



Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Courtyard by Marriott Midtown, Sacramento
January 29, 2016, 10:00 am-3:30 pm
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Bellisimo	Yolanda	TA	Lamanque	Andrew	PPP
Benson	Mitchel	Ind	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Blackwood	Kathy	Ind	Leong	Tim	PD/PPP
Brown	Aaron	TA	Ly	Pearl	PD
Buckley	Jerry	PD	May	Ginnie	PPP/PD
Carr	Leslie	PD	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Christian	Sonya	PPP	Murillo	Kindred	Ind
Coleman	Laura	Ind	Randall	Meridith	PD
Cox	Jana	PPP	Rutan	Craig	PD
Dieckmeyer	Diane	TA	Scallion	Brooke	PD
Ferguson	Chris	PPP/Ind	Schardt	Jan	PD
Garcia	Valentin	TA	Scroggins	Bill	PD
Goold	Grant	Ind	Sokenu	Julius	TA
Greaney	KC	Ind	Stanskas	John	Ind
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Steenhausen	Paul	PD
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Howell	Lisa	Ind	Van Hook	Dianne	Ind/PD
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Warren-Marlatt	Rebecca K.	Ind
Johnson	Joyce	PD	Webb	Catherine	PD
Kovrig	Neill	PPP			

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind	Kinney	Terry	NA
Atalig	Christina	Ind	Pacheco	Robert	NA
Baker	Karen	PD	Rodriguez	Mario	Ind
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Spano	Jeff	TA
Fisher	Stacy	Ind	Stirling	Anna	PD
Harnish	Eric	PPP	Van Ommeren	Alice	Ind

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Tyson	Sarah	Ind
Leufgen	Jillianne	Ind	Wagner	Natalie	PD
Roberts	Matthew	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 Jeff, Bill Scroggins, Dianne, and Matthew.
- B. IEPI Evaluation
 - 1. Barry briefly described the recent transition in the evaluation process for IEPI, and introduced the new evaluator Bob Pacheco.

- C. Specialized Training Project
 - 1. Theresa introduced Brooke Scallion, who is project manager of the CLPCCD Specialized Training project. She noted that this projects fits well with the existing IEPI structure—particularly the Professional Development Workgroup.
- D. Theresa identified the three people who recently joined the CCCCCO Institutional Effectiveness division: Karen Baker, Mia Keeley, and Scott Valverde. Karen was helping with Advisory Committee logistics, while Mia was at the SLO Symposium and Scott was at a Diversity in Hiring workshop.
- E. Communication Plan Update
 - 1. Pamela Cox-Otto summarized the findings of the research done to date by Interact Communications. The original idea of focus groups did not work out due to travel and time issues, and was replaced by a series of deeper interviews with faculty, executive leaders, deans, and students, as well as CCCCCO staff. One recommendation that resulted was putting a personal face on IEPI through the use of success stories. (See the PPP Workgroup section below for more details.)
- F. Best Practices Framework Update
 - 1. Ginnie reported briefly on the Best Practices Framework concept developed originally in the PPP Workgroup. This project envisions creating a nonprescriptive repository of resources that colleges can use to implement effective practices on their campuses in a variety of areas. It is focusing first on two areas: Integrated planning and disaggregation of data. Ginnie and Andrew will be making presentations to the Academic Senate Accreditation Institute, ACCCA, and other groups to solicit feedback on their approach, and PPP will be working with the RP Group on the project. Ginnie concluded by walking through a tentative timeline for the work. (See the PPP Workgroup section below for more details on the project.)
- G. Reflections on the Governor’s Budget
 - 1. Theresa summarized the aspects of the Governor’s Budget related to IEPI.
- H. Reports on IEPI progress to date were postponed due to lack of time.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

- 1. The summary of this Workgroup meeting will be provided at a later date.

B. *Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)*

- 1. Matthew updated the workgroup in some detail on the status of the Spring/Summer 2015 (Cycle 1), Fall 2015 (Cycle 2A), and Spring 2016 (Cycle 2B) PRTs. Highlights included the following:
 - a. 35 PRTs are now active, counting all three cycles.
 - b. In Cycle 1, the very first follow-up visit is scheduled for Shasta College on February 22, and should complete the PRT process there. Follow-up visits for Barstow, Berkeley, CCSF, and Merced are scheduled this Spring, and Matthew has asked the Allan Hancock and Solano leads to schedule their follow-up visits as soon as possible. The Yuba follow-up visit will likely occur in Fall 2016.
 - c. In Cycle 2A, initial visits delayed due to weather at Lake Tahoe and Lassen are scheduled to take place on Feb. 29 and Feb. 5 respectively. Initial visits have taken place at all 15 other institutions, and the scheduling of second visits is underway.
 - d. In Cycle 2B, we are trying to schedule both initial and second visits up front, and are in the process of obtaining date options from all the client institutions. Several PRTs remain incomplete, and recruitment efforts are underway.
- 2. The workgroup continued discussion of collecting and disseminating candidate best practices identified during the PRT process.
 - a. Other useful sources for best practices were suggested, including private nonprofits, such as the Aspen Institute, Complete College America, Achieving the Dream, and the Carnegie Foundation, along with research organizations such as the Educational Advisory Board, Community College Research Center, and the Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy at Sacramento State.

- b. Members suggested creating a “new and emerging issues” website (to cover issues such as the use of the new workforce development dollars, spending restrictions on Student Equity dollars, preparing for the inevitable economic downturns and accompanying reductions, accreditation changes, and funding-formula proposals), and providing comparative data for the CCCs and other higher education systems.
- 3. Members also discussed gathering best practices for the PRT process itself. Suggested methods included the following:
 - a. Asking each PRT or PRT member for one paragraph on a procedure or operation or logistical action that helped make the PRT successful in rendering assistance to the client institution.
 - b. Asking each client institution (probably the CEO) to provide a brief answer to the question, “How did the PRT process help you succeed?”
 - c. Following up with the client institution one year after the final visit, and asking the CEO or other well-informed person to answer the question, “What was the main lasting consequence of the PRT process?” or “What stayed with you as a result of the PRT process?”
 - d. Soliciting best PRT practices from the PRT-based communities of practice.

C. Professional Development (Paul)

- 1. Review of Notes from November Meeting
- 2. Professional Learning Network (PLN)
 - a. Update on the project
 - i. The PLN is “live” (prolearningnetwork.cccco.edu) but still needs to undergo accessibility testing before it can be officially launched. Workgroup members were given a demonstration of the PLN’s newly added features (such as a series of videos on CCC data tools). Workgroup members were encouraged to register, explore the site, and provide feedback at their convenience.
 - ii. The PLN includes thousands of videos on using digital tools and enhancing professional skills. The videos are produced by Grovo (a national workplace training firm) as part of the PLN’s Learn Academy. Workgroup members suggested partnering with Lynda.com for additional training videos.
 - iii. Workgroup members made other suggestions for the PLN, including (1) housing an archive of past webinars, (2) adding a disclaimer in the speakers bureau that the Chancellor’s Office does not necessarily endorse the speakers, (3) installing a “help me”-type button on the Chancellor’s Office website that would take users to the PLN for assistance, (4) allowing users to “subscribe” to certain topics and alerting them as resources in that area are added to the PLN.
 - iv. More than 100 faculty, administrators, and staff have volunteered to serve as content reviewers. The plan is for @ONE to manage the review process (something @ONE is already doing for courses as part of the Online Education Initiative).
- 3. Regional Workshops
 - a. Workgroup members briefly reviewed a list of IEPI-sponsored regional workshops that have occurred since the last advisory committee meeting (which was in mid-November) or are scheduled to happen over the next couple of months. These include:
 - i. Inmate/Re-entry Education
(A) December 7-8
 - ii. Diversity in Hiring
(A) November, 2, November 4, January 8, January 14, January 25
(B) Scheduled: January 29 (Chabot), February 10 (Clovis Community College), February 16 (Yuba College). Another Diversity in Hiring workshop has been added for February 19 at L.A. Trade-Tech College.
 - iii. Student Learning Outcomes
(A) January 21 (session at ASCCC Innovation Institute)
(B) Scheduled: February 19 and February 20 (sessions at ASCCC Accreditation Institute, San Diego)

- iv. Audit/Fiscal Compliance
 - (A) Scheduled: February 19 (College of the Canyons)
- v. Integrated Planning
 - (A) December 17, January 22
 - (B) Scheduled: February 26 (College of the Canyons)
- vi. Basic Skills
 - (A) Scheduled: February 11 (Clovis Community College—Herndon Campus), February 16 (Hilton Orange County/Costa Mesa), February 22 (Hilton Oakland Airport), March 2 (Marriott Hotel Riverside)
 - (B) The goal of these workshops is for participants (attending the workshops in teams) to leave with a set of evidence-based strategies to include in their application for the state-funded basic skills transformation grants. The workshops will be highly interactive, with college teams encouraged to reflect on each strategy and whether it might be a good fit for their college. Workgroup members reviewed a matrix of questions posed to attendees at the August 2015 enrollment management workshops and agreed that a similar approach would be helpful at the basic skills workshops.
- vii. Student Support (Re)defined
 - (A) Scheduled: March 18 (CCSF)
- 4. Update on recent survey by 4C/SD on professional development
 - a. Leslie Carr provided a summary of preliminary survey results pertaining to professional development and flex policies at colleges. The survey closes on February 5th. Leslie will write an executive summary after the survey closes and will share it with the workgroup.
- 5. Ideas for future workshops/specialized training
 - a. Craig Rutan facilitated a discussion by workgroup members on possible topics for future IEPI workshops and training. Topics suggested by workgroup members included:
 - i. Collaborative approaches to leadership training with faculty and administrators
 - ii. Emergency preparedness/incident command training
 - iii. Funding and budgets for CCC, including the various categorical pots of money and what they can/cannot be spent on
 - iv. Examples of exemplary campus professional development programs and how they fund such efforts using flex, categorical, and other funding sources
 - v. Student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment, particularly for new faculty members. This could include examples from departments that write and analyze SLOs well.
- 6. Demo of Zoom
 - a. Rico Bianchi provided a demo of Zoom, an online video conferencing service that is available for free to CCC personnel. Zoom can be accessed at <http://confernow.org/>.

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

- 1. Strategic Communications Update from Interact Communications, Inc.
 - a. Overview of One-on-One Interviews
 - i. Focus groups did not work, so they conducted one-on-one interviews
 - (A) 51 people interviewed
 - (B) Who was interviewed?
 - (1) 16 Deans
 - (2) 13 Faculty
 - (3) 11 Students
 - (4) 11 CEOs, CIOs, CSSOs, etc.
- b. Interview findings
 - i. We need to develop a framework for communicating
 - (A) IEPI needs a metaphor to simply explain our efforts
 - (B) The metaphor will be clear, concise and engaging
 - (C) Branding and marketing could flow from this metaphor

- ii. Communications vis-à-vis stratification of organizations
 - (A) Focusing our communications for various roles in the Colleges
 - (B) IEPI components and interest among different roles
 - (1) Comprehensive interest: best practices and professional development
 - (2) CEOs, CIOs, CSSOs: technical assistance
 - (3) Deans and Faculty: professional development
- iii. Concerns among interviewees
 - (A) IEPI as a punitive effort
 - (B) IEPI may create more work for them
 - (C) IEPI exists to punish colleges on sanctions with ACCJC
 - (D) Colleges will be held accountable for the data and goals they set in the IE indicator portal
 - (E) Because IEPI is a CCCCO effort, colleges are concerned that IEPI's activities may impact their college's funding
- iv. Survey
 - (A) Measurement instruments for assessing survey responses and attitudes
 - (1) Inductive instrument
 - (2) Theoretically derived instruments: diffusion of data innovations
 - (B) The survey will be sent to CEOs and disseminated from the top down
 - (1) The survey will reach people in nearly every role within the college/district
 - (2) The instruments will categorize these peoples' responses
- c. Next steps
 - i. Requests for branding/ marketing/ information
 - (A) Colleges need a clear 1-page description of the IEPI initiative
 - (B) We need visuals to clearly describe our efforts:
 - (1) IEPI's connection with all of the other initiatives
 - (2) IEPI's composition and efforts within each component
 - (3) Resources available through IEPI
 - ii. Communication strategy using institutions' stories
 - (A) Communicate stories from the field
 - (1) Stories of colleges implementing innovative ideas that were inspired by Specialized Training opportunities
 - (2) Stories of effective practices shared through PRT visits
 - (B) Narratives must be authentic and shared across various media
 - (1) Communications must be authentic
 - (a) People can easily sniff-out inauthenticity
 - (b) We don't need to account for all the major stories; we need a spectrum of IEPI experiences
 - (2) We will share these "ground-level" stories across various media
 - iii. Legislative, BOG, and Administration Interviews
 - (A) Interviews will be completed by March 1
 - (B) Anticipated questions:
 - (1) What does success look like?
 - (2) What are your thoughts on the IEPI initiatives
 - iv. IEPI website and brand
 - (A) IEPI website
 - (1) The new website will functionally replace the College of the Canyons website and the CCCCO's IEPI websites
 - (2) A cluster analysis will be used when developing the website
 - (B) The IEPI brand
 - (1) All the research will inform how to develop the IEPI brand
 - (2) After all the research, the brand will come together very quickly

- (3) Marketing will be delineated when the brand is released
- 2. Effective practices resource development
 - a. Focus Areas
 - i. Integrated planning
 - ii. Disaggregation of data
 - iii. Enrollment management
 - iv. Resources allocation
 - v. Participatory/ shared governance
 - b. Template and framework for the effective practices resources
 - i. Provides clear definitions for focus areas
 - (A) We cannot assume that colleges clearly understand these focus areas or that they are conscious of their local constraints
 - (B) Focus area definitions and descriptions must be clear
 - (C) Develop definitions that are broad enough so that users can easily interpreted them in light of their institution
 - ii. The template/framework for effective practices resource must account for college/district governance processes
 - (A) Institutions that use effect practices resource will need guidance on how to implement new practices within the confines of their institution’s shared governance processes, taskforces, or committees.
 - (1) We have to answer the question: “How do I work with my campus climate to implement effective practices?”
 - (2) Provide examples and models for moving effective practices through local processes
 - (a) E.g., Encourage the use of a method like S.W.O.T. analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) in a shared governance setting to demonstrate how their institution may augment their current practice
 - (B) The effective practices resource cannot be prescriptive
 - (1) Template/ frameworks should be presented as recommendations or guidelines
 - (2) We should refer to these practices as “effective practices”, not “best practices”
 - (3) We need to distinguish between requirements (e.g., Title 5) and recommendations in the effective practices template
 - c. Solicitation of feedback for effective practices resources
 - i. We need to be prepared for inquiries that seek to know how the “effective practices” we are authoring are, in fact, “effective practices”
 - ii. Enlist the support of external evaluators to analyze these effective practices resources
 - (A) RP Group
 - (B) 3 CSN
 - iii. Additionally, CCC professional associations will need to participate in the development of the effective practices resource content
 - (A) Effective practices resources will come from the field
 - (B) Associations provide an additional layer of content vetting
 - iv. PRTs’ insights on effective practices resources
 - (A) PRT member should evaluate best practices resource
 - (B) PRT micro-teams (new) will be able to provide specific information about issues colleges are encountering, and they may be able to articulate best practices with deeper insight
 - (C) The Communities of Practice may be able to provide insight from having received PRT visits
 - v. Solicitation of feedback from association conferences
 - (A) Describe what the effective practices resource is
 - (1) Describe the focus areas

- (2) Non-prescriptive approach: recommendations, not requirements
 - (3) Explain how the tool is going to be used
 - (B) Seek initial impressions through guided discussion
 - (1) What do you like?
 - (2) What else would you like?
 - (3) Are these focus areas a good fit for your institution?
- d. Sustaining a Community of Practice
 - i. Create listservs to maintain momentum
 - (A) Listservs for specific topic areas
 - (1) Accreditation
 - (2) Credit/non-credit
 - (3) Integrated planning
 - (4) SLOs
 - (B) Maintaining listservs
 - (1) Newsletters
 - (2) Should we have a listserv moderator?
 - (3) Archive conversations
 - ii. Creating a wiki-type resource
 - (A) Let the community define the topic areas
 - (B) Would this be redundant, bearing in mind the PLN?
 - iii. How do we communicate in order to create the momentum?
 - (A) Use established channels of communication
 - (1) Websites
 - (2) Any connected listserv
 - (B) IEPI will need to create a newsletter or another attractive method of communication

III. General Session 2

- A. Matthew, Barry, Paul, and Theresa shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions (see above).
- B. Barry and Theresa announced that IEPI had now passed our one-year anniversary, since January 26, 2015 was our first Advisory Committee meeting. They noted that the initiative had made extraordinary progress over the past year, due in large part to the quality of this Advisory Committee, whose rich and robust discussions have formed the cornerstone of so much that IEPI is doing. They cited in particular the Partnership Resource Teams, the fact that over 2000 people had attended IEPI regional workshops on topic of great importance, and the fact that IEPI had built an Indicators system, including a web portal, from scratch, and that all 112 colleges (at the time) had adopted the framework locally and entered their targets by the required June 30 deadline.

IV. Adjournment