



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
 California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
 July 22, 2016, 10:00 am-3:15 pm
 Meeting Summary**

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	Janio	Jarek**	Ind
Barton	Michelle	Ind	Johnson	Joyce	PD
Blackwood	Kathy**	Ind	Kovrig	Neill K.	PPP
Bruno	Julie	PD	Lamanque	Andrew**	PPP
Carr	Leslie	PD	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Coleal	Sharlene	PD	Lumapas-Taylor	Quincy	PD
Cooper	Courtney	PD	Ly	Pearl	PD
Dieckmeyer	Diane**	TA	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Druley	Jennifer	PD	Nezaam	Keith	PPP
Fiero	Diane**	PD	Oberg	Anjeanette	PD
Garcia	Valentin	TA	Rutan	Craig	PD
Greaney	KC	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Gribbons	Barry**	Ind	Todd	James	PD
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Wah	Linda	PPP
Jaffe	Louise**	Ind	Webb	Catherine	PD

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Atalig	Christina	Ind	Johnson	Catherine	Ind
Baker	Karen	NA	Keeley	Mia**	PD
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Larson	Erin**	TA/ PD
Bray	Susan	PD	McNeice-Stallard	Barbara	PPP
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Pacheco	Robert	NA
DuBreuil	Michelle	PD	Pilati	Michelle	PD
Fisher	Stacy**	Ind	Schrager	Cynthia	Ind
Fuller	Ryan**	Ind	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Howe	Michael	PPP	Spano	Jeff**	TA
Johns	Krista	NA	Valverde	Scott	TA

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Connick	Debra	PPP/Ind	Ton-Quinlivan	Van	
Hoig	Todd	Ind	Tyson	Sarah	Ind
Roberts	Matthew	Ind			

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

**PRT Member or Lead

I. General Session 1

- A. Madelyn and James shared Education Moments.
- B. Pam walked through the logo styles and the website, which is nearing launch. Louise suggested adding a Trustee tab to the main screen.
- C. Barry gave an update on activities related to indicators:
 1. We now have data for the Year 3 throughput and median time to degree measures, which the Chancellor's Office will present to the Workgroup this afternoon.
 2. The CSU system has a well-regarded student success dashboard, which will also be presented this afternoon on a conference call.
- D. Matthew gave an update on technical assistance activities.
 1. In Cycle 2B (for which services commenced in Spring 2016), all but two PRTs have completed their second visits.
 2. In Fall 2016 (Cycle 3A), we will have 10 PRTs and one Super-PRT (a district-level PRT drawing its membership from the college-level PRTs). We have confirmed 76 PRT members so far, of whom 16 have prior PRT experience in Cycle 1.
 3. Nine more institutions have been approved for Spring 2017 (Cycle 3B) so far.
 4. The Workgroup will be reviewing evaluation reports on Cycle 1 and the first two visits in Cycle 2B, along with the first edition of Spotlight, which focuses on the Barstow College PRT.
- E. Theresa gave an update on Policy, Procedure, and Practice, and on CCCCCO matters.
 1. Eloy Oakley has been named as Chancellor. He will begin service in December 2016. At the Board of Governors meeting, he highlighted some of his particular interests, including equity and diversity, guided pathways, and strengthening partnerships with UC and CSU.
 2. Work on communications is continuing.
 3. Work on the toolkits (now called resource centers) is also continuing, with integrated planning and data disaggregation in the pipeline and enrollment management to come next.
 4. Leadership development was added to the IEPI charge in the 2015-16 budget, and the Chancellor's Office is continuing development on that front. James noted that the EEO/Diversity program might connect well with leadership development efforts.
- F. Jeff gave an update on professional development.
 1. The Workgroup is working from a draft outline of PD offerings for 2016-17.
 2. Eight CTE Data Unlocked workshops and two inmate education sessions have been completed.
 3. The Basic Skills summit is scheduled for August 2-3, and already has about 330 registrants.
 4. Still in the works are additional workshops on inmate education and CTE Data Unlocked, institutional financial aid eligibility, and dual enrollment.
 5. Plans call for rolling out the integrated planning toolkit in time for the RP Group conference in October.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)

1. Update on Recommendations for Year 3 Indicators
 - a. Throughput measure: Received data from MIS and have run some descriptive and validation analyses. The description of denominator by cohort year. Stacy Fisher explained the data collected. (see handout)
 - i. Stacy pointed out that the Scorecard cohort isn't capturing behavioral statistics. Stats from Psych, Sociology, etc. classes are excluded and not in the 1501 TOP code. There

- is no easy way to identify those courses presently. If there could be a way of including these courses in the future, that would be good.
- ii. The data show high proportions of students from the 3-year cohort being picked up in the first year, 73 percent for the most recent cohort.
 - iii. The percentage of first-time students attempting math in year one has increased. You can qualify for this cohort by taking English without taking any math. Same for English.
 - iv. Overall English rates have gone up about 5% and math rates have gone up about 3%.
 - v. There appears to be some kind of ceiling for colleges currently, which hopefully will rise in the future.
 - vi. Average change in rates by college: In math 3.5% and in English 4.7%. Maximum change 18% Math and English 26%.
 - vii. Positive change 94% over those 5 years. Only 20 have had tiny decreases.
 - viii. Interesting that there is significantly more variation in English over time.
 - ix. Page 2 separated math rates by race and cohort. The Asian students do quite well but all groups are going up.
 - x. English rate is pretty consistent, and going up as well. Of course, highest rates result in lower increase.
 - xi. Page 4: The score card metric is race and gender.
 - xii. Students who start in transfer level are much more likely to finish in two years. The only cohort included is 2009-2010.
 - xiii. There was a lot of praise for the information. Good to have something people can have to look at and see the positive changes.
 - xiv. If the Chancellor's Office could let this live in the data mart, it would be helpful so colleges could drill into this a little bit more.
 - xv. KC Greaney suggested that the group think about adding a measure since the majority of students are part time. Transfer directed students are more likely to be full time.
- b. Review the process for vetting and releasing a new metric to public view.
- i. It was suggested that we should do workshops sooner than later. Fall or spring to talk about the data. If this can also live in the data mart it will connect it with goal setting and changes to practice.
 - ii. KC offered to be a presenter for target setting.
 - iii. Year two should be cumulative.
 - iv. The score card has been asking for some shorter term leading metrics. This throughput measure might be a great one and a good way to vet it. They meet in November and if they do approve it, then it would be a part of the Scorecard when the preliminary scorecard goes out. A fallback plan may be data mart and workshops.
 - v. The group has decided that the most creative name for the new measure is Transfer Level Math Completion Rate (TLMR) Y1 and Y2. Similar for English.
2. Analysis of goal setting data from year 2: Summary of the data from year 2 and a comparison with year 1 results.
- a. For year two, short term and long term goals were required. Went from 4 to 7 indicators required. Programmatic compliance changed from 1 metric to 3.
 - b. More colleges are setting goals on non-required metrics.
 - c. Minimum goals are higher than the maximum goals. Smallest goals set have increased and there is expectation that those at the lowest levels will make the highest gains. It's also more rational than last year.
 - d. With regard to accreditation status, the goals are more rational.
 - e. With regard to college indicators, these numbers make more sense than last time. Minimums are usually increasing faster than maximums. And of course, minimums have more range to change.

- f. The number of colleges setting goals for all indicators is going up, which is nice to see. Thirty-four colleges out of 114 colleges completed all goals.
 - g. Twenty-eight districts provided goals for at least one of the optional choice indicators.
 - h. Goal setting for the optional metric is going up substantially, with 19 to 49 colleges this year. Overall went from 23 to 53, which conveys that colleges are feeling more confident that this is a self-assessment tool.
 - i. Barry suggested that a few folks in the committee could scan this information to see if there is anyone who might need a PRT and offer assistance. This should be positive rather than punitive.
3. Presentation by Jeff Gold from CSU
 - a. Jeff Gold from Cal State presented student success dashboard views from a CSU-developed system.
 - b. It was developed using SAS Business Analytics and they are moving to open source programs.
 - c. Everyone in the committee was extremely excited and impressed with the presentation and the way it can visualize the data.
 - d. The data focused on student success in categories of achievement gaps, demographics, graduation rates and transfer students. It also showed historical trends, predictive analytics and interactive visualizations.
 - e. Everyone agreed that this sneak peek at the CSU dashboard was interesting and inspiring. It would be a great idea to have the whole Advisory Committee look at it for a few minutes at an upcoming meeting.
 4. Major Goals of the Committee for 2016/17 and Future Agenda Items and wrap up.
 - a. The committee again reiterated that this throughput measure, now called Transfer Level Math Completion Rate, is a great measure and could be widely useful to many colleges as a milestone measure.
 - b. The data from CCCCO through the portal made a lot of sense and was reflected by what colleges submitted as goals and even optional goals.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

1. Matthew updated the group briefly on the status of PRTs in all cycles.
2. Mini-PRTs
 - a. Von noted that an idea similar to Mini-PRTs had come up in Strong Workforce discussions, and a subgroup of practitioners will be designated as experts in CTE data. IEPI Mini-PRTs could draw on this bank of experts, too, with appropriate training on the IEPI approach to technical assistance. Von noted that college might benefit from Mini-PRT assistance in areas such as workforce-related counseling and bringing in partner agencies; streamlining curriculum development; and instructional design.
 - b. Val observed that there has been a disconnect between CTE-provided student services and mainline student services; Matthew suggested that this might be a good opportunity to benefit both.
3. *Spotlight* No. 1
 - a. Matthew reiterated the importance of qualitative information in evaluating the effectiveness of PRT technical assistance.
 - b. Bob noted that the purposes of the *Spotlight* are to inform readers about the PRT process, and to illuminate the issues facing the client institutions. This edition focuses on the human touch characteristic of PRTs, and on the story behind the work.
 - c. The PRT process appears to have an impact on the client institutions, on the PRT members, and through them, potentially on their home institutions, too.
 - d. Von suggested using part of the back page to provide information on additional IEPI resources.
 - e. Scott and Matthew reminded the group that plans call for a follow-up about a year after the final visit, to check on the extent to which the institution has been able to sustain progress.

Krista noted that in a year's time, some folks on the campus might well not remember that progress originated with the PRT process.

4. Evaluation of the PRT Process
 - a. Bob said that he likes to look at evaluation data in two steps, a la the Stanford approach: "I wonder..." and "What if...?"
 - b. Val suggested that to improve campus understanding of the process, we could send the point persons a PRT rollout packet, with templates for emails, handouts, and so on.
 - c. Bob noted a couple of overall findings based on the Cycle 1 and Cycle 2B survey results:
 - i. Both the client institutions and the PRTs are finding the process quite positive.
 - ii. Visit 2 is meatier than Visit 1, so one would expect more variety in the commentary about Visit 2, by which time institutions are looking at their issues more deeply. Krista suggested that if this pattern holds, it would be useful to inform PRTs about it ahead of time.
 - iii. Val suggested that change management is important, and that there will always be bumps in the implementation of new initiatives at client institutions. So maybe IEPI should offer help on change management, through PD workshops ("Change Management 101") or even a Mini-PRT. The issue of change management could be addressed in the Menu of Options as appropriate, and might be addressed in a supplemental visit shortly after Visit 2, while the institution is preparing its I&EP. It might also appear in the Visit 3 wrap-up, and might be added to PRT training.
 - d. The group discussed the importance of PRTs emphasizing structures and processes independent of particular persons, economic fluctuations, etc. as much as possible, so that improvements have a better chance of being sustained in the long run.

C. Policy, Procedure, and Practice and Professional Development (Joint Meeting, Theresa and Craig Rutan)

1. Introduction
 - a. Representatives from the RP Group and the P3 workgroup have been working to develop a set of tools that will become part of the Professional Learning Network (PLN).
 - b. Theresa Tena and Craig Rutan introduced the Resource Center materials to the combined workgroups.
 - i. The Resource Center will be an important component of the Professional Learning Network (PLN).
 - ii. The Professional Development Workgroup's feedback on the Resource Center is critical to understanding how the Resource Center might integrate with the PLN.
 - c. Craig Rutan introduced the presenters who are charged with the development of the Resource Center materials:
 - i. Integrated Planning – Barbara McNeice-Stallard
 - ii. Data Disaggregation – Craig Hayward
2. Resource Center Presentations
 - a. Integrated Planning – presented by Barbara McNeice-Stallard
 - i. Barbara addressed the change in nomenclature for this set of resources. These resources were initially named Effective Practices Resources Toolkits, but using feedback from the field, the Effective Practices Resources Toolkits were collectively renamed the Resource Center.
 - ii. Scope of work for the Integrated Planning resource
 - (A) Identify and describe key characteristics of Integrated Planning
 - (B) Create frameworks for Integrated Planning practices
 - iii. Barbara described the Integrated Planning model
 - (A) The Integrated Planning resource can be easily implemented within the diverse educational contexts that exist in the California Community College (CCC) system.

- (B) The Integrated Planning strategies can be used for program reviews and strategic planning.
 - (C) Components of the Integrated Planning cycle model
 - (1) Discover
 - (2) Develop
 - (3) Implement
 - (4) Evaluate
 - (5) Report
 - (6) Mission
 - (D) The general framework could be used to help colleges develop a new integrated planning model or to determine if some step that should be included in the model is missing. There was a desire expressed to see some concrete examples in addition to general models.
 - (E) The Integrated Planning cycle model is useful even during institutional ebbs and flows (e.g., recessions, institutions changes, etc.).
 - (F) Barbara led the group through an activity in which they engaged the Integrated Planning cycle model.
- b. Example of Dissemination of Materials on Dual Enrollment – Michelle Pilati and Anna Stirling
- i. Michelle and Anna described how the Resource Center will integrate with the PLN.
 - ii. They introduced dual enrollment as a concept and shared strategies to disseminate the materials. Posting lengthy Word or PDF documents is not likely to be very useful to colleges. The resources being added to the PLN need to be engaging and interactive. One option would be to create infographics to present the information. Additionally, they can create archived webinars that can be broken into sections, allowing users to review only certain parts of the webinar at each sitting. The ultimate goal is to create learning modules that include assessments and that these modules will grow over time as new information becomes available.
- c. Data Disaggregation – presented by Craig Hayward
- i. The RP group is currently working to develop resources that will convey the importance of data disaggregation and provide guidance on how data disaggregation could be used locally. Online resources are currently under development and those resources will be reviewed by instructional designers, made more engaging, and added to the PLN. The goal is to identify promising practices and processes, with the initial release of tools planned for August and the first presentation of those tools to be at the Strengthening Student Success conference in early October. Some areas where data disaggregation could be useful include looking at student learning outcomes assessment, data on CTE programs, equity, basic skills, accountability, and institutional effectiveness. In order to disaggregate data like SLOs, it would need to be collected on the student level instead of the section level.
 - ii. Data Disaggregation workgroup
 - (A) Consists of three researchers and planners from the CCC system
 - (B) Three draft tools in the Data Disaggregation resource:
 - (1) Enrollment management/student retention
 - (2) SLO disaggregation
 - (3) Assessments
 - (C) The format of the Data Disaggregation resource:
 - (1) Statement of the problem
 - (2) Case studies of colleges with effective Data Disaggregation practices
 - (a) City College of San Francisco
 - (b) Irvine Valley College

- (3) Practice - how do you do it?
 - (a) Provides steps to implement Data Disaggregation practices
 - (b) Practices are broken into focus areas
 - (c) Provides links to additional resources
 - (d) Not just a tool for a researchers; the Data Disaggregation resource will be accessible to trustees, faculty, and administrators
- iii. Major components of the Data Disaggregation resource
 - (A) Defining Data Disaggregation
 - (1) Democratization of data
 - (2) Spectrum of data
 - (a) Accessible data
 - (b) Multivariate modeling
 - (B) Key example: Cross-tabbing
 - (1) An example was provided of disaggregating age groups among special student groups (e.g., veterans)
 - (2) Supports student equity planning
 - (3) Supports the assessment of disproportionate impact

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

- 1. Overview of the Leadership Development RFAs by Jeff Spano
 - a. Introduction to the two types of Leadership Development RFAs
 - i. Colleges/districts
 - ii. Associations/ professional organizations/ institutes
 - b. Nature of the Leadership Development grants
 - i. Non-traditional RFA
 - ii. Chabot-Las Positas CCD allocates these funds as a fiscal agent
 - c. Components of the Leadership Development RFAs
 - i. Background and need
 - ii. Eligible applicants
 - iii. Expected outcomes
 - iv. Allowable use of funds
 - v. Required evaluation
 - vi. Short responses
 - d. Feedback and questions from the P3 workgroup
 - i. Please align the expected outcomes with the application questions so that the colleges/districts and associations/ institute's grant writers can more easily articulate how they plan to meet these expected outcomes.
 - ii. Can a college that offers non-credit coursework (e.g., AB86 institutions: San Diego, Santa Ana, etc.) apply for leadership development funding? There is need for leadership development in non-credit institutions.
 - iii. Please include information about how college/districts and associations/ institutes might be evaluated.
 - iv. Does the rigor of the evaluation change in proportion to the amount awarded?
 - v. Keeping in mind that the range of proposed leadership development needs is going to be broad, can you provide examples of ideal leadership development activities college/districts and associations/ institutes could plan to implement?
 - vi. Could the applications emphasize that we're expecting college/districts and associations/ institutes to tell us the kind of the leadership development programs they are proposing, and we're allowing them to think broadly about leadership development?
 - vii. Please include a grant point person and the application contact information.
 - viii. Please extend the deadline, because the stated 8/19 date may preclude faculty from participating.

2. IEPI's Strategic Communications
 - a. Theresa Tena introduced the IEPI Newsletter
 - i. Short and informative communications
 - ii. Attractively designed
 - iii. We don't want to over-communicate through email. Instead, we want to condense our communications into one or two strategic mediums. The IEPI Newsletter will be one of those mediums.
 - iv. The inaugural IEPI Newsletter will be sent-out August, 2016.
 - b. What should IEPI communicate and how should IEPI communicate?
 - i. Pam Cox-Otto affirmed the importance of episodic Spotlights.
 - (A) Spotlights ought to continue because it offers a deep-dive narrative that provides an insight into the colleagues-help-colleagues PRT approach to technical assistance.
 - (B) It humanizes the PRT visits and emphasis the usefulness of the PRTs, and their ability to benefit any institution in the CCC system
 - ii. Pam Cox-Otto describes the nature and intent of the IEPI Newsletter
 - (A) Short and sweet communications
 - (B) The language of the IEPI Newsletter will avoid "administrivia"
 - (1) The language and rhetoric will get to the heart of the issue in each topic
 - (2) A voice that assumes we are a CCC system, not just individual colleges/district
 - (3) Clean, organized, and attractively designed
 - (C) Avoids over-communication by strategically selecting what should be communicated at the appropriate time
 - (D) Content will be vetted by IEPI and the IE division
 - c. Critiques of communication strategies within the CCC system
 - i. Too many listservs
 - (A) Is there any possibility of streamlining our email communications?
 - (B) Can Interact or CCPRO help us communicate more effectively?

E. Professional Development (Craig Rutan)

1. Basic Skills Summit

Kirsten Corbin provided an update about the upcoming Basic Skills Summit for colleges that received a basic skills transformation grant. Sixty-four colleges were awarded transformation grant and each grant had a maximum award of 1.5 million dollars. Each college applying for a transformation grant needed to implement at least two interventions. Interventions include using high school data for student placement, accelerated sequences in mathematics and English, and incorporating supplemental instruction. 62 of the 64 colleges awarded a grant are attending the summit.

2. Survey Results from Inmate Education Presentation

There were two inmate education events held in June, one at Bakersfield College and one at Chaffey College. Each of these events included a site visit to the prison. A new type of survey was constructed for these events that will be used for IEPI events going forward. The survey is based on whether sessions meet intended outcomes. The survey showed that faculty had a slightly lower opinion of the events than administrators, but the majority of both groups found the event useful. The survey showed that most colleges are in the early stages of developing inmate education programs. Concerns were expressed about startup costs, recruiting faculty that are willing to teach in the prison, and making the programs sustainable. 86% indicated that they would attend another IEPI workshop and one-third of those completing a survey indicated that they would be interested in serving on a PRT. Attendees hope that workshops will include breakout sessions that are designed to deal with the specific needs of attendee groups (faculty, administrators, researchers, etc.).

3. Update on the Professional Learning Network (PLN)
The PLN will now include free access to Lynda.com. Users with a PLN account should have access to Lynda.com trainings beginning on August 1. Since the launch of the PLN in April, several upgrades have already happened. The ability to change privacy settings in myPD has been added. Additionally, the layout of the myPD page has been updated. The submission of calendar events has been improved including the ability to submit recurring events for the PLN calendar. Lynda.com and Grovo with introduction videos will be added to the learn page on the PLN.
4. Upcoming Workshops on Pathways
The IEPI Executive Committee has approved funding workshops on pathways. The pathways workshops may include pathways from high school to college, CTE pathways, guided pathways, meta majors, and other possibilities. Committee members were asked to send in details about pathway programs that might be included in the workshops. These workshops may be two days to allow for a broader discussion of different pathway models.

III. General Session 2

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

IV. Adjournment