



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee Chancellor's Office January 20, 2017, 9:30 am-2:30 pm Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	Lomeli	Alejandro	TA
Bandyopadhyay	Santanu**	PD	Lumapas-Taylor	Quincy	PD
Bellisimo	Yolanda	TA	May	Ginni**	PPP
Burke	Kathleen**	TA	McGinnis	William G.**	TA
Curry	Keith		Oberg	Anjeanette	PD
Fried	Sandy	PD	Purtell	Valentina	Ind
Goold	Grant	Ind	Rutan	Craig	PD
Gribbons	Barry**	Ind	Skinner	Erik**	Ind
Janio	Jarek**	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Jarrell	Paul	TA	Todd	James**	Ind
Kay	Beth	Ind	Van Hook	Dianne**	Ind
Lamanque	Andrew**	PPP	Webb	Catherine	PD
Lee	Matthew C.	TA			

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Julie	PD	Johnson	Catherine	Ind
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Madden	Sean	NA
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	McNeice-Stallard	Barbara	PPP
Davidson	Adore		Rodriguez	Mario**	Ind
Dettman	Sarah	NA	Schrager	Cynthia	NA
DuBreuil	Michelle	PD	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Fisher	Stacy**	Ind	Spano	Jeff**	PD
Howe	Michael	PPP	Stevens	Amy	
Jez	Su Jin	PD	Valverde	Scott	TA

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Bernliner	Rachel		Oakley	Eloy	NA
Leufgen	Jillianne	Ind	Siguenza	Bryanna	NA
Metune	Laura	NA	Tyson	Sarah	Ind
Mills	Keetha		Whitke	Kevin	
Moiuuddin	Saleem				

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

I. General Session 1

- A. Chancellor Eloy Oakley
- B. Keith and Barbara shared Education Moments.
- C. Mario provided an update on the State budget.
 - 1. Two substantial innovations related to institutional effectiveness
 - a. \$150 million one-time funds for Guided Pathways. Trailer bill language will follow with details.
 - b. Innovation Awards, for which the CCCCCO now has broader discretion than before.
 - 2. Modest 1.34% growth, and 1.48% COLA
 - 3. Mario emphasized the need for institutions to include in their budgetary planning the anticipation of a future recession, and the large increases in PERS and STRS contributions that will be required in the next four years.
- D. Barbara provided an update on the Integrated Planning ASK.
 - 1. The ASK uses the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP) definition of integrated planning as “the linking of vision, priorities, people, and the physical institution in a flexible system of evaluation, decision-making and action. It shapes and guides the entire organization as it evolves over time and within its community.”
 - 2. The ASK reflects creation of an integration planning model that includes Discover, Develop, Implement, Evaluate, and Report.
 - a. Each step includes tools, templates, and forms on which the group has asked for and received feedback.
- E. Theresa introduced some new members and guests:
 - 1. Governmental Relations: Laura Metune, Vice Chancellor
 - 2. Success Center: Sandy Fried, Executive Director; Rachel Berliner; and Kevin Whitke
 - 3. New members: Keith Curry and Paul Jarrell

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

- 1. Review Year 3 Completion Data
 - a. Ryan distributed completion data.
 - b. There may be better indicators of momentum points or leading indicators.
 - c. Data driving discussions is important. So, indicators should be selected that help inform and provoke the conversation.
 - d. We should consider making these and similar data available through data on demand or other similar systems for those interested in them.
- 2. Review of current metrics.
 - a. Alice reviewed new metrics like completion of transfer-level English and Math.
 - b. There was considerable discussion of whether it should be degree-applicable or transfer-level for IEPI vs. Scorecard. We should look at the data for both to understand the difference.
 - i. There is quite a bit of discussion related to CSU requiring Algebra II as prerequisite for statistics and currently allowing colleges to not require the prerequisite, though this sunsets in a couple years. There are also discussions among some discipline faculty about requiring stats for degrees. These two factors could have a dramatic impact on decisions about using degree applicable vs. transfer level math.
 - ii. We should continue with the current indicator for Year 4 and keep evaluating the difference for different purposes.
 - c. There is training planned for Scorecard on Feb. 6 and should be expanded to include IEPI indicators.
 - d. The workgroup is also supportive of creating a 45-day vetting process of IEPI data similar to the process for Scorecard data should the Chancellor’s Office want to do that.
- 3. Year 4 Recommendation
 - a. No deletions.

- b. We should split the number of degrees by CTE and non-CTE.
 - c. In regards to the Transfer level English and Math (or degree applicable), we should look at where there is a dropoff (e.g., after 2 years, 3 years, 4, 5, 6?)
 - d. We should consider asking in the portal, probably for Year 4, which 3 indicators were most useful to planning processes, and which indicators were not useful all.
 - e. Non-credit
 - i. No changes for Year 4.
 - ii. It will be interesting to see what people put in the fill-in-the-blank in Year 3.
 - f. No changes to fiscal viability, accreditation status, nor audit.
 - g. Goals for Year 4
 - i. No votes for course completion rate being required.
 - ii. We recommend requiring the following student achievement indicators: Completion (6-year goal only), Transfer-level English/Math after 1 or 2 years (pick one of the 4 indicators), Median Time to degree (6 year goal), Required College Choice from the list, Number of Degrees/certs combined (CCCCO approved certs only).
 - iii. No changes to fiscal, accreditation, or audit goals at this time. However, we may need to revisit Fiscal after checking with Mario to see if he has any need for changes to them.
4. Other
- a. Sometime in the future, we should blend the single place for data (data lake or Datamart) with non-required indicators.
 - b. We should make available a standard set of data for various purposes in a single spot.
 - c. Strong Workforce
 - i. We should look at the data for number of degrees/certs duplicated (like IEPI) vs unduplicated (like Launchboard).
 - ii. If we decide to make changes to IEPI in the future based on these data, we could include both during a transition period.
 - iii. We should look at employment in Q2 and Q4 and wage in Q2 at the college-level for Year 5. If promising, we should begin letting folks know that it's coming.
 - iv. We should discuss the alignment of IEPI indicators with Strong Workforce, including the above.
 - d. We should look at what goals are required in various states.
5. Future Agenda Items
- a. Changes to Fiscal Goals if any.
 - b. Portal Changes in Year 4
 - c. Data Visualizations
 - d. Data from Research or Strong Workforce described above.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

1. The group welcomed Paul and Alejandro as new members.
2. Matthew updated the group on the status of PRT processes in all cycles, including the Mini-PRTs and COPs.
 - a. Bill suggested that it might be appropriate for IEPI to work with CCLC on CEO training and leadership, perhaps through Mini-PRTs, especially for new arrivals from out of state.
 - b. Yolanda highlighted enrollment management as an appropriate topic for a Mini-PRT.
 - c. Kathleen noted that evaluation of the COPs should be specific, and Matthew observed that that would depend on the topic developed by each COP organically.
 - d. Members noted the need to prepare client institutions after V3 for future IEPI contacts/requests, especially as related to evaluation of long-term PRT effects.
 - i. Matthew will build in notification of client CEOs about those future contacts.
3. Evaluation report on Cycle 2A, Visits 1 and 2
 - a. Matthew reminded members that data for this cycle are inconsistent, in part because of difficulties in the handoff between the original outside evaluators and the current evaluator.

- b. Matthew walked through the report, answered questions, and took the following suggestion:
 - i. Clarify the source question for Table 20 item g, to ensure that the meaning of what is now “institutional community” is plain.
- 4. Suggestions for future agenda items
 - a. On what quantitative measures should we focus?
 - b. Video of PRT client personnel and PRT members discussing their experiences
 - i. Using the resources of Interact to produce the videos
 - c. How to capture success stories and group them together
 - d. Input measures for the PRT process
 - e. Survey of all CEOs: What kind of issues might you want help on? Responses would provide guidance to both PRT development and PD.
 - i. Then perhaps offer PRT help in specific commonly reported areas.
 - ii. Recruit expertise from partner organizations with an emphasis on those areas.
 - iii. Sample topics that the group identified as likely candidates included emergency preparation, completion, Title IX, dealing with and basic needs such as student housing and food, mental health issues, and new federal government policies that will have an impact on CCC students.

C. Professional Development (Craig Rutan)

- 1. Review of scheduled PD activities
 - a. The list of PD events scheduled through May was distributed. Typically the last workshop of a series is videotaped for the PLN, and due to the long waitlist for the February 26th Pathways Training Workshop, it will be livestreamed.
 - b. IEPI will be hosting more Integrated Planning workshops. The early IP trainings will now transition from being RP Group convenings to IEPI-sponsored workshops.
 - c. The February 4th Dual Enrollment Workshop in Long Beach sold out, so an additional one will be held in the south—the search for a location for it is underway.
 - d. Plans for developing and planning a Leadership Summit will proceed once more feedback is received regarding what the summit ought to address.
- 2. Review/discuss results of last meeting’s priority polling of additional topics from 11/7 visioning meeting
 - a. The list of additional topics to turn into future IEPI workshops, grouped according to the priority determined at the previous meeting, was distributed.
 - b. Many of the high-priority topics relate to integrating initiatives at community colleges.
 - i. Work is underway at the Chancellor’s Office to better align and integrate SSSP, SE and BSI. A draft for this redesign should be released February 15th.
 - c. It was decided that there should be a change management component as part of each IEPI workshop to equip attendees with information on the change management aspects of implementing new ideas at their college.
- 3. Input on and volunteers for Emergency Preparedness workshop planning
 - a. Work is being done to develop an Emergency Preparedness Workshop.
 - i. A suggestion to do this as a large summit in which colleges could select training from a range of potential topics was met with widespread support. This would allow the workshop to meet colleges’ diverse needs.
 - b. Volunteers are needed for a planning committee; please contact Scott Valverde in the Chancellor’s office to volunteer.
- 4. Upcoming Letter of Interest for Year Three PD Fiscal Agent
 - a. A Letter of Interest is to come out February 23rd.
 - b. This is not an indication that the relationship with Chabot-Las Positas has been anything but positive; the initial contract was for only a two-year term rather than the typical five, so it is about to expire.
- 5. Review/revisit list of priority topics for PLN

- a. A list of topics previously agreed upon as valuable resources to get on the PLN without an accompanying workshop was distributed.
 - i. Topics in bold were confirmed as being high priority.
 - ii. Feedback should be solicited from members of the Advisory Committee about what ought to be covered by these topics, given how broadly they could be interpreted.
 - b. The suggestion to try to get mandated training programs (e.g., sexual harassment training) on the PLN in such a way that employees could get a certification of completion was met with widespread approval.
 - i. It was noted that the requirements for these trainings are complex and go through a wide range of offices. It will be important that they be properly vetted in order for the colleges to adopt them as standard practice.
6. Provide feedback on methods of soliciting PLN submissions
- a. A push is underway to increase content on the PLN; various strategies for getting quality content were discussed.
 - b. Concern was expressed about the vetting process and the labeling of faculty-relevant practices on the PLN as “best practices” without being vetted by the Academic Senate.
 - i. Content is vetted for quality by @One prior to being uploaded to the site, but this process is not as rigorous as some would prefer.
 - ii. Agreement was reached that the PLN should differentiate between thoroughly vetted material labeled in a way that emphasizes that it is a “best of” practice and material that is promising, but for which there is no evidence.
 - (A) Labels for these two categories to be used on the PLN will be proposed at the next meeting.
7. PD evaluation update on Dual Enrollment
- a. Dual Enrollment Workshops have been very highly rated. Of particular note is the success of the presenters’ interactive style. Many have commented on appreciating being collaborated with rather than lectured to.
 - b. The most significant recommendations that have been made are to fine-tune the structure of table discussions to make them more relevant to the different roles of attendees, and to have more concrete models to aid in putting partnership agreements together.

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

- 1. Review minutes from December 2, 2016
 - a. Edits to be submitted to Sean Madden after the session adjourns.
- 2. Report out on ASK Project
 - a. Strategic enrollment management
 - i. Advance notification of SEM survey sent to PIOs, CIOs, CBOs, CEOs, and CSSOs, as well as Academic Senate and researchers. 108 responses to date. Much interest in survey. Suggestion made that a reminder email should be sent to all parties.
 - ii. Currently conducting literature review. Already met with Frances Parmelee at CCCCCO about how colleges are funded.
 - iii. First convening on SEM project will be March 2, 2017 at the CCC Chancellor’s Office.
 - iv. Intent to keep survey findings low-level, digestible.
 - v. Michelle Barton and Theresa Tena met with CIOs on January 16, 2017. Discussed access and retention. CIOs discussed new initiatives toward completion and remarked that, during transition from access to completion, there will be declining FTES reported.
 - vi. Important to navigate CIO-CSSO relationship related to SEM.
 - vii. ASKs are not about changing funding models. Rather, they are about relationships at the college and district levels that affect SEM.
 - viii. CCCCCO materials require updating to reflect new funding through most recent budget act.

- b. Outline process of ASK materials to PLN
 - i. Group quickly looked over the “ASK Material for the PLN (Draft)” document on their own.
 - ii. A brief history of PLN and a summary of what PLN now contains were provided. There is a desire for more colleges and individuals to submit effective or “promising” practices so that PLN becomes a more viable source of information.
 - iii. There is a desire for PLN to serve as baseline of information for PRTs and a repository of resources for colleges.
 - iv. The suggestion was made that faculty could help write ASK outcomes. The language needs to be clearer and more cohesive.
 - v. IEPI Executive Committee discussed the need to balance sharing resources of practices now occurring at colleges with need to highlight and underscore documentation and research designating activities as exemplary. P3 members expressed concern about sharing problematic materials. There is a concern about who is doing the vetting. The vetting process needs to be strong, rigorous. Suggestions made:
 - (A) PLN explicitly state that “promising practices” are not vetted.
 - (B) PLN also make explicit who is doing the vetting.
 - (C) There should be rubrics to facilitate the vetting process.
 - (D) Those vetting the ASKs amend the materials themselves if they think such amendments would benefit the materials. Concern was expressed that such practice would need to tread lightly given that edits could change the focus/meaning of the materials.
 - (E) Monthly status reports include updates on vetting.
 - vi. We can always take problematic ASK material off the PLN.
 - vii. PLN is useful for CEOs in particular. The PLN is a way of warehousing information for new CEOs. Lifespan of a CEO is short. Listservs cannot store information the same way the PLN can.
 - viii. Suggestion made that the PLN offer a “like/dislike” function as well as the ability for PLN users to leave comments on ASKs.
 - ix. Suggestion made that PLN should include a visual seal of approval for vetted effective practices so that there is no confusion as to what is effective and what is simply “promising.”
 - x. Suggestion made to shorten the draft language and use it to replace what is already on the PLN.
 - xi. Four attendees volunteered to review PLN and edit draft language to reflect vetting process.
- c. Integrated planning
 - i. Next scope of work includes helping colleges directly.
 - ii. Desire for guidance from the field on leadership component.
 - iii. Just accepted by RP Group to present on integrated planning at their upcoming conference in San Francisco.
 - iv. Will present to board members and CEOs on leadership at CCLC Annual Legislative Conference in Sacramento on January 29, 2017.
- d. Grovo.com
 - i. Full accessibility set for April 2017.
- e. Data disaggregation
 - i. Time-to-degree white paper almost ready.
 - ii. Phase 1 tools in finalization process.
 - iii. Phase 2 tools in development.
 - iv. DD helps with student equity planning.

- v. Paper recently submitted to upcoming veterans conference. “Art and Heart of Data Disaggregation” accepted for conference in March 2017.
 - vi. Requirement of DD for SLOs discussed.
 - vii. Much of what Craig Hayward shared is already available on the PLN.
3. Presentation of additional ASK concepts
 - a. Concepts for ASKs
 - i. Governance
 - ii. Resource allocation
 - iii. Change management/leadership
 - iv. Pathways
 - b. Overview of areas of focus identified by Letters of Interest as included in 2016 IEPI legislative report
 - c. Strong and diverse faculty presence needed on pathways ASK.
 - d. Overlap of various ASKs discussed.
 4. Proposed statutory, regulatory, practice changes related to pathways (Bill Scroggins, President of Mt. SAC)
 - a. Pathways as a concept defined.
 - b. State of the system defined in terms of pathways initiative.
 - c. Multiple measures placement championed. State needs to rethink common assessment test.
 - d. Suggestion made that we have innovated enough, and now it is time to implement.
 - e. Many different kinds of pathways are successful depending on college, its community, its population.
 - f. Changes to Title V can positively impact pathways implementation.
 - g. Discussed issue of possible IT nightmare as a result of giving priority enrollment to students who have met program prerequisites.
 - h. Noncredit and pathways discussed. Noncredit as prerequisite not likely to be a problem. Main problem is creating noncredit courses of quality that can be used for transfer. Noncredit needs are growing. How can noncredit help students to achieve their goals?
 5. Communications/marketing update
 - a. Discussion of new role-specific one-pagers aimed at trustees, faculty, classified staff, CEOs, and administrators. One-pagers are vetted and will be printed for upcoming events.
 - b. Campaign of gratitude underway. Those who have participated on a PRT will receive IEPI polo shirt as well as portfolios.
 - c. IEPI website undergoing continual improvement. Version 2.0 just finalized.
 - d. IEPI now on Twitter. Visit twitter.com/ccc_iepi.
 - e. Livestreaming of professional development events underway. Interest in making livestream interactive, so that those watching remotely can ask questions and make comments in real time.

III. General Session 2

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

IV. Adjournment