



**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Hyatt Regency Sacramento
March 11, 2016, 10:00 am-3:30 pm
Meeting Summary**

Members in Attendance

| Last | First | Wkgrp* | Last | First | Wkgrp* |
|---------------|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|--------|
| Bandyopadhyay | Santanu | PD | Jaffe | Louise | Ind |
| Bellisimo | Yolanda | TA | Lamanque | Andrew | PPP |
| Blackwood | Kathy | Ind | Larkin | Patti | PD |
| Braxton | Phyllis | PD | Lee | Matthew C. | TA |
| Campbell | Tylar | Ind | Light | Olivia | TA |
| Chadwick | Jan | TA | May | Ginni | PPP |
| Christian | Sonya | PPP | McGinnis | William G. | TA |
| Coleman | Laura | Ind | Messina | Kimberlee | TA |
| Cooper | Courtney | PD | Meuschke | Daylene | Ind |
| Dain | Claudette | PPP | Purtell | Valentina | Ind |
| Dozier | Julia | PD | Randall | Meridith | PD |
| Druley | Jennifer | PD | Rutan | Craig | PD |
| Ferguson | Chris | PPP/Ind | Sandoval | Carmen | PD |
| Garcia | Valentin | TA | Scallion | Brooke | PD |
| Greaney | KC | Ind | Scroggins | Bill | PD |
| Gribbons | Barry | Ind | Skinner | Erik | Ind |
| Hakim | Anthony | PPP | Tena | Theresa | PPP |
| Hayward | Craig | Ind | Wulff | Deborah | Ind |
| Holland | Breanne | PD | | | |

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

| Last | First | Wkgrp* | Last | First | Wkgrp* |
|----------|-----------|--------|-------------|--------|--------|
| Adams | Gary | Ind | Larson | Erin | PD |
| Atalig | Christina | Ind | Pacheco | Robert | NA |
| Cox-Otto | Pamela | NA | Rodriguez | Mario | Ind |
| DuBreuil | Michelle | PD | Slimp | Ronnie | PPP |
| Fisher | Stacy | Ind | Spano | Jeff | TA |
| Fuller | Ryan | Ind | Todd | James | PD |
| Keeley | Mia | PD | Valverde | Scott | TA |
| Lamantia | Tricia | PPP | Van Ommeren | Alice | Ind |

Guests in Attendance

| Last | First | Wkgrp* | Last | First | Wkgrp* |
|---------|-------|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| Connick | Debra | PPP/Ind | Tyson | Sarah | Ind |
| deAnda | Rosa | PPP | | | |

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

I. General Session 1

- A. The session opened with self-introductions of three of the four new student representatives: Tylar, Anthony, and Olivia.
- B. Phyllis, Craig Hayward, and Daylene shared Education Moments.
- C. Theresa introduced the new VC of TRIS, Debra Connick, and Matthew introduced the new PLN Project Manager, Michelle DuBreuil.

- D. Effective Practices Resource Toolkits Update
 1. Theresa briefly described the Toolkit concept, and the development of the first two Toolkits: Integrated Planning and Data Disaggregation. Dissemination of the Toolkits will occur with the help of TTIP South. The PPP and PD Workgroups will work together on ideas for additional Toolkits, which will include enrollment management, resource allocation, and governance. They are very open to feedback and suggested adjustments along the way, and hope to have one or two Toolkits ready for Fall 2016.
 2. Ginni noted that based on feedback already received at presentations by Ginni and Andrew, the terms "framework" and "rubrics" had been discarded in favor of "toolkit," because the tools are intended to be optional resources rather than requirements. They will focus on practices actually *used* successfully by CCCs.
- E. Barry updated the group on Indicators progress. He indicated that now is a good time to be working on the Year 2 Indicators goal-setting. A recommendation on Year 3 Indicators will be finalized in the Workgroup today. It will likely include measures for access, wage data, noncredit, and throughput in English and math.
- F. Matthew reported on the status of the PRT process and on the Advisory Committee meeting schedule.
 1. The three-visit cycle is now complete for our first client institution, leaving 34 active PRTs. Four or five more institutions from the first cycle are expected to complete their follow-up visits in Spring. All Cycle 2A institutions are expected to complete their second visits in Spring, with follow-up visits to be scheduled in Fall. In the latest cycle, 2B, all but two institutions will complete both first and second visits in Spring or early summer, with follow-up visits to be scheduled in Fall. Up to 11 additional institutions have been approved by Executive Committee to begin PRT visits in Fall.
 2. PRT training for Cycle 2B (beginning Spring 2016) is now complete.
 3. Executive Committee has approved the 2016-17 meeting schedule, which will be distributed soon to all members.
- G. Craig Rutan reported on recent work in PD:
 1. Four Basic Skills Innovation Grant presentations have been done.
 2. The first CTE Data Unlocked workshop is being held today.
 3. Discussion regarding SLO assessments is focusing on how to make them meaningful, and usable in planning.
 4. The PLN is still undergoing ADA compliance review.
- H. Pam Cox-Otto gave a brief update on communications:
 1. The survey following up on interview findings is underway.
 2. She asked for volunteers to do a Q-Sort activity, the results of which will be used to help organize the IEPI website.
 3. Interact is beginning to gather successes related to IEPI for inclusion in communications.
- I. Theresa's report on PPP progress appears above. She took the opportunity at the end of the session to introduce Scott Valverde and Mia Keeley, two new members of the IE Division staff.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

1. Barry gave an update on Year 2 portal and indicators. Currently implemented and portal is open.
2. Year 3 indicators
 - a. Indicators recommended
 - i. Noncredit course success is recommended for year 3. Include SP if possible.
 - (A) Do not call this metric "course completion"; instead it should be called "course success" so that SP will count as a success.
 - (1) Course success would be A-C grades (no lower grades reported), SP or P.
 - (2) Cohort will not include MW, RD, or UG in denominator.
 - (3) Everything else will count as not successful.

- (B) Note that there are no standards, or rubrics, for the data in the grade field for non-credit. Not only does it include grades and other codes, but the codes have not been standardized. In other words, SP might be different from one college to another.
- (C) Communication will need to occur on this indicator. Eric noted that related workshops would be the purview of Academic Affairs (perhaps with support from IEPI to put them on).
- (D) Non-credit fill-in. Completely open fill-in.
- (E) Number of CDCP Awards.
- ii. Short-term remedial rate or Throughput Rate
 - (A) % completing transfer-level English in 1 year (transfer level CB05 = "A")
 - (B) % completing transfer-level English in 2 years (transfer level CB05 = "A")
 - (C) % completing transfer-level Math in 1 year (transfer level CB05 = "A")
 - (D) % completing transfer-level Math in 2 years (transfer level CB05 = "A")
 - (E) Denominator needs to be determined. The intent is to include those students who intend to take transfer-level English or Math or have a goal that requires it. One option is all students directed toward initial assessment (SS04 = "AY") in Spring/Summer/Fall of cohort year.
- iii. Low-unit certificates (college)
- iv. Median time to degree (college)
 - (A) Look at difference between AA/AS and ADT? Perhaps in future years?
- v. Participation rate (district, can only do within the physical district boundaries)
- vi. CTE Skills Builder (Median % change by college, not actual wages)
- b. No new fiscal indicators recommended for Year 3 at this time.
- 3. Potential future indicators
 - a. Disaggregate some indicators by ADT (such as median time to degree).
 - b. Fiscal metric: OPEB
- 4. Eric had some discussion points and questions
 - a. Need to think about why we are collecting data on specific indicators
 - b. Moving forward, should we sift or separate different indicators between goalsetting and programmatic info?
 - c. Is the focus of IEPI goalsetting on an institutional level rather than providing information for programmatic development?
- 5. Items for Next Meeting
 - a. Launchboard Update
 - b. Using the data
 - c. CSU Dashboard

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

1. In some cases, Matthew reported, it had been necessary to assign more than one person from a given institution to the same PRT, in order to assemble the best-fitting set of expertise for the client institutions. In the vast majority of cases, however, he has been able to assign PRT members with no institutional duplications. The group confirmed that such diversity on each PRT is desirable. Assigning members from the same district, but not from the same college, did not cause the group much concern.
2. Matthew reviewed the status of each cycle of PRT assistance, and shared the Executive Committee's decision to add signature lines to the I&EP template--one for the CEO and one for the Academic Senate president (where applicable) signifying acceptance of the Plan.
3. Alternative approaches to technical assistance
 - a. Noncredit PRTs
 - i. The group agreed that the PRT volunteer pool should be expanded to include noncredit expertise.

- b. Micro PRTs: The group brainstormed ideas and questions concerning the micro PRT concept. Highlights included the following:
 - i. Should micro PRTs offer direct consulting services per se?
 - ii. Should they be provided to an institution only after it had received regular PRT services?
 - iii. Should any funding accompany or result from the micro PRT services?
 - iv. Presentations on solving a particular problem or issue. For example, if a Board and CEO are experiencing communication problems, the micro PRT could facilitate a one-to-two-day session with the following elements:
 - (A) Discussion of good communication practices
 - (B) Discussion of how things are done here
 - (C) Suggestions for improvements to fill the gap
 - (D) Either or both sides of the communication issue might have blind spots that prevent seeing the underlying issue, so the micro-PRT would have to have their antennae up for that possibility.
 - v. Pre-PRT or post-PRT visits by a micro PRT, which might or might not contain members from the full PRT. The pre-PRT visit could help define the issues on which the full PRT would focus, or help the institution organize and prepare for the full PRT visit; the post-PRT visit could provide follow-up assistance on a specific set of stubborn problems.
 - vi. Have multiple visits as needed, which might evolve into a coaching or mentorship role.
 - vii. We need to avoid duplication of assistance offered by other organizations, and/or coordinate our services with theirs.
 - (A) The Toolkits should include information on people and organizations that provide technical assistance services.
 - (B) We need to avoid recommending specific consultants directly.
 - viii. Micro PRTs might need a higher level of expertise, as well as constituency-group credibility. Current, larger PRTs benefit from their collective expertise; a one-person micro-PRT would not have that advantage.
 - ix. Micro PRTs might well have to provide straight talk--e.g., "This is really bad"--which the current PRTs do not do.
 - x. Micro PRTs might be provided following an IEPI Workshop on a given topic, to help answer the "now what?" question.
 - xi. Bring in retired practitioners to serve on micro PRTs.
- c. IEPI as broker of expertise
 - i. IEPI could arrange and pay expenses for a presentation at a particular institution or group of institutions by a team from a college that had succeeded in resolving a challenging issue of interest--a "star." That team might even stay after the presentation and serve as a micro PRT on that issue.
 - ii. A PRT might bring in such a team during a second visit as a "live model" or example.
 - iii. IEPI could facilitate and pay for sending people from a given institution out to visit other institutions that had successfully dealt with similar issues.
 - iv. Colleges with sound practices or great models on a given issue might volunteer to receive a team of folks from a PRT client for a day of shadowing and discussion.
 - v. IEPI might partner with other agencies involved with CCCs to highlight emerging issues and coordinate information resources across multiple issues.
 - vi. Potential problems: Saturation, and lack of time to attend/participate.
 - vii. Webinars or other online approaches might replace some in-person experiences.
- d. Community of Practice: Brainstorming session on organizing content
 - i. From PRT clients, gather a list of major hurdles/concerns, to help design COP content. Big-picture, not confined just to original Areas of Focus. Present the list in

some specified order, and ask which of these would be most useful to address. Then the COP could explore the best ways to address these concerns.

- ii. Focus on the most common Areas of Focus. Ask experts what the most common hurdles are, and ask the colleges what their biggest hurdles are.
- iii. Come in for dinner the night before--a nice dinner, in a nice place.
- iv. Discuss challenges, lessons learned, what the colleges did, informally.
- v. The more participants, the more structure will be needed. Should there be a limit on the number?
- vi. Networking and making connections can be the biggest benefit, even if the substantive content is relatively light.

C. Professional Development (Craig Rutan)

1. Review of Notes from January Meeting: Notes from the January 29, 2016 meeting were accepted.
2. Professional Learning Network (prolearningnetwork.cccco.edu)
 - a. Update on accessibility testing and official launch date
 - i. Evaluating ADA compliance before full launch
 - ii. Registration is available to the public (soft launch)
 - iii. PLN is in testing using internal staff – plan for official launch by mid-April
3. Regional Workshops
 - a. Debrief of basic skills transformation workshops and other recent workshops
 - i. Basic skills workshops have been completed and, while none of the workgroup members were able to attend, workgroup members reported positive feedback from individuals at their campuses that had attended the meetings.
 - b. Update on planning for CTE Data Unlocked/Launchboard 2.0 workshops
 - i. CEOs/CIOs should attend regional workshops 9:30-3:30 on Fridays – teams will get on computers and work with their own colleges actual data – must attend to be eligible for \$50k + 10 hours technical assistance.
 - ii. CCCCO.edu>Institutional Effectiveness>Link to flyer
4. Final Results of Survey by 4C/SD on Professional Development (Leslie Carr or designee)
 - a. No survey data available today (Leslie out). The survey results will be brought to the May IEPI workgroup meeting.
5. Ideas for Future Workshops/Specialized Training
 - a. Student Learning Outcomes: There was agreement that we need to help colleges begin discussions about SLOs and moving from compliance to a something that reflects what we want our colleges to be. Meridith mentioned that Shasta brought in David Marshall from IEBC (<http://www.iebcnow.org/ContactUs/DavidMarshall.aspx>) for a presentation and that it really helped jumpstart their local conversations. If we want to go forward with this, we probably want to speak with the Academic Senate leadership to create a joint set of regional presentations.
 - b. Guided Pathways: There was a lot of interest in having presentations about pathways following the presentation by Sonya Christian. The group felt that the presentation shouldn't be limited to just guided pathways, but should include other models. Pasadena was brought up. Norco College has been doing a lot of work around meta-majors and completion.
 - c. Financial Aid Symposium was also suggested. This was seen as an area where instruction and student services could come together to gain a better understanding of the regulations, the challenges faced by our students, and how our decisions could negatively impact our students. There was also a desire to include pieces about financial literacy to help our students.
 - d. Growing Institutional Leaders: A joint presentation among administrators, faculty, and classified staff on growing institutional leaders and creating a collaborative campus environment.

- e. Community College Budgets: There were discussions about a presentation on community college budgets and how to use categorical funding effectively to increase budget flexibility.

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

1. Review of the resource toolkit/ Effective Practices resource presentations provided at the ACCCA Conference and ASCCC Accreditation Institute
 - a. Feedback on Effective Practice resources from break-away group meetings:
 - i. Participants want these resources to evolve.
 - ii. Diligent vetting of resources
 - iii. To have malleable Effective Practices resources so that they can be easily interpreted/ implemented in various educational contexts (rural/urban colleges, single college/multi college districts, etc.)
 - iv. Non-prescriptive instruction and soft guidance in Effective Practices resources
 - b. Recommendation to integrate a decision matrix model into the format of the Effective Practices resources
 - i. Identify the decision to be made.
 - ii. Establish a plan and process.
 - iii. Help the institution develop a timeline and isolate time-sensitive variables.
2. Review of Scope of Work for the Disaggregation of Data and Integrated Planning Effective Practices resources from RP Group
 - a. Craig Hayward and Barbara McNeice-Stallard will lead the development of these Effective Practices resources.
 - b. Disaggregation of Data Effective Practices resource
 - i. Resource format
 - (A) Visual – brochure-type format
 - (B) Easy to read
 - (C) Literature review included
 - (D) Clear instructions and guidance
 - (E) Easy to replicate
 - ii. Major components of the Disaggregation of Data resource
 - (A) Examples of context areas that disaggregated data could affect
 - (1) Disproportionate impact among underrepresented groups
 - (2) Accreditation
 - (3) Student equity (multiple-factor correlations and getting away from uni-variant)
 - (4) Program review process
 - (B) This resource will serve to support institutional decision-making among administrators.
 - (C) Although this Effective Practices resource seeks to support disaggregation of data processes vis-à-vis accreditation, it will also help users to look at data in different formats.
 - iii. Case studies will be integrated into the Disaggregation of Data Effective Practices resource.
 - (A) A variety of educational contexts will be provided.
 - (B) Case studies may not be limited to California Community Colleges.
3. Consistency among Effective Practices resources
 - a. Standardizing the advice and the presentation of the information
 - b. Instead of categorized by the topic, perhaps these resources could be categorized by the problem administrators seek to solve. For example:
 - i. Achievement gap
 - ii. Resource allocation
 - iii. Student retention
 - c. Resources must be user-friendly and visual – they need to be approachable.

- d. Effective Practices resources must provide information that will benefit educational leaders in various educational contexts – rural, suburban, urban, small, large, single-college district, multi-college district, etc.
 - i. Integrate vignettes that speak to various education contexts.
 - ii. Perhaps case studies may also speak to the diverse educational contexts in our system.
- e. Bridge theoretical information with practical instruction/ guidance.
4. What does the ongoing review of these resources look like for our committee?
5. What do we call these Effective Practices resources?
 - a. Effective Practices Toolkit
 - b. Effective Practices Toolbox
 - c. Effective Practices Tool Chest
 - d. Effective Practices Toolshed
 - e. Suggestions from the field: “repository” or “resources”
 - f. The Workgroup’s conclusion: “Effective Practices Resource Toolkit”
6. Evaluation of Effective Practices resources
 - a. Ed Insights is contracted to evaluate all efforts undertaken through the Specialized Training RFP.
 - b. Evaluation of Effective Practices resources will be integrated into their scope of work.
7. Presenting information about the Effective Practices resources at upcoming conferences
 - a. Preliminary work leading to the SCUP and Uber Conferences:
 - i. Reach-out to the associations and organizations prior to visiting the conferences
 - ii. Seek feedback on the Effective Practices resource from the following groups by requesting workshops at the conferences for the following associations:
 - (A) CIOs
 - (B) CEOs
 - (C) Deans
 - b. Uber Conference (ASCCC, CIOs, CSSOs, CCCAOE Conferences)
 - i. IEPI will present about P3’s forthcoming Effective Practices resource at the general session, which will be attended by hundreds of people from all of the above-mentioned associations.
 - ii. Julie Bruno and Cathleen Rose will be coordinating and moderating this activity. Anybody presenting should be in contact with Julie Bruno.
 - iii. There is interest in IEPI providing a condensed, 2-hour version of our Integrated Planning workshop.
 - (A) Will this be a Professional Development-type workshop or can we orient the presentation to focus on the Integrated Planning Effective Practices resource?
 - (1) We can easily provide a miniature version of the Integrated Planning Workshop.
 - (2) Perhaps some of the same people will be open to presenting again.
 - (a) Barry Gribbons (COC, IEPI Exec. Comm.)
 - (b) Daylene Meuschke (COC, IEPI Exec. Comm.)
 - (c) Anyone else?
 - (B) There will need to be an aspect of this miniature Integrated Planning Workshop that draws attention to the forthcoming Effective Practices resource for Integrated Planning and seeks feedback on this resource.
 - iv. IEPI’s presentation will happen on the last day of the conference and early in the morning.
 - (A) Develop an engaging and interesting presentation.
 - (B) Be deliberate about seeking input and feedback from the audience.
 - (C) Integrate a polling application into the presentation to bolster audience interaction and get responses to important questions in real time.

- (D) Facilitation might include an interactive discussion:
 - (1) Attempt to have people from the same college and district sit together and review a checklist of elements within the integrated planning process.
 - (2) Facilitators will listen to these team discussions and make note of the issues they identify as being crucial to integrated planning.
 - (3) We may include these findings in the Effectiveness Practices resource for Integrated Planning.
 - (4) Facilitators will assure that the Effectiveness Practices Resource for Integrated Planning will not replace current practices, but will provide a menu of options for Integrated Planned methods and processes.
- 8. Connecting P3 Effective Practices resources with Technical Assistance and Professional Development
 - a. PRT
 - i. Use LOIs, PRTs' Areas of Focus analyses, and Innovation and Effectiveness Plans to influence the development of Effective Practices resources.
 - ii. In future PRT visits, the institutions being visited by PRTs will benefit from Effective Practices resources that came directly from the field.
 - b. Professional Development
 - i. Partner with existing PD trainings.
 - ii. Become familiar with how the PD workgroup standardizes and vets PD content.
 - iii. Track what PD resources are being engaged on the Professional Learning Network to help us prioritize future Effective Practices resources.
- 9. What should go on the agenda for the next meeting?
 - a. Discuss the development of an Effective Practices resource for enrollment management.
 - b. Update on the Strategic Communications
 - i. Survey for CEOs
 - ii. Q Sort

III. General Session 2

A. Matthew, Barry, Ginni, and Craig Rutan shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions (see above).

IV. Adjournment