General

- i. Suggestion from workgroup member: Create a space on the PLN for colleges to place and store their professional development materials. This space would be intended primarily for personnel from the particular colleges but accessible to everyone to view.
- ii. Allow for organization-sponsored (endorsed) material. Would be created and vetted by organization (such as CCCAOE) members.
- iii. As a condition of receiving grants from CCCCO, colleges should be required to post resulting findings/materials on PLN.
- iv. PLN could include dissertations and other scholarly works related to community colleges.
- v. CCCCO is working with a video production firm (Grovo) on several videos about using CCC data tools (such as Salary Surfer). The videos will be posted on the PLN. The PLN also will include Grovo-produced video tutorials on how to use the PLN. (These videos are part of a deal negotiated by TTIP South last year with Grovo.)

b. Streamlining the resource submission form

- i. Funding Sources should be combined with the Strategies/Approaches field. Also, Participation in the program (students served and whether the program is scaled) should be part of Data and Outcomes. Local Context could be part of other fields (such as Strategies/Approaches) or inserted as part of a broader “Other Comments” field. A separate Awards/Recognition field is probably not necessary.
- ii. Given the lack of consensus among researchers about when a specific practice is “promising” and when it can be deemed an “effective practice,” keep “effective/promising practice” as is.
- iii. Except for the field with the brief summary of the program, it was suggested that submission fields not have a word-count limit. Readers can choose to obtain more information about the practice by clicking “Read More.”
- iv. A line should be added along the lines of “please complete these fields as you would like them to appear in the PLN.”

c. Evaluation rubric

- i. Add criterion that material is accurate/current.
- ii. Makes sense to have review teams of two persons, adding a third reviewer if the two reviewers don’t agree on a submission.
- iii. Award-winning programs (such as the system’s Exemplary Program Award and Student Success Award) and other recognized programs/practices (such as those in CCCCO’s “Basic Skills Completion” e-resource) should be showcased in the PLN (no additional vetting necessary).
- iv. Reviewers should be asked to suggest tags for material.
- v. If submission is rejected for inclusion in the PLN, reviewers should be required to provide the reason(s).
- vi. Should look at ways for reviewers to complete and submit rubric in a more automated fashion.

d. User feedback on PLN materials

- i. Workgroup members discussed how PLN users might provide feedback on resources. There was consensus that a “Like” button makes good sense. Users of the PLN would be able to identify materials with the most “likes.”

e. Personalized PD plan

- i. Anna Sterling (@ONE) provided a summary of the recent initial focus-group meeting on the MyPD Plan component of the PLN. (Focus group members are providing input and feedback on what MyPD should look like and allow users to do.) Group members

are discussing issues such as (1) goals users can identify or choose from in their plans, (2) flagging interesting materials to come back to later, and (3) badging for those who complete a training module or other milestone.

- ii. The next step is to go over a prototype that the project's Web developer will create.
2. Workshop debrief
 - a. The workshops' emphasis on bringing teams, sharing practices with each other, and leaving with a list of action items has been effective. To help attendees recall for themselves the highlights/major points of each workshop (and to help them explain the workshops to colleagues who did not attend), a workgroup member suggested the idea of producing some sort of summary document/materials package at the end of each workshop and making it available to workshop participants.

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

1. Introduction by Interact Communications, Inc.
 - a. Strategic communications challenges for IEPI:
 - i. The size of California Community College (CCC) system
 - ii. Diversity of campuses and geographic educational contexts
 - iii. IEPI Advisory Committee members need to be consistent in communicating IEPI efforts
 - iv. Brand IEPI as a movement that promotes student and institution success, not merely an administrative effort
 - b. Initial research to be conducted by Interact Communications, Inc. (Interact):
 - i. Create focus groups
 - ii. Conduct deeper interviews:
 - (A) College/district personnel
 - (B) Legislators
 - iii. Conduct statewide online survey
 - c. Develop a single IEPI website
 - d. Develop internal and external communications strategies:
 - i. Avoid trickle down communication from CEO to college personnel
 - ii. Make IEPI communications pieces "stick" by communicating in a personal, narrative style
 - e. Develop IEPI branding
 - i. We will keep the name "IEPI"
 - ii. Development of compelling branding to accompany the existing "IEPI" name
 - f. Interact is committed to transparent research and open communication with IEPI stakeholders
2. Policy, Procedures, and Practices Workgroup discussion and feedback
 - a. Workgroup perspectives: members provided description of on-the-ground, campus' perspective of IEPI
 - i. Initiative fatigue
 - ii. Concern about more oversight
 - b. Unique branding: IEPI ought to be emotionally compelling, as a movement, not another oversight-oriented California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office initiative
 - i. Emphasize the partnership/personal aspect of IEPI's efforts
 - ii. Communicate to internal and external audiences
 - iii. Develop routine communications strategies (e.g. newsletter and website content)
 - c. How will Interact evaluate the effectiveness of their communication strategies?
 - i. Assess language and rhetoric surrounding IEPI within CCC's professional associations communications (listSrvs, newsletters)
 - ii. Offer a pre and post evaluations on college/district personnel's attitudes regarding IEPI
 - iii. Assess website traffic: develop analytics, with timestamps, on new IEPI website

- d. How do we communicate uniquely among other CCC Initiatives?
 - i. Consistent communication, images, and info-graphics
 - ii. Easy-to-understand, succinct communication pieces
- 3. Creating a rubric/crosswalk to help colleges/districts meet ACCJC's standards
 - a. Collaboration with ACCJC
 - i. Collaboration has not yet happened in the manner we thought it might
 - ii. Obtaining ACCJC's verification and certification of the rubric/crosswalk may not happen soon
 - iii. The *CCCCO's Taskforce on Accreditation Report* and the recent Board of Governors' decision to confront accreditation issues with ACCJC may stifle collaboration with ACCJC
 - b. Clarifying IEPI's goal of the rubric/crosswalk
 - i. We are supporting the overall quality and effectiveness of CCCs/CCDs, which will include providing guidance to help them overcome accreditation sanctions
 - c. Questions regarding the development of IEPI best/good policies, procedures, and practice
 - i. How do we evaluate best practices?
 - (A) Are there practices that could be considered universal?
 - (B) Who determines the quality of best practices?
 - ii. Models of improvement: how do we communicate a spectrum of best practices?
 - (A) How do we account for contextual factors among our CCCs (urban/rural school, diverse sizes, etc.)?
 - (B) A best practice for one college could negatively impact another
 - iii. Should we also address bad practices?
 - iv. How do we develop a short list of best practices that are universal/common for all colleges?
 - (A) We might use ACCJC's standards and policies, particularly:
 - (1) Integrated planning
 - (2) Enrollment management (vis-à-vis institutions' mission statements, fiscal management, and course scheduling)
 - (3) Disaggregation of data
 - (4) Resource allocation
 - (B) Utilize a "Models of Improvement" method:
 - (1) Delineate a spectrum of "good" practices
 - (2) Avoid prescriptive language
 - d. Evolution in ACCJC's standards and policies
 - i. The 2015 Edition of ACCJC's standards and policies differ from ACCJC's standards and policies from the 2002 Edition – the 2013 Revision
 - ii. ACCJC continues to be oblique when communicating which policies CCCs are going to be evaluate CCCs against
 - iii. How do we build a rubric/crosswalk that can easily flex with the evolution of ACCJC's standards and policies?
- 4. Disseminating best/good practices
 - a. Dissemination of best/good practices through professional development (PD)
 - i. The broad themes requested by CCCs regarding PD trainings: integrated planning, enrollment management, etc.
 - ii. Continue to seek consultation of professional associations and organizations to inform PD workshops
 - b. Create a best/good practices manual or resource
 - i. With regard to developing content, should we request the participation of CCC professional organizations and associations?
 - ii. They could specifically speak to the issues their constituents confront
 - iii. Seek the consultation of:

- (A) CIOs
- (B) CBOs
- (C) ALOs (No specific statewide organization)
- (D) ASCCC
- (E) CSSOs
- (F) CCCT

iv. Review ACCJC reports and review notes on commendations and reaffirmations

III. General Session 2

A. Matthew, Barry, Paul, and Theresa shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions (see above), and responded to a few questions.

IV. Adjournment