



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
May 13, 2016, 10:00 am-3:30 pm
Meeting Summary**

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn		Lamanque	Andrew	PPP
Bandyopadhyay	Santanu	PD	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Barton	Michelle	Ind	May	Ginni	PPP
Braxton	Phyllis	PD	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Brown	Aaron	TA	Messina	Kimberlee	TA
Cabral	Robert	PD	Purtell	Valentina	Ind
Carr	Leslie	PD	Rutan	Craig	PD
Chadwick	Jan	TA	Sandoval	Carmen	PD
Cooper	Courtney	PD	Schardt	Jan	PD
Dozier	Julia	PD	Skinner	Erik	Ind
Goold	Grant	Ind	Sperling	Dustin	PPP
Greaney	KC	Ind	Steenhausen	Paul	PD
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Suarez	Angelica	PPP
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Tarman	Christopher	Ind
Heumann	Michael	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Holland	Breanne	PD	Todd	James	PD
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Webb	Catherine	PD
Janio	Jarek	Ind	Wulff	Deborah	Ind
Johnson	Joyce	PD			

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Atalig	Christina	Ind	Johnson	Catherine	Ind
Baker	Karen	NA	Larson	Erin	PD
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Pacheco	Robert	NA
Bray	Susan	PD	Rodriguez	Mario	Ind
Campos	Fredy	NA	Schrager	Cynthia	Ind
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
DuBreuil	Michelle	PD	Spano	Jeff	TA
Fisher	Stacy	Ind	Thorne	Terra	TA
Howe	Michael		Valverde	Scott	TA
Jez	Su Jin	PD	Van Ommeren	Alice	Ind

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
deAnda	Rosa	PPP	Tyson	Sarah	Ind
Mills	Keetha		Wagner	Natalie	Ind
Pilati	Michelle				

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

I. General Session 1

- A. Breanne, Madelyn, and Santanu shared Education Moments.
- B. Theresa and Barry briefly reviewed the past year of work by the Advisory Committee, and called out Ronnie, Catherine, Scott, Mia, and Karen for particular thanks. They also thanked Paul Steenhausen for all his contributions to IEPI, and wished him well in his transition to the LAO.
- C. Matthew asked members to contact him if they were in doubt about continuing service on the Advisory Committee.
- D. Pam gave a brief update on the IEPI branding research and design work to date.
- E. Paul walked through the Professional Learning Network website, which has now debuted officially. Useful features include the Calendar, Speakers Directory, Resources (which have the advantage of already having been vetted), the Learn Academy, and MyPD (on which users can set up their own professional development page). Staff will be asking for additional content submissions in specified areas in a strategically deliberate order.
- F. Matthew gave an update on technical assistance activities.
 1. Four institutions have completed the PRT process in Cycle 1 (for which services commenced in Spring 2015), so we now have 31 active PRTs.
 2. All but one institution in Cycle 2A (for which services commenced in Fall 2015) have completed both the initial and second visits.
 3. In Cycle 2B (for which services commenced in Spring 2016), all initial visits have been completed.
 4. Eleven more institutions will join the active ranks in Fall 2016 (Cycle 3A), and initial meetings with those CEOs, and assembly of the PRTs, are underway.
 5. Three more have been approved for Spring 2017 (Cycle 3B), with more on the way.
- G. Barry gave an update on activities related to indicators.
 1. No further Year 3 changes are contemplated.
 2. The Workgroup is still working on defining the population for the throughput measures.
 3. The Fiscal Advisory Workgroup is working on the OPEB liability measure.
 4. We are inviting feedback from the field in numerous conferences, and so far have received none indicated any need for radical changes. Many commenters have stressed the desire for meaningful target-setting.
- H. Theresa gave the Policy, Procedure, and Practice update.
 1. Work on the toolkits, the website, and the logo is continuing.
 2. Theresa noted that IEPI has two evaluators: Bob Pacheco, who has already been introduced, and Ed Insights. From the latter group, she welcomed Fredy, Cynthia, Su Jin, and Terra, and asked them to introduce themselves; they did so.
- I. Paul gave an update on professional development.
 1. He called attention to ongoing work on the PLN, outreach, training, strategies to raise awareness, and the workshops that have been presented to date.
 2. He also noted that the Workgroup was in the process of finalizing content development priorities for specialized training.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)

1. Indicators Purpose
 - a. Purpose and Positive Uses of the Indicators This Past Year

- i. SRJC had a meaningful goal setting process this year. The FTES target setting was especially useful. The additional time this year compared to last year was helpful. Faculty were well engaged in the process.
- ii. Year 1 goals were hard to set and make meaningful for some indicators, especially since there was little ability to have an impact given the timing.
- iii. Year 1 goals especially make little sense for the 6-year cohort metrics.
- iv. Short term goals make better sense for leading indicators.
- v. Connecting measures to department planning and disaggregating the data are helpful when possible.
- vi. More attention should be paid to developing and using actionable or leading indicators.
- vii. Conversations around fiscal indicators were good.
 - (A) Rather than setting “aspirational targets” for fiscal indicators, we may want to compare to standards set by the CCCCO.
 - (B) The exception would be FTES, for which aspirational targets are good.
 - (C) Using visuals like red, yellow and green lights was considered, but probably not a good idea for now as it might convey a message that is too evaluative.
- viii. Six-year targets are good for achievement indicators.
 - ix. The threat of negative consequences would have adversely impacted goal setting.
- b. For the July meeting, we should go indicator by indicator to reconsider which should have short-term, long-term, or no targets.
- c. We should consider the topic of disaggregation in more detail next year.
- d. We should review the targets set by colleges and optional indicators to see if there are implications for the work next year.
- e. Professional development on goalsetting is needed.
- f. Guidelines and prompts for colleges to consider in the goalsetting process would be helpful.
- g. We should consider two surveys next year
 - i. Academic Senate Presidents assessing the process and degree of faculty/senate engagement in the target setting process.
 - ii. IEPI Indicator contacts at colleges assessing the process used for target setting.
- h. Next year, we should consider if there are areas of institutional effectiveness common in community colleges not assessed by the current indicators, and possible priority areas like number of course sections with OER materials, pathways, etc.
2. Implications of the Indicators and Targets for the Community Colleges as a System
 - a. Next year, we should also consider comparing the college indicators and targets to system indicators and targets.
3. Implications of any emerging initiatives for future indicators
 - a. We should consider the implications for the attention on regions and other Doing What Matters recommendations on targets.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

1. Matthew updated the group on the status of PRTs in all cycles.
2. Additional approaches to technical assistance: Menu of Options
 - a. Matthew presented for discussion a revised set of additional technical assistance approaches based on the discussion at the last meeting. The group made the following suggestions for improvement in the micro-PRTs/mini-PRTs section:
 - i. Service Categories
 - (A) As a label, use “workshops” in lieu of “presentations” on solving a particular problem or issue.
 - (B) Add an action plan as an element in the workshop category.
 - (C) Add referrals to other entities as a category.
 - ii. Timing: Add a note indicating that the options presented do not represent an exhaustive list of all possibilities.

- iii. Number of visits: Replace the listed options with “To be determined on a case-by-case basis.”
 - iv. Funding for the Client Institution: Add text to the effect that the client institution may request funding specifically to address issues for which micro-PRT assistance was requested, based on the findings of the micro-PRT and on demonstrated need.
 - v. Composition
 - (A) Add a typical size.
 - (B) Clarify stipends and expenses for mini-PRT members:
 - (1) Micro-PRT members, like PRT members, are *not* paid consultants.
 - (2) Small stipends may be available for micro-PRT members in accord with current IEPI practice, with the amount to vary depending in part on the time required to provide assistance.
 - (3) All reasonable travel and other expenses associated with micro-PRT assistance are reimbursed.
 - vi. Expertise: Delete the unhelpful text under “Recommended or requested experts in specialized areas.”
 - vii. Training and Approach
 - (A) Use the more general “positive approach” rather than calling out Appreciative Inquiry per se, though we will continue to use that method.
 - b. In the Broker of Expertise section, the group suggested specifying not-for-profit higher-education organizations for referrals, and deleting any reference to for-profit consultants, in keeping with the IEPI approach overall. They also noted that most of the items under facilitating inter-institutional assistance are closely related to other aspects of IEPI, including professional development/specialized training, the PLN, and partnering with other organizations to coordinate information resources.
 - c. The group discussed a variety of ways to minimize the appearance of a conflict of interest arising from a PRT or mini-PRT member later serving as a paid consultant at a former client institution. We can tell PRT members that they may not actively solicit paid work based explicitly on their work through IEPI. If they do later contract with a former client institution, it must be clearly independent of the PRT process. On the other hand, it is to be expected that an institution that has formed a constructive relationship with a PRT member who is an expert in her/his field might request paid services from that member at a later date, and IEPI is not in a position to police such contracts. One possibility is for the former PRT member to request a letter from the institution stating that it, not the member, had initiated the request for services, and send that letter to the Project Director for the IEPI files.
3. PRT Process Communities of Practice
- a. Matthew presented a list of topics for discussion (based in part on the Workgroup’s brainstorming session at the last meeting) at the COP design and planning meeting on June 1, and requested feedback from the group, which made the following suggestions:
 - i. On June 1, focus on the structure of the first COP gathering, who should be invited, what content might be most useful, and the scheduling of the gathering. The rest of the topics can be covered at that first gathering.
 - ii. The first COP gathering should not be a sit-down dinner, which would restrict conversations to small groups, but rather should promote moving around and meeting everyone in the room.
 - iii. Promoting the first gathering by bringing in somebody everyone would like to meet might be beneficial.
 - iv. Consider emerging issues as content for part of the first gathering.

C. Professional Development (Craig Rutan)

- 1. Welcome and Introductions
- 2. Review of Notes from March Meeting
- 3. Toolkit Update

- a. Craig Hayward (Irvine Valley College and RP Group) provided an update on the development of two IEPI-commissioned toolkits: disaggregation of data and integrated planning. (Integrated Planning is being headed up by Barbara McNeice-Stallard of Mt. SAC.)
 - b. These two toolkits, the first of several planned toolkits for IEPI, will identify effective practices (as well as lessons learned) and will include case studies, data, and narratives for each topic. Each toolkit will provide additional details that will allow users to take a deeper-dive into the material.
 - c. The toolkits are meant for “enthusiasts”—not just experts and statisticians.
 - d. Toolkit content will be placed on the Professional Learning Network. The intent is to make the material engaging and user-friendly.
 - e. Once completed (likely by the end of 2016), regional workshops will be offered to introduce these toolkits to the field.
4. Regional Workshop Schedule for 2016-17 and Content Priorities for Professional Learning Network
- a. Through April 30, 2016, IEPI has sponsored or co-sponsored a total of 42 workshops on 10 different topics. These workshops have been attended by more than 3,600 faculty, classified staff, administrators, and trustees.
 - b. At their May 12th meeting, the IEPI Executive Committee approved a schedule of professional development offerings (both in person and through the PLN) for the next 18 months. The list strongly reflects the suggestions and guidance of the PD workgroup.
 - c. Given limited time and budgets for CCC personnel, workgroup members discussed ways of fostering attendance at the various planned IEPI workshops, including (1) publishing a schedule of upcoming fall and spring workshops ASAP, (2) embedding workshop sessions within association conferences, (3) holding two workshops on related topics on back-to-back days, and (4) providing live webcasts of workshops. A workgroup member voiced caution on the idea of holding consecutive-day workshops, noting that it can be difficult for faculty to attend multiple days giving teaching responsibilities.
 - d. Beyond workshops, the workgroup discussed potential opportunities for IEPI to collaborate with CCC professional organizations to enhance professional and leadership development across the system. For example, IEPI could help to set standards and articulate leadership competencies, identify gaps in the landscape of current training offerings, create a “badging” system, and pave the way for more seamless professional and leadership development pathways.
5. Basic Skills Transformation Grants
- a. The Board of Governors is expected to approve the basic skills grants at its upcoming meeting.
 - b. IEPI, the Academic Affairs division of the Chancellor’s Office, and key system partners are in the early stages of planning a kick-off summit for late July or early August. The purpose of the summit is to have grantees connect with subject matter experts and each other, and to develop a campus game plan for kick-starting implementation when the new school year starts up again.
 - c. IEPI and summit partners would like to send out to grantees a pre-summit survey to guide the event planning effort. Workgroup members were encouraged to follow-up after the meeting with any suggested questions for the survey.
6. Professional Learning Network
- a. Michelle Pilati discussed strategies for maximizing outreach and training to the field on the Professional Learning Network, including presenting at conferences and board meetings, holding targeted webinars, and providing regional and campus-based trainings. Workgroup members suggested creating a monthly newsletter of what’s new on the site.
 - b. Workgroup members emphasized that the best way to drive traffic to and usage of the PLN is by making it an invaluable resource that personnel feel they must go to in order to accomplish their work and obtain needed information. Examples of ways to do this include

- (1) having mandated trainings on the PLN (such as sexual harassment training), (2) adding additional training providers such as Lynda.com, (3) making it possible for personnel to track and report flex hours on the PLN, (4) offering flex credit for completing trainings found on the PLN, (5) creating space on the PLN for colleges to house their own locally developed materials, and (6) creating CCC-validated badges that faculty and staff can share with peers to show what they know. The PD workgroup should think about creating ad hoc subgroups to provide guidance on what each of these components (beginning with badging) should look like.
- c. Workgroup members viewed the discussion board on the PLN (“Connect”) and agreed that a ninth forum category should be added related to using/navigating the PLN itself. The workgroup also discussed the benefits of providing some basic descriptions and examples of topics that might be included in each forum category.
 - d. The workgroup agreed that, given the topic’s importance (and fact that IEPI plans to hold a regional workshop on the topic in spring 2017), cultural competence/proficiency should be added to the resource submission form. Going forward, PLN staff will need to establish a protocol for adding/removing topics.
 - e. Workgroup members agreed that users should be able to choose whether to make their MyPD listing and sections public or private.
7. Final Results of Survey by 4C/SD on Professional Development
- a. Leslie Carr, who had shared the preliminary results of a 4C/SD survey at the January meeting, provided the final numbers and results.

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Update from Interact
 - a. IEPI Branding
 - i. Branding statement – Participate. Collaborate. Innovate.
 - (A) Interact’s branding and communication research involved interviews with the following groups:
 - (1) Students
 - (2) Colleges faculty
 - (3) College administrators
 - (4) California Legislative staff
 - (5) CCCCCO staff
 - (B) The words in the branding represent those most commonly used to describe the IEPI initiative
 - (C) Each word is strategically placed and each verb is an imperative mood
 - b. IEPI Visual Treatment
 - i. Brief review of all seven logos
 - ii. Review of the logo chosen by IEPI Communications Cabinet and the IEPI Executive Committee
 - (A) Description of IEPI “bridge” concept
 - (B) Demonstration of various renderings of the IEPI “bridge” concept
 - (1) Color options
 - (2) Serif, san serif options for the font of the IEPI text
 - iii. The bridge concept with the blue color palette and san serif font for IEPI text was favored by the IEPI Executive Committee and P3 Workgroup
 - c. Methodology behind the Development of the IEPI Website
 - i. Navigability and organization of website
 - (A) The structure of the website is an outworking of the Q-Sort completed by the IEPI Advisory Committee
 - (B) Pam integrated navigability strategies from her doctoral dissertation research
 - (C) The structure of the website prevents an informational “junk drawer”

- ii. Categorization of informational content
 - (A) Activities –workshops registration, success stories, calendar, etc.
 - (B) Information per role – targeted information for administrators, classified staff, researchers, and faculty
 - (C) Communication and contact information
- iii. Concerns
 - (A) Information seems to be placed in silos
 - (B) Where are the components? I don't see anything about professional development, technical assistance, or indicators.
 - (C) Bearing in mind this website is developed for CCC staff, how could California Community College outsiders feel welcome on our website? It seems like the website is only for insiders.
- d. Future Tasks of Interact Communications, Inc.
 - i. Creating collateral materials for IEPI
 - ii. Helping us name the IEPI “toolkit”
- 3. Recent / Future P3 presentations
 - a. Thursday, April 7: Research and Planning Conference in San Diego, CA
 - b. Friday, April 22: UBER Conference – Academic Senate, CIOs, CSSOs, and CCCAOE in Sacramento, CA
 - c. Friday, June 3: SCUP Symposium in San Mateo, CA
- 4. Effective Practices Resource Toolkit (EPRT)
 - a. Current list of resource topics:
 - i. Integrated Planning
 - ii. Disaggregation of Data
 - iii. Enrollment Management
 - iv. Resource Allocation
 - v. Governance
 - b. EPRT Development (Handouts for the Integrated Planning and Disaggregation of Data EPRTs were provided)
 - c. Integrated Planning by Barbara McNeice-Stallard
 - i. Status of the Integrated Planning EPRT development
 - (A) Consulted with 3CSN, Career Ladders, and PLN professional for input on the development of the EPRT
 - (B) Solicited feedback on the EPRT from the field at association conferences
 - (C) Barbara is acting as the project lead and they have recently brought on a project coordinator
 - (D) Conducting interviews to inform content
 - (E) Assuring there is a strong link to the effective integrated planning practices and ACCJC accreditation standards
 - ii. Major components
 - (A) A calendar that aligns college projects that are connected to integrated planning
 - (B) Guidance on the people who could be involved in integrated planning meetings
 - (1) A designated leader of the integrated planning effort (e.g., President, CEO, etc.)
 - (2) A designated facilitator that can keep the discussion focused on integrated planning
 - (3) Faculty will be included in the integrated planning meetings
 - (C) A checklist for implementing a new integrated planning model or process
 - (D) Delineate a variety of vetted integrated planning models or processes used by these institutions:
 - (1) Butte College
 - (2) College of the Canyons

- (3) Riverside City College
- (4) Santa Barbara City College
- (5) Moorpark College
- (6) San Joaquin Delta College
- (E) Suggestion: the integrated planning models and processes need to be thoroughly vetted by a large group of experts before the colleges are named in the EPRT
 - (1) The PLN names specific colleges and provides contact information for effective practice experts
 - (2) Should we use pseudonyms for the colleges?
 - (3) California Legislative members and the Governor's administration may want to know which colleges have effective practices to share and how IEPI is sharing these effective practices
- (F) Suggestion: integrate a readiness self-assessment before our institutions integrate a new process or model
 - (1) They may ask self-assessment questions:
 - (a) Does my college embrace change?
 - (b) Are there technological or infrastructure obstacles that could impede the implementation of a new process?
- (G) Based on feedback from the field, the EPRT might include examples of integrated practices that haven't worked; these may be called "lessons learned"
- (H) Within the design of the EPRTs, there will be connection points to other EPRT resources (e.g. Aspects of Integrated Planning EPRT may refer users to the Enrollment Management and Disaggregation of Data EPRT)
- d. Disaggregation of Data
 - i. Status
 - (A) Established a Data Disaggregation Workgroup
 - (1) Made-up of three researchers and planners from the CCC system
 - (B) Three draft tools for the Disaggregation of Data EPRT
 - (1) Enrollment management/student retention
 - (2) SLO disaggregation
 - (3) Assessment testing
 - ii. The format for the Disaggregation of Data EPRT
 - (A) Statement of the problem
 - (B) Case studies of colleges with effective disaggregation of data practices
 - (1) City College of San Francisco
 - (a) Great SLO disaggregation practices over multiple SLO areas
 - (2) Irvine Valley College
 - (C) Graphic or visualization
 - (D) Practice - how do you do it?
 - (1) Contains specific steps to implement data disaggregation practices
 - (2) Practices are broken into segments for specific focus areas
 - (3) Links to additional resources
 - (E) The Data Disaggregation EPRT will be accessible (translated) for multiple college users (e.g. Trustees, faculty, administrators, etc.)
 - iii. Major components
 - (A) Defining disaggregation of data
 - (1) Democratization of data
 - (2) Spectrum of data
 - (a) Accessible data (e.g., number of students in ethnic categories)
 - (b) Multi-variant modeling
 - (3) Key example: cross tabbing

- (a) An example was provided of disaggregating age groups among veteran students
 - (b) Supports student equity planning
 - (c) Supports the assessment of disproportionate impact
 - (B) Disaggregation of Data EPRT will focus on the following areas:
 - (1) Supporting student equity planning
 - (2) Disproportionate impact analysis
 - (3) Meeting ACCJC's requirement for disaggregation of SLOs data
 - (4) Enrollment management
 - (C) Suggestion: can we integrate information about how disaggregation of data relates to basic skills educational data?
- e. Dissemination of the EPRTs
 - i. Medium of EPRT
 - (A) Developing an interactive website
 - (B) Printed materials in a three ring binder
 - (C) Integrate into the PLN
 - ii. Proposed launch of the EPRTs
 - (A) CCLC Fall Conference

III. General Session 2

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

IV. Adjournment