Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Sheraton Grand Sacramento
September 8, 2016, 9:30 am-2:30 pm
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Barton	Michelle	PPP	Lamanque	Andrew	PPP
Brown	Aaron	TA	Larkin	Patti	PD
Burke	Kathleen	TA	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Carr	Leslie	PD	Leong	Tim	PPP
Chadwick	Jan	TA	May	Ginni	PPP
Cox	Jana	PPP	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Dain	Claudette	PPP	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Druley	Jennifer	PD	Randall	Meridith	PD
Fiero	Diane	PD	Rutan	Craig	PD
Garcia	Valentin	TA	Skinner	Erik	Ind
Goold	Grant	Ind	Stanskas	John	Ind
Greaney	KC	Ind	Suarez	Angelica	PPP
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Todd	James	PD
Heumann	Michael	Ind	Walthers	Kevin	
Janio	Jarek	Ind	Warren-Marlatt	Rebeccah K.	Ind

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind	Keeley	Mia	PD
Adams	Julie	PD	Larson	Erin	PD
Atalig	Christina	Ind	McNeice-Stallard	Barbara	PPP
Baker	Karen	NA	Pacheco	Robert	TA
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Pilati	Michelle	PD
DuBreuil	Michelle	PD	Rodriguez	Mario	Ind
Fisher	Stacy	Ind	Schrager	Cynthia	Ind
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Spano	Jeff	PD
Harrington	Deborah	PD	Stirling	Anna	PD
Howe	Michael	PPP	Thorne	Terra	NA
Johns	Krista	NA	Valverde	Scott	TA
Johnson	Catherine	Ind	Van Ommeren	Alice	Ind

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Connick	Debra	PPP/Ind	Tyson	Sarah	Ind
deAnda	Rosa	PPP	Woodyard	LeBaron	PPP
Roberts	Matthew	Ind			

Wkgrp: Ind = IE Indicators; PPP = Policy, Procedure, and Practice; PD = Professional Development; TA = Technical Assistance   *2*

I.   General Session 1

A. Kevin and Angelica shared Education Moments.

B. Amy Stevens of Interact provided a communications update.
1. The IEPI website is officially up and running, and work has already begun on version 2. Ronnie Slimp is the contact person for maintaining the website, and will process feedback received. The use of social media is still under discussion.
2. Interact will be shooting video footage today for a short introduction to IEPI. A few interviews will be conducted during the lunch break.
3. The bimonthly newsletter has begun publication.
4. The content approval process for the website is in development.
5. Amy asked members to spread the word about both the website and the listserv.

C. Barry gave an update on activities related to indicators.
1. In response to a question about why there are so many indicators, John Stanskas cited both legislative and institutional needs, based on wide input. The Workgroup will soon begin a discussion on whether reducing the number of indicators would be appropriate.
2. The Workgroup will soon begin work on Year 4, with a discussion of noncredit indicators and the portal structure scheduled for today. Changes are not expected to be numerous.

D. Matthew gave an update on technical assistance activities.
1. In Cycle 1 (for which services commenced in Spring 2015), only two of the eight institutions have yet to complete the process, and one of those will receive its follow-up third visit next week. Discussions of the follow-up visit for the last institution are still underway.
2. All 17 institutions in Cycle 2A (for which services commenced in Fall 2015) have completed both the initial and second visits, and five follow-up visits have been set.
3. In Cycle 2B (for which services commenced in Spring 2016), all initial and second visits have been completed, and two follow-up visits have been set.
4. In Cycle 3A (for which services have commenced in Fall 2016), all but one of the 11 institutions have set their first visits, and all but three have set their second. One PRT is still missing a Lead, but otherwise all PRTs are complete. The Fall PRT Fundamentals Webinar was offered, as was the first of the PRT Workshops; the second is scheduled for September 16.
5. Twelve institutions so far have been approved for Spring 2017 (Cycle 3B). Three more are expected, to bring the total to the maximum of 15.
6. The evaluation process for training is running smoothly now.

E. Theresa gave the Policy, Procedure, and Practice update.
1. Leadership development was explicitly included in the 2015-16 IEPI budget, and the Chancellor's Office has launched an application for grant funding to support activities in that area by districts and organizations.
2. Work on the Resource Center on the PLN is continuing. Discussion of the Enrollment Management tool will kick off in the Workgroup today.
3. The Workgroup has received a request to discuss the funding formula, and will share the results of that discussion with the appropriate bodies.
4. Theresa introduced guest Richard Winn, the Vice President of Operations for ACCJC, who is spearheading preparations for the first annual ACCJC conference, scheduled for Spring 2017.

F. Craig gave an update on professional development.
1. The Workgroup will be looking a survey results for the Basic Skills Initiative today.
2. Craig noted the upcoming new workshops on curriculum and financial aid.

3. Work continues on developing content for the PLN.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

1. Workshops on Indicators and Goalsetting
   a. Have two workshops, one in the north and one in the south.
   b. KC volunteered to present with Barry and Stacy.
2. Non-credit Metric Update and Detail
   a. 5 colleges have SP grade reported.
   b. SP goes to the BOG for approval in November.
   c. Alice will check on when people can submit SP grades and confirm it is optional.
   d. The ASCCC and CCCCO should consider sending a message on this matter.
3. Portal Structure, including Indicators that Don't Apply to All Colleges
   a. For indicators that don't apply to all colleges, it's not necessary to split off into a different area of the portal. Rather, they can be filled in with NA or footnoted with <10.
4. Deleting Indicators
   a. The group concluded that we should keep all indicators, though improvements in how they are visually presented might help.
5. Future Indicators
   a. Consider additional employment and wage data. Look at CTEOS with other Launchboard data.
   b. Consider 3 Year completion rate.
6. Future Items
   a. Year 4 Indicators: Which should have short-term and long-term required goals?
7. Stacy reviewed Year 3 Framework of Indicators (a handout was provided).
8. Stacy reviewed the Analysis of Individual Indicators (a handout was provided).
9. The group suggested consideration of making data downloadable into Excel.
10. Common Portal
    a. It would be good to have basic student equity data prepared by a single source. Colleges could augment with additional data.
    b. Have all the data accessible from one place.
    c. Ideally a common set of indicators and disaggregations would be identified, from which subsets would be used for various purposes.
    d. Careful consideration needs to be given to goal-setting, avoiding top down and encouraging improvements connected to actions.
11. Alignment of IEPI Indicators with System Goals.
    a. There are currently some linkages, but could be more aligned.
    b. Consider additional possible indicators for the system in future meetings.
    c. Common portal might help bridge interconnections.
    d. Common portal can also help with integrated planning with the initiatives.
    e. We should make an inventory of all the indicators. Barry, Craig, Alice, Jarek, and Gary volunteered to help with this.

B. *Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)*

1. Matthew introduced Kathleen Burke, President of LA Pierce College, who is replacing Brian King as the CEO rep on this Workgroup.
2. Matthew facilitated a discussion of what has gone well and what could have gone better in the PRT process to date.
   a. What has gone well: Highlights of the discussion included the following:
      i. We have implemented in a very short time a process that has worked very well.
      ii. The training model is good.
      iii. The Workgroup has provided good input in a very collaborative setting, and the input has shaped the process.

      iv.   People around the state have bought into the value of the process, and are interested in PRTs, as both clients and members.

      v.   Evaluations are integral to the process.

  b. What could have gone better: Highlights of the discussion included the following:

      i.   Communication and marketing about the nature and purposes of the PRT process could have been better, though they have steadily improved since the first cycle.

      ii.   Using CEOs as the source of the LOIs caused some concern early on, but the implementation of the more detailed treatment with the Senate President's input has helped.

      iii.   The Workgroup does not have a clear enough sense of how the process has been improved. Matthew said he would bring a summary of changes to the next meeting.

      iv.   Trends in LOIs and AOFs, as well as both intended and unanticipated effects of the process, should be part of the evaluation. Bob Pacheco indicated that evaluation to date has focused on improving the process and structure; capturing trends and changes will be next.

      v.   Results and implications of the process should come back to inform IEPI; Matthew noted that that is already happening with respect to professional development, since he forwards potential topics drawn from the PRT evaluations to the PD Workgroup co-chairs.

      vi.   We need to be able to demonstrate the extent to which the PRTs are working as intended. The Spotlights are great, but the first issues do not address how each PRT's involvement added value to the institution's improvement processes.

      vii.   Questions for future discussion: What happens when all institutions that want assistance have gone through the process? What analysis should be done on expenditures reports?

      viii.   We need to build in multiple perspectives on the extent to which the PRT process has contributed to long-term progress.

  c. Bill noted that Butte, which is receiving PRT assistance this Fall, has a leadership development program that could benefit the whole system by reducing "raids" of other institutions' leaders.

3. Bill reported on his Mini-PRT visit at Riverside CCD.

  a. Bill volunteered to pilot the process to allow for better follow-up and for training or other resources.

  b. The aim was to improve Board practices and goal-setting, but communication also arose as an issue during the visit, and improving communication was added as a Board goal.

  c. The Board will analyze its progress after four and 12 months.

  d. Informally at the end of the visit, Board members indicated that it had been helpful, and staff said it had been fabulous.

  e. Bill observed that in his experience (which encompasses Board training for 35 districts), boards need professional development, too. The group wondered whether CCLC, for example, might be receptive to using IEPI funds to promote and provide more training for trustees. Matthew said he would follow up.

4. Spotlight

  a. The group reviewed the latest Spotlight briefly, and suggested that Spotlights should be distributed through the IEPI website and listserv and through the CEO-all listserv.

  b. One member commented that the daily news feed from the CCCCO is great.

  c. One member suggested that each PRT Spotlight indicate how many PRTs were active at the time.

  d. See also the note on Spotlights under section II.B.2.b above.

  e. Bob said that the next Spotlight would feature indicators and goal-setting.

5. Matthew asked the group what elements of technical assistance would be most important to share in the upcoming annual report to the Legislature by IEPI. Suggestions included the following:

    a. What PRTs have achieved: Visit evaluation results, Spotlights

    b. Summary of most common Areas of Focus, perhaps with context and analysis of the reasons for any patterns

    c. On what activities client institutions are spending their seed grant funds

    d. The PRT process is still in its infancy, and improvements are ongoing.

C. *Professional Development (Craig Rutan)*

1. Professional Learning Network Focus Groups: The IEPI Professional Development Workgroup was broken into two groups to discuss the Professional Learning Network (PLN). One of the goals is to improve the structure, content, and the searchability of the PLN. New content for the PLN will be reviewed and vetted by a wide group of individuals from various constituent groups. A call will be going out to constituent groups to submit available resources or create new resources to be included in the PLN.

2. What should the PLN look like in the future? What resources need to be added? How does the site need to be modified based on usage and user feedback? A survey may be sent to the field to determine why people come to the PLN and what they are looking for from the PLN.

3. Emergency Preparedness: IEPI will be conducting a series of professional development workshops on this topic during spring 2017. Members of the PD workgroup completed a survey about their college/district emergency preparedness training and procedures. The results from the surveys will help inform the design of the upcoming workshops.

4. Curriculum and Financial Aid Workshops: IEPI held two workshops with 183 attendees in Irvine and 160 attendees in Sacramento. The ultimate goal of the workshops was ensuring that financial aid resources are available to help students stay in school. The workshops covered federal and state financial aid requirements. Currently, community college students receive approximately 3 billion dollars in financial aid each year, with 1.9 billion coming from federal Pell Grants. In order for students to be eligible for federal financial aid, students must be enrolled in a program of at least 16 units. The workshops also covered possible funding for students taking noncredit courses as a clock-hour program.

5. Survey Results from Basic Skills Summit: A basic skills summit was held in Sacramento for the 64 colleges that received a basic skills innovation grant. Of those 64 colleges, 62 colleges had at least one representative at the summit. The attendees were asked to complete a survey similar to the one used for the inmate education events. Two thirds of the attendees felt that the summit helped position their colleges to be successful in implementing the grants. Approximately half the attendees were satisfied with the information that the summit provided on implementing specific interventions. Forty-five percent of attendees were satisfied with the information about incorporating basic skills changes into their integrated planning processes. Thirty-four percent of attendees were satisfied with the information presented on regulations related to basic skills and 60% were satisfied with the information on improving student performance. The attendees appreciated the time networking with other colleges and sharing practices across colleges. In the future, attendees would like to see repeated breakout sessions, with more specific details instead of overview information. The biggest challenge identified was overcoming faculty resistance to change.

6. Change Management: The workgroup discussed the possible ways to present information on change management to colleges. Available resources on change management from Lynda.com need to be reviewed to determine how useful they are. Additionally, representatives from the PLN should reach out to the field to have previous presentations incorporated into the PLN. There was some concern that colleges needing help with change management might not know to come to the PLN, so advertising available resources may be important. The workgroup also felt that change management topics should be included in every IEPI professional development event to assist colleges with implementation of the changes they learned about.

7. Update on the Professional Learning Network: Interact will help develop the marketing and outreach plan for the PLN. Colleges have the ability to designate a local administrator that can assign custom trainings as well as those in Grovo, Lynda.com, and Skillsoft when it launches in

2017. The PLN is forming focus groups to review new features of the PLN. Colleges need the PLN to provide certificates or some other proof of completion and this will be available for Grovo resources with their October release. The PLN is up to 3000 registered users.

8. A Holistic Approach to Professional Learning: A proposal for a research project on professional development was originally sent to the Academic Senate's Foundation to possibly fund the project. The ASCCC Foundation reviewed the proposal and thought that the project was broader than faculty professional development and thought that IEPI might be a better venue for this work. The workgroup reviewed the proposal and thought that the project was worth exploring. The workgroup recommended sending the proposal to the IEPI Executive Committee to consider funding the research.

D. *Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)*
  1. PLN
     a. IEPI is hosting a series of college-based meetings on integrated planning in order to give guiding input to IEPI Integrated Planning Resource Center.
     b. Convenings are day-long facilitated workshops for exploring tools, gathering stakeholder feedback, and creating deliverable plans to bolster integrated planning.
     c. Logic model allows you the opportunity to backwards-map.
     d. Need to add leadership development piece to PLN. Push for leadership not just at the top but from the middle.
     e. Need to engage users with more interactive material on PLN.
     f. What is the impact of PLN on the individual user? What are the various levels of engagement with PLN? How do we evaluate this? Discussion of focus groups. Hope for measurable change on campuses as a result of PLN.
     g. PLN should be a foundational piece in PRT training. PLN needs to be more widely utilized within the CCC system.
     h. Basic skills research reports, then and now. Current reports are more in-depth and complex as a result of basic skills training.
  2. Leadership Development
     a. Gap analysis was prepared by Keren Stashower. Interviews with trainers and trainees. Institutional funds for cross-silo leadership development. Desire for interesting, innovative approaches to leadership development. Desire for teamwork within colleges and districts to promote leadership development.
     b. Next visioning meeting is scheduled for November 7 in Sacramento.
     c. Tim Leong with CCPRO is interested in professional development opportunities for his organization.
     d. Ongoing integration and awareness are necessary. Strategies needed for better communication between divisions, groups.
     e. Question regarding seed money: Can PRTs assist colleges in helping them to internally succeed and function as cohesive units? Theresa Tena says yes. Jeff Spano and Theresa Tena responded to questions regarding PRTs.
     f. Theresa Tena defined "visioning committee" for the group.
  3. Professional Development/Enrollment Management
     a. One of the challenges of enrollment management is that a person's individual expertise has a unique influence on how that person views enrollment management. How can we reconcile these various viewpoints with how the college views and handles enrollment management?
     b. The group provided individual definitions of enrollment management.
        i. Essence of it is "butts in seats." Must be mission-centric, focused on the community. Future-focused. Must maximize time, space, and expertise to create right opportunities at the right time and place with the right professors to satisfy student needs.
        ii. Meeting the needs of students so that they reach their goals in the most efficient manner possible.

        iii. Process of aligning college course offerings with student needs. Helping students to graduate on time. Creating most efficient pathway to graduation.
        iv. Not just about onboarding students but retaining students.
        v. Efficiency. Space utilization. Thinking about class size, not just curriculum. Thinking about class size from funding perspective. Providing enough low-cost offerings to offset high-cost offerings. Looking at waitlists to determine student needs, rather than imposing what the administration thinks students need on students.
        vi. Faculty preferences vs. student needs.
        vii. Flexibility in good economy and bad economy.
        viii. Courses must meet student and community needs. Must meet productivity and budget needs. Accreditation standards. Sequencing of courses must be carefully choreographed. Pass rates not always indicative of instructor talent and abilities.

    c. Student access vs. student success. Student success is a product of student access. Funding comes from creating access.
    d. Marketing and advertising efforts to boost enrollment.
    e. California's population is stagnant in metropolitan areas. Population is growing in rural areas.
    f. Sustainability. How do we manage enrollment over time?
    g. Formal definition of enrollment management given and discussed.

4. Spotlights
    a. Another avenue for communication.
    b. Too marketing-oriented, potentially.

5. Interact assistance. Broad discussion of technical assistance.

6. Marketing IEPI
    a. Effort to tailor marketing materials for professional development resources to individual groups, e.g., CBOs, Student Services personnel.

7. Changes to system funding formula
    a. Many PRT requests for enrollment management.
    b. Two-thirds of our campuses are losing enrollment. Even a good district is in danger of losing two to three million dollars annually.
    c. Apportionment formula needs to be changed; IEPI as change agent. Some funding must be tied to success; some funding must be tied to equity; argument is that too much of the funding formula is tied to enrollment. Problematic that no growth in enrollment leads to less funding. Belief that two-thirds of campuses should not be penalized for losing enrollment, when California population is in large part stagnant.
    d. Student Success Taskforce research. Out-of-state funding models.

8. Data disaggregation
    a. Argument that it should not be used as proxy for equity.
    b. Limitations vs. possibilities needs to be addressed; data disaggregation must provide empirical evidence.
    c. Asian subpopulation
    d. How do you deal with multiethnic students, that is, how do you report on a student who is, for instance, half-white and half-Chinese?
    e. MIS requirements vs. what college might want to do locally.

9. IEPI's relationship with Strong Workforce and California College Promise

III. General Session 2
    A. Matthew, Barry, Ginni, and Craig Rutan shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions (see above).

IV. Adjournment