



**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee  
Courtyard by Marriott Midtown, Sacramento  
November 13, 2015, 10:00 am-3:45 pm  
Meeting Summary**

**Members in Attendance**

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Bandyopadhyay	Santanu	PD	Li	Erika	PPP
Benson	Mitchel	Ind	Ly	Pearl	PD
Braxton	Phyllis	PD	May	Ginnie	PPP
Buckley	Jerry	PD	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Carr	Leslie	PD	Meuschke	Daylene	PD
Chadwick	Jan	TA	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Coleman	Laura	TA	Randall	Meridith	PD
Dieckmeyer	Diane	TA	Rutan	Craig	PD
Ferguson	Chris	PPP	Skinner	Erik	Ind
Garcia	Valentin	TA	Sokenu	Julius	TA
Goold	Grant	Ind	Stanskas	John	Ind
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Steenhausen	Paul	PD
Johnson	Joyce	PD	Suarez	Angelica	PPP
Kovrig	Neill	PPP	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Lamanque	Andrew	PPP	Webb	Catherine	PD
Lee	Matthew C.	TA	Wulff	Deborah	Ind
Leong	Tim	PD			

**Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance**

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Atalig	Christina	Ind	Larson	Erin	PD
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Rodriguez	Mario	Ind
Cooper	Darla	NA	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Spano	Jeff	TA/PPP
Fisher	Stacy	Ind	Todd	James	PD
Kinney	Terry	NA	Van Ommeren	Alice	Ind

**Guests in Attendance**

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
deAnda	Rosa	PPP	Leufgen	Jillianne	Ind
Fuller	Ryan	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 Jarek Janio, Bill McGinnis, and Diane Dieckmeyer.
- B. Barry, Matthew, Theresa, and Paul reported briefly on IEPI progress to date and answered questions as they arose; areas highlighted included the following:
  - 1. Indicators
    - a. Barry noted that the Year 2 Indicators will be going to the Board of Governors for approval on November 16, 2015.
    - b. The Workgroup is now focusing on Year 3 (including measures of access, wages and employment, and noncredit activity) and on data disaggregation and visualization.

2. Technical assistance
    - a. Matthew summarized progress to date on the Fall 2015 PRTs.
  3. Policy, Procedure, and Practice
    - a. Theresa noted that the Interact Communications study was underway.
    - b. The Workgroup will be working on the following:
      - i. A best practices framework, crosswalk, or rubric to cover accreditation-related practices
      - ii. Barriers to attendance at professional development activities
    - c. The CCCCCO has issued the RFA for the \$12 million project for disseminating best practices, and the award will be going to the Board of Governors on November 16, 2015.
  4. Professional Development
    - a. Paul summarized the upcoming regional workshop topics, including Student Support Redefined, diversity in hiring, the California Conservation Corps, inmate education, and integrated planning.
    - b. The Workgroup is discussing the following topics:
      - i. How IEPI can support the basic skills funding initiative
      - ii. Disaggregation of data
      - iii. Enrollment management
      - iv. Launchboard 2.0 in early 2016
    - c. Work continues on the My PD Plan and discussion board components of the Professional Learning Network, which is still a few weeks away from the soft launch.
- C. Barry thanked the RP Group for their work as partners in both evaluation and professional development, and noted that with respect to IEPI, the organization would be moving exclusively into professional development henceforth. He introduced Darla Cooper, who emphasized that no actual conflict of interest existed with the RP Group's evaluation work, but that the possible appearance of conflict had been sufficient to choose to end the evaluation activity. She then summarized the Group's work to date, and noted that some wrap-up activities were still to be completed. Theresa echoed Barry's recognition of the RP Group's contributions.

## II. Workgroup Sessions

### A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

1. Year 3 Indicators. Possible indicators for Year 3 were discussed.
  - a. Additional indicators discussed included measures of placement, throughput, completion of college-level English and Math, and non-credit.
  - b. Additional indicators recommended for consideration in Year 3 include:
    - i. Basic skills course sequence completion
    - ii. Basic skills completion Year 1
    - iii. Percent of basic skills taught by full-time faculty
    - iv. Percent of students completion college level English and Math in Year 1
    - v. Low Unit Certificates
    - vi. FTES/Award
    - vii. Percent of students enrolled who completed any units
    - viii. Number of CTE degrees
    - ix. Number of CTE certificates
    - x. Totals in SS file elements
    - xi. Student-counselor ratio
    - xii. Scorecard skills builder
    - xiii. Ave. unit load/part-time enrollment
    - xiv. Financial aid awards (average awards)
    - xv. Non-credit enrollment
    - xvi. Non-credit sequence completion
    - xvii. Non-credit transition to credit
    - xviii. First generation enrollment

- xix. New faculty diversity
- xx. In-district participation rate
- c. Regarding the non-credit measures, Jarek will get more input and bring back definitions.
- d. We should encourage long-term goal setting and encourage risk taking by setting aspirational goals.
- e. There should be regional workshops in the spring on indicators.
- f. We should reinforce that there will be no punitive consequences for not reaching goals.
- g. We should work with statewide organizations in writing messages to send out to constituent groups.
- 2. Jill and Gary reviewed Launchboard based employment metrics. We should consider ways of meeting other reporting requirements, including ACCJC or Gainful Employment, through the Launchboard.

**B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)**

1. The group reviewed the work of the last meeting related to collecting candidate best practices through the PRT process, and then discussed additional elements in a posted best practice or success story that would be most useful. Among them were the following:
  - a. A very clear statement of the issue or problem addressed by the improvement or practice
  - b. Who functioned as the champion of the improvement process or practice
  - c. What role the various constituent groups and functional groups played in the process
  - d. Resource impact of the improvement or practice: Resources needed or revenues realized
  - e. How the improvement or practice is integrated with planning and resource allocation initiatives and processes
  - f. Challenges faced, with recommendations on dealing with them
  - g. Steps taken to ensure that the improvement or practice is sustainable and yet flexible
  - h. Evaluation of the improvement or practice
  - i. Adaptation of the improvement or practice in response to change
  - j. Where the institution is in the projected timeline for progress, and what it anticipates going forward
  - k. References and additional resources on the subject, including seminal publications, with royalties for usage (if any) paid by IEPI
2. The group then discussed some ideas for association professional development, including the following:
  - a. Technology aspects of the new statewide initiatives, including integration, costs, and interrelations among those initiatives
  - b. Integration among the initiatives, more broadly speaking. Matthew noted that the PPP Workgroup had that issue on its overall agenda.
3. Ideas for presenting, organizing, and finding the best practices on the PLN included the following:
  - a. Digital Stories (e.g., videos of various institution personnel talking about challenges faced and overcome, and other aspects.
  - b. Photographs and other images that capture aspects of the best practice
  - c. Two-minute video captures of an associated workshop or planning process, a la Chuck Workman.
4. Members reviewed a selection of Menus of Options and Innovation and Effectiveness Plans already submitted to identify additional items on which IEPI might follow up as good candidates for possible dissemination. Items discussed included the following:
  - a. Sheer recognition of an issue as a first step in resolving it
  - b. Data issues
    - i. Establish a Data Integrity Committee.
    - ii. Designate data custodians accountable for data integrity.
    - iii. Develop a systematic process for testing ERP changes prior to full implementation.

- iv. Lodge principal responsibility for consistency of data reporting to outside entities in one department, and establish a regular audit procedure before such reporting.
- v. Develop just-in-time tutorials for occasional users of various systems, such as curriculum management.
- c. Enrollment management
  - i. Develop and implement a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan.
  - ii. Establish a cross-functional team to build internal capacity for implementing the enrollment management plan.
  - iii. Establish and support outreach/retention teams, including students, teachers, counselors, and staff.
  - iv. Design and implement one-stop entry and retention services.
  - v. Develop and implement an Adult Learner Reentry Program.
- d. Professional development
  - i. Improve staff understanding of the impact of their day-to-day work on the big picture.
  - ii. Offer an integrated set of leadership workshops covering multiple aspects: Board, executive team, middle management, governance groups, cross-constituency groups, etc.
- e. Student equity and support
  - i. Establish counselor/faculty advisor teams to work on Major Declaration Week, Registration Support Week, and Degree Evaluation Week.
  - ii. Develop and implement more case management and mentoring programs.
  - iii. Provide proactive advisement on academic and CTE pathways.
- 5. Tim Leong shared his observations as a PRT member in the Fall.
  - a. The college's own preparation is very important. Several ideas to improve that preparation were suggested by the group:
    - i. Name two point persons—one logistical and one substantive, with the latter responsible for getting the word out on the nature and purposes of the PRT.
    - ii. Conduct a pre-visit on campus well before Visit 1.
    - iii. Produce a webinar or video presentation for prospective client institutions.
  - b. Manage college expectations to reduce requests for immediate conclusions and solutions.
  - c. The group made several suggestions to get started and maintain momentum in the PRT process:
    - i. The Project Director could send out a follow-up email at the appropriate time urging prompt completion of the Summary of Initial Observations and the Menu of Options.
    - ii. Use recently retired CEOs as Leads.
    - iii. Ask the institution to set up the group that will be working on the I&EP early, even before Visit 1 takes place.

### ***C. Professional Development (Paul)***

- 1. Professional Learning Network
  - a. Workgroup members continued the discussion from October's meeting on forum categories for the portal's discussion board. As a result of this discussion, the workgroup settled on seven main themes/topics, which will be included in the Professional Learning Network.
  - b. Workgroup members reviewed two sample graphics depicting a student success framework model. By incorporating one into the Professional Learning Network, users' search for topics and effective practices could be made easier. Members agreed on a graphic they liked (one reprinted from the Chancellor's Office's 2013 e-resource on basic skills completion). A 2.0 version of the Professional Learning Network could include such a graphic with links to various effective practices and information sources.
  - c. The workgroup also discussed the concept of having an online self-assessment tool in the Professional Learning Network so that colleges could identify strengths and gaps in their current policies/practices related to student success (and then use the Professional Learning

- Network to identify the material they need). Workgroup members liked the concept. A workgroup member suggested looking at tools designed by Achieving the Dream
2. Regional Workshops
    - a. Past Workshops
      - i. City College of San Francisco has asked to host a Student Support (Re)defined workshop in January or February. Workgroup members expressed support for the idea.
      - ii. More Diversity in Hiring workshops are likely to occur. Details are still to be worked out. Workgroup members agreed that faculty need to be trained on this topic since so many serve on hiring committees.
    - b. Planned Workshops
      - i. Workgroup members went through a list of upcoming workshops, including inmate/re-entry education in December and Integrated Planning in December, January, and February.
      - ii. The Chancellor's Office and IEPI are discussing the idea of holding regional workshops in early 2016 to assist colleges that want to apply for basic skills transformation grant monies (a state-funded program in the enacted budget). In addition, workgroup members suggested and discussed the idea of forming smaller, more focused Partnership Resources Teams ("mini-PRTs") to offer technical assistance to colleges on basic skills and other topics.
      - iii. Workgroup members discussed the need in the field for additional support (professional development) on enrollment management. Given its complex nature and the difficulties many colleges are currently experiencing, other forums on the topic likely would be welcomed by the field.
      - iv. Two representatives from the Chancellor's Office's Workforce and Economic Development (WED) Division provided an update on Launchboard 2.0, a comprehensive career technical education data system that is scheduled for launch in January 2016. Workgroup members agreed that training on Launchboard will be important and that it makes sense for IEPI to partner with WED on professional development in this area.
  3. 4C/SD has drafted a survey to go out to the field on professional development and perceived barriers to professional development. Workgroup members were encouraged to email Leslie Carr with feedback and suggestions on the survey questions.
  4. The workgroup ran out of time for a demonstration of Zoom, so this item will be rescheduled.

***D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)***

1. Workgroup member introductions (College, Association)
  - a. Theresa Tena (CCCCO, Institutional Effectiveness)
  - b. Angelica Suarez (Southwestern College, CSSOs)
  - c. Andrew Lamanque (Foothill College, IEPI Exec.)
  - d. Neill Kovrig (San Diego Continuing Education, 4CS)
  - e. Ginni May (Sacramento City College, ASCCC)
  - f. Ronnie Slimp (CCCCO, Institutional Effectiveness)
  - g. Rosa de Anda (CCCCO, Governmental Relations)
2. Discussion of agenda and schedule
  - a. Developing crosswalks, rubrics, and best practices related to ACCJC accreditation standards
  - b. Identifying barriers that keep college staff from attending professional development opportunities
3. CCCCCO's Letter of Interest for a Partnership Resource Team (PRT) visit
  - a. CCCCCO will receive a PRT visitation in 2016.
  - b. CCCCCO will identify ongoing challenges related to reporting.
  - c. CCCCCO is open to receiving constructive feedback from the IEPI Advisory Committee members for Letter of Interest for a PRT.

- d. CCCCCO will not request a seed grant.
- 4. Crosswalks, rubrics, and best practices related to ACCJC's accreditation standards
  - a. Update on ACCJC's Rubric
    - i. Former rubrics provided guidance in the following areas:
      - (A) SLOs
      - (B) Planning
      - (C) Institutional Effectiveness
    - ii. Colleges were able to actively assess and categorize the quality of operation in the areas listed above.
    - iii. Shortly after ACCJC introduced their rubrics, they believed that colleges had sufficient resources to successfully meet ACCJC standard and policies.
    - iv. Despite ACCJC belief that colleges were sufficiently resourced to meet their standards, the colleges continued to be placed on accreditation sanction.
    - v. ACCJC plans to reinstitute training opportunities:
      - (A) Best practices conference – colleges with strong accreditation practices will share their best practices and strategies
      - (B) Information symposiums
  - b. Independent from ACCJC, IEPI will develop crosswalks, rubrics, and best practices.
  - c. The group identified the following areas for crosswalks, rubrics, and best practices:
    - i. Integrated planning
    - ii. Enrollment management
    - iii. Disaggregation of data
    - iv. Resources allocation
    - v. Governance
  - d. Plan to delegate a sub-committee for crosswalk, rubric, and best practice development:
    - i. Sub-committee to be identified by the Policies, Practices and Procedure Workgroup
      - (A) Sub-committee will identify topics and resource development.
      - (B) Sub-committee may partner with a research and evaluation entity to support development for best practices resources.
      - (C) Sub-committee will be developed in six-month timeframe.
    - ii. Strategy for developing crosswalk, rubric, and best practice resources:
      - (A) Focus on one or two best practice areas at a time.
        - (1) Focusing on one or two best practices areas will allow for detailed analysis for best practice resources.
        - (2) Sub-committee may divide into two workgroups so that each can focus on one topic.
    - iii. Sub-committee planning session
      - (A) Develop a standard format for the best practices resources.
      - (B) IEPI's Policies, Practices, and Procedure Workgroup will need to identify a small group of people to participate on the sub-committee.
      - (C) Identified initial topics:
        - (1) Integrated planning
        - (2) Disaggregation of data
    - iv. Create planning group to give shape to the operation of the delegated sub-committee:
      - (A) Andrew Lamanque and Ginni May will develop a structure for the delegated sub-committee.
        - (1) Formalize/standardize the format for best practice resources.
        - (2) Refine the scope of discussion for the best practice resource.
      - (B) Sub-committee composition
        - (1) Limit the number of people to participate in delegated sub-committee: Too many members might stifle productivity.
        - (2) Foster focused conference with a small cadre of topic experts.

- (3) Develop partnership with the RP Group to shoulder the research associated with topics.
    - (4) Seek consultation from professionals connected with association conferences.
      - (a) 2016 ACCCA Conference (Feb. 17-19 in Riverside, CA)
      - (b) ASCCC's 2016 Accreditation Institute (Feb.19-20 in San Diego, CA)
  - e. Dissemination of best practices resources
    - i. Seek consultation for the dissemination of best practices resources:
      - (A) CCCPRO
      - (B) Interact Communications, Inc.
    - ii. Develop a communication strategy early.
- 5. Barriers to attending professional development
  - a. Professional development among classified staff
    - i. Existing professional development opportunities are being discussed in the 4CSD's executive committee.
      - (A) A professional development survey was developed by 4CSD.
      - (B) There may be an update on that survey after the 4CSD Executive Committee meeting that happened on Wednesday, November 11.
    - ii. Background on professional development funding and IEPI's current efforts
      - (A) No longer a categorical line item for professional development in college/district allocations
      - (B) Until the 1990s, colleges and districts were provided a total of five million dollars for professional development.
        - (1) Professional development opportunities exist for administrators and institutional leaders.
        - (2) Professional development opportunities are lacking for adjunct faculty and classified staff.
      - (C) Currently, the IEPI's twelve million dollars for specialized training affords the CCC system a new opportunity to offer relevant, strategic professional development workshops to boost institutional effectiveness within our colleges and districts.
    - iii. Concerns about professional development opportunities among classified staff
      - (A) Assuring them that their pay will not be docked for time missed while at profession development activities
      - (B) Assuring that a proxy will serve in their place while they are gone
      - (C) They do not want professional development opportunities to be compulsory.
      - (D) Can they afford these opportunities?
    - iv. Creating access to professional development for classified staff
      - (A) Non-compulsory professional development opportunities
      - (B) Encourage classified staff to utilize their flex days/hours when attending professional development activities.
      - (C) Colleges/districts may need to offer temporary help while staff are participating in professional development activities.
      - (D) Send classified staff with a team.
      - (E) Provide web-based or simulcast/telecast/ webinar professional development opportunities.
    - v. Facilitating professional development opportunities for classified staff
      - (A) Offer multiple professional trainings.
        - (1) Two days
        - (2) Morning/afternoon training days

- (B) Campus closure days or academic calendar lulls
  - (1) Integrate professional development opportunities into college/district convocation events
    - (a) Caveat: This is the president's day to reflect on the mission and vision for the college.
    - (b) Many of the convocations involve professional development activities.
    - (c) Partner with college presidents to identify possible professional development topics.
    - (d) Will these topics deviate from the four topics previously identified?
    - (e) Will we have to tailor all the professional development opportunities to the college needs?
    - (f) Do we contract with an organization that can speak to the professional development topic they have identified?
  - (2) Identify lulls in academic calendar and develop a time frame for professional development opportunities.
- vi. Concerns about professional development opportunities among faculty and adjunct faculty
  - (A) Faculty are limited in the number of hours they can be released for professional development.
    - (1) Adjunct faculty have a small number of hours to commit to professional development opportunities.
      - (a) Assure that pay is not docked for missed class time.
      - (b) Backfill missed course hours with auxiliary faculty member/proxy.
    - (2) Are there ways we can provide proxies to fill-in for faculty members while they participate in professional development activities?
  - (B) Institutional policies have limited the number of faculty (and classified staff) who attend professional development activities.
    - (1) Typically, event attendees will present on the conference when they return to the campus district.
    - (2) How do we encourage administrators to select who attends these professional development opportunities? What is the most strategic way of encouraging the administrators to include more classified staff and adjunct faculty to participate in IEPI professional development opportunities?
    - (3) If they do not have it already, can we encourage colleges to develop a stipend policy for adjunct faculty who attend IEPI professional development opportunities?
- b. Measurement mechanisms to capture the positive effects of professional development among adjunct faculty and classified staff
  - i. Qualitative measurements
    - (A) Encourage staff to present on items learned from IEPI professional development events to other personnel.
    - (B) Encourage professional development participants to present to local constituencies different from their own.
  - ii. Campus climate survey
    - (A) Climate surveys contain qualitative aspects; however, campus climate survey can also provide a quantitative measurement for the positive effects of professional development opportunities.
- c. Policies surrounding flex days
  - i. Opportunities to use flex days for IEPI professional development
    - (A) The CCCCO can use contracting power to bring third party professional development vendors onto campus (e.g. USC higher education seminars).
      - (1) This would take place one campus at a time.

- (2) This strategy would be very expensive.
    - (3) Professional development opportunities may not cohere closely with our identified focus areas.
  - ii. Other limits to using flex days for professional development
    - (A) Colleges may not be able facilitate a robust, focused professional development opportunity with the money allocated.
- d. Fiscal component related to professional development
  - i. Categorical funding for professional development has changed since the 1990s.
  - ii. The Governor’s administration encourages colleges to use unrestricted funding for professional development.
  - iii. The Student Success Taskforce recommends professional development for all.
  - iv. We may be able to leverage existing professional development money and create an allocation specifically for professional development in IEPI focus areas.
- e. Deliverables
  - i. Review 4CSD’s survey regarding professional development.
  - ii. Develop best practices resource Delegated Sub-Committee.
    - (A) Reach out to professional associations.
    - (B) Introduce our efforts at professional association conferences to gather input and identify potential Delegated Sub-Committee members.
    - (C) Confirm a timeline for the creation of best practices resources.
  - iii. Analysis of IEPI professional development attendance, to date
    - (A) What is the composition of the IEPI professional development event participants? Is there a group larger than others (faculty, classified, administrative, etc.), and how do we create professional development to meet their needs?
    - (B) Where are our participants coming from? We may need to adjust which colleges we ask to host IEPI professional development activities.

**III. General Session 2**

- A. Matthew, Paul, Theresa, and Alice shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions (see above).

**IV. Adjournment**