



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Chancellor's Office
March 10, 2017, 9:30 am-2:30 pm
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Barton	Michelle	Ind	Leong	Tim	PD
Bellisimo	Yolanda	TA	Lomeli	Alejandro	TA
Brown	Aaron	TA	Lumapas-Taylor	Quincy	PD
Bruno	Julie	PD	May	Ginni	PPP
Burke	Kathleen	TA	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Carr	Leslie	PD	Mehdizadeh	Mojdeh	Ind
Cox	Jana	PPP	Messina	Kimberlee	TA
Dain	Claudette	PPP	Meuschke	Daylene	Ind
Fried	Sandy	PD	Oberg	Anjeanette	PD
Garcia	Valentin	TA	Purtell	Valentina	Ind
Greaney	KC	Ind	Rutan	Craig	PD
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Schardt	Jan	PD
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Suarez	Angelica	PPP
Heumann	Michael	Ind	Swarm	Darryl	TA
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Janio	Jarek	Ind	Todd	James	Ind
Jarrell	Paul	TA	Vo-Kumamoto	Tram	Ind
Kay	Beth	Ind	Wah	Linda	PPP
Lamanque	Andrew	PPP	Webb	Catherine	PD
Larkin	Patti	PD			

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind	Madden	Sean	NA
Atalig	Christine	Ind	Pacheco	Robert	NA
Davidson	Adore	PPP	Pilati	Michelle	PD
Dettman	Sarah	NA	Schrager	Cynthia	PD
DuBreuil	Michelle	PD	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Fisher	Stacy**	Ind	Spano	Jeff**	PD
Fuller	Ryan**	Ind	Stevens	Amy	PPP
Howe	Michael	PPP	Stirling	Anna	PD
Jez	Su Jin	PD	Valverde	Scott	TA
Johnson	Catherine	Ind	Van Ommeren	Alice**	Ind
Larson	Erin**	TA/ PD			

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Bernliner	Rachel	PPP	Siguenza	Bryanna	NA
Cerna	Oscar	PPP	Stoup	Gregory	Ind
de Anda	Rosa	PPP	Swan	Gary	Ind
Leufgen	Jillianne	Ind	Urbano	Juan	PPP
Moiuuddin	Saleem	PPP	Wutke	Kevin	

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

I. General Session 1

- A. Valentina and Barry shared Education Moments.
- B. Matthew asked applicable members to notify their organizational leads by the end of the month if they want to serve again in 2017-18.
- C. Both the Integrated Planning and Data Disaggregation Applied Solutions Kits are now available on the PLN.
- D. Members moved to Workgroup sessions earlier than usual to accommodate the midday presentation on Data Visualization.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

1. Alice Van Ommeren and Stacy Fisher gave an overview of the portal and its metrics as well as the webinar held Wednesday, March 9, 2017.
 - a. The portal allows colleges to see their previous year's goals. This feature is only accessible when people log in. It's not publically available.
 - b. There is an ongoing concern that there is not enough time from data availability to the goals' due date in June.
 - c. The one metric that caused the most confusion was the OPEB liability.
 - d. All new metrics are on Scorecard except Time-To-Degree and Participation Rate.
 - e. Transfer level Completion rate and other data may be up on Datamart at some point, but it is available on Data-on-Demand and Scorecard now.
 - f. The portal will be populated in early April once Scorecard comes out.
 - g. Overall, the webinar was well done and positive.
2. Review of data on short-term metrics
 - a. Ryan Fuller went over the handout, which used existing Scorecard metric outcomes at 2, 3, and 4 years, as well as the 30-units-in-first-year Scorecard momentum point and 15-units-in-first-term Scorecard momentum point.
 - i. Handouts are attached.
 - ii. Interesting data.
 - iii. It might be helpful to supply companion tool kits with these metrics to inform planning.
 - iv. The group discussed the 30-units-in-first-year Scorecard momentum point and it was noted that the cohort size in this comparison was larger.

(A) The data showed that 88% of students with 30 units in the first year have a completion outcome within 6 years.
 - b. There was a discussion that students should be encouraged to take as many units as possible and get through as soon as possible, but each student's hurdles need to be considered, as well, especially with the number of non-traditional students.
 - i. Many counselors across colleges are resistant to push students to take more classes because they are empathetic to other demands on time.
 - ii. While maybe not every student should go full time given various reasons why students wouldn't be able to, getting 5-10% of students to shift to full time would have a big impact.

- c. It was suggested to have the information available on Data-on-Demand and cross-promote it with a link from the IEPI site to additional data resources in order to increase awareness.
 - d. The students who attempted 30 units in the metrics need to be included, not just the ones who completed them, for the full picture.
 - e. The reason the six-year window is important is because students have a six-year maximum for financial aid.
 - f. An internal system for Scorecard should be created that would follow cohorts as they are progressing. This would fit nicely with ASKs (Applied Solution Kits) and the idea of creating a place with a variety of tools and guidance on how to use them.
 - g. It was suggested that someone write a statewide brief that looks at provocative data with direct implications to be made available (Data-on-Demand) to each college so they could compare that with their numbers.
 - i. Once this is published, it was recommended to get this to regional research groups, who can then have a discussion and make sure it is disseminated on campus.
 - ii. There will be a conversation with the RP Group regarding the brief and who will write it, and this will put it on a list for future IEPI indicators.
3. The group revisited time to degree and discussed concerns from the scorecard webinar and possible definitions.
- a. The indicators portal has a few new metrics: Transfer-Level Completion rate, Participation rate, and the Time to Degree rate. There was a discussion to whether or not to place these on the Scorecard.
 - i. The decision was to place the Transfer-Level Completion rate on the Scorecard this year but keep the Participation rate off. The Time to Degree rate was also withheld because people felt that metric wasn't ready for the public.
 - ii. There are different definitions for Time to Degree across the country and the state, so there was hesitancy in putting a definition on the Scorecard. There were questions regarding special admits, stop-outs, and where students start and end, among others.
 - iii. The Workgroup decided not to include special admits, but it was mentioned it would be good to at least flag them.
 - iv. Time to Degree will still go out on the portal with our definition.
 - v. With the increasing data we look at, there is more need to look at various groups of students, not just the traditional ones.
 - vi. It was mentioned it would be good to know how many units students are transferring.
 - b. How to measure full-time and part-time is still being figured out and should be vetted sometime within the next year.
 - c. It was suggested to use 24 units to measure full-time, as 12 units a semester is the minimum for students to get financial aid.
 - i. The issue with using 24 units is 2 years of 24 units doesn't add up to the 60 units needed for completion.
4. Transfer-Level completion rate challenges regarding degree-applicable math were discussed.
- a. Some people argue that a lot of AA degrees only require degree-applicable math, and we should run those numbers instead. That data should be available by summer.
 - b. There is confusion with the name "Transfer-Level Completion rate" and other completion rates.
 - i. An explanation of the differences between the two and what the data of each tells us has been added to the sheet that also describes all the available remedial metrics.
 - c. There was a consensus to change the name to either "Transfer-Level Achievement" rate or "Transfer-Level Completion Success" rate.
5. Visualizations Ideas for a Toolkit or ASK were presented and discussed.
- a. KC Greaney presented a visualization on Santa Rosa Jr. College and used Tableau software to create the visualization. The annual rate is \$1500 for each of the desktop versions for the first year, and then it goes down from there in the second year.

- b. James Todd presented a visualization on Modesto College using Tableau.
- c. Daylene Meuschke presented a visualization on College of the Canyons using Tableau.
Examples of what COC uses Tableau for: To track enrollments from registration to completion, Program Review and Capacity.
- d. We will keep stockpiling the visualizations and discuss how we can increase access to them.
- 6. The agenda items for the next meeting will include the following:
 - a. Present additional information on LaunchBoard indicators.
 - b. Wrap up the discussion on indicators.
 - c. Discuss the creation of a statewide brief covering data that has strong implications for college practices.
 - d. Continue the discussion on visualizations.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

- 1. Darryl Swarm, Library Director from Feather River, introduced himself. He is replacing Pearl Ly as the Council of Chief Librarians representative.
- 2. Matthew walked the group through the current status of PRT Cycles.
- 3. Scott noted that at regional workshops, a laptop will be deployed to encourage folks to complete the expertise profile and thus volunteer for PRT service.
- 4. Members discussed briefly the importance of getting the word out to the field on sharing best practices through submissions to the PLN.
- 5. Evaluation of the PRT Process: One Year After
- 6. Bob Pacheco introduced the topic, noting that PRTs have potential benefits for the client institutions, the PRT members, and the system as a whole. One question is whether those benefits last longer than just a few weeks or months.
 - a. Workgroup members offered numerous reflections on what the one-year-after report should analyze, contain, or reveal, including the following:
 - i. Had the PRT not visited, where would the client institution be?
 - ii. If progress has not been sustained as well as one might hope, what were the causes? For example, turnover in personnel can have a significant effect on follow-through on planned initiatives.
 - iii. What progress has been made on the milestones in the I&EP?
 - iv. What was the return on investment (ROI) on efforts to address the Areas of Focus?
 - v. What connections exist among the LOI Areas of Focus, what was heard at Visit 1, and what ended up in the I&EP?
 - (A) It might be, for example, that improvements in participatory governance were significant, even though that was not among the Areas of Focus.
 - (B) Members suggested trying to uncover underlying “antennae issues” before the first visit, so that the membership of the PRT can be adjusted accordingly. Matthew said he can certainly add that question to his initial interview with client CEOs.
 - vi. Client-institution personnel might have difficulty remembering the effects of the PRT, particularly if more recent events (e.g., an accreditation visit) have produced effects that might overlap.
 - vii. What impact, if any, did the PRT process have on student success?
 - viii. To what extent have PRT members served as mentors for client-institution personnel?
 - b. Members suggested the following sources for the one-year-after report:
 - i. CEOs
 - ii. PRT Leads and members
 - iii. Facilitated conversation between the client CEO and the PRT Lead
 - iv. The actual point person at the client institution, as identified by the PRT Lead
 - c. Members suggested having a standard set of questions for one-year-after interviews, including, for example, “In which of the visits did you participate?”

- d. Members also suggested considering additional models for PRT assistance, including a therapy model, and regular follow-up beyond the third visit.

C. Professional Development (Craig Rutan)

1. Professional Learning Network (PLN) Update
 - a. Review Process: attached handouts provide further information on the review process.
 - i. Submissions from IEPI partners and statewide organizations are not reviewed. They are posted directly and branded as being from the organization that enabled it to avoid review (e.g., ASCCC resources are not reviewed and are posted in such a way that it is clear that they reflect ASCCC views in particular).

(A) There was general consensus that it is necessary to add a further check in this process whereby resources that avoid review by the PLN are sent to the submitting organization to confirm that they truly are reflective of that organization's views.
 - ii. Recruiting reviewers has been a challenge, and faculty in particular are in demand. Reviewers for other constituent groups have been recruited on an on-demand basis, as there has not been a steady stream of relevant material for other constituent groups.
 - b. There was discussion about how to improve the process by which resources from workshops get transferred to an online format. It was suggested that presenters should be asked beforehand to design PowerPoints that are independently informative. There was agreement that offering speakers a template on how to aid in creating PowerPoints that transition to the PLN well would be a good idea.
 - c. A desire was expressed to have formalized processes written down for all the work that goes on in the background of the PLN so that there is a stable foundation that can endure personnel turnover.
 - d. A new look-and-feel for the PLN will be coming in April. The new design aims to tie the PLN more closely to IEPI.
2. PD Workshop Status
 - a. Attached is a list of professional development activities that have recently happened, are scheduled through April, and that are in the works for the coming months.
 - b. There was a discussion about what the next step for IEPI workshops should be, as there is a desire to start branching out further from the original target audience.
 - i. There was a desire to plan workshops such that they built off of one another in a coherent structure throughout the year so that colleges could plan series of teams to attend well in advance, and those teams would receive training that integrates with what others from their campus have recently received.
 - c. Geographical challenges for workshops were discussed. Rural colleges have trouble attending because of travel constraints, and colleges in large cities (LA in particular) that look near each other and airports really aren't when considering traffic.
 - i. Having workshops live-streamed to other campuses at which a facilitator manages the team activities was suggested as a way to overcome part of this challenge.
3. Updates from Ed Insights on Evaluations from Indicators and Pathways Workshops
 - a. Both workshops were rated as meeting or exceeding reviewers' expectations.
 - b. General recommendations on the basis of these and previous workshop evaluations:
 - i. Make time spent working with teams more structured, perhaps by having trained facilitators circulate and provide input during those times.
 - ii. Provide presenters with information about effective presentation practices. In particular, aim to increase interaction of presenters with participants.
 - iii. Make up-to-date handouts/PowerPoint slides available online and/or in a booklet during and even before workshops.
 - iv. Make sure that participants are aware beforehand that workshops will be videotaped, and recognize that cameras will affect the amount and type of participation.

4. Discussion of IEPI Workshops for Guided Pathways referenced in 2017-18 Education Trailer Bill
 - a. The governor’s proposed Education Trailer Bill includes language specifying that in order to receive money from the proposed one-time guided pathways funding, a college must have “notification that the community college has attended an Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative workshop for guided pathways.” There was a discussion about how these future workshops, if the language remains, should be similar to or different from the December 2016 and January 2017 Pathways Workshops.
 - i. There was a desire to help colleges build teams to send that will be able to effectively take the information back to the campus and drive change forward. This would need to include skeptics and faculty.
 - ii. There was interest in distinguishing between the particular Guided Pathways framework utilized in the California Guided Pathways Project and the non-specific guided pathways movement, and being clear about what IEPI workshops are aiming to promote: the particular or the general.
 - iii. There was general agreement that it would be beneficial to be able to direct colleges towards relevant online materials prior to workshops, preferably housed on the PLN. This would allow teams to spend more time action-planning with support at the workshop, and less time simply receiving information.
 - b. The specific language is likely to be refined during the legislative process, so discussion of this point will likely reappear on the agenda for the May meeting.
5. Note that IEPI committee reappointments are coming up, so there may be some turnover in the group in the next six months as we gain new members and lose old ones.

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

1. ASK Project Updates and Considerations
 - a. Flyers
 - i. Discussion of “What Is IEPI?” one-pager. Consistency issues therein. Agreement that ASK is Applied Solution Kit, not Applied Solutions Kit. All IEPI and CCCCCO materials must be consistent in this way.
 - ii. Origin and purpose of ASKs discussed in order to bring new workgroup members up to speed. Distinction made that ASKs are designed to provide “a way” to help colleges but not “the way” to help. ASKs are not meant to tell colleges what to do.
 - iii. Opinion shared that the branding of IEPI and the ASKs has come a long way.
 - iv. Criticism offered that all of the ASK one-pagers look too much the same. The fact that one side of the one-pagers is the same across the board makes it hard to differentiate between them.
 - v. Suggestion made that PRTs be armed with “What Is IEPI?” one-pager as well as the ASK one-pager that relates specifically to the reason for their college visit.
 - vi. Consensus reached that the ASK one-pagers will require further editing.
 - b. Data Disaggregation (DD)
 - i. Craig Hayward went over RP Group DD ASK monthly report. Craig is currently forming a DD advisory committee. He provided the names of DD development team members and mentioned that he is looking for one additional member. He wants the advisory committee to represent key stakeholders. He has plans to film and livestream upcoming workshops.
 - ii. Consensus that DD monthly report is well done and very useful.
 - c. Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)
 - i. Advisory committee meeting on 3/2 was well-received. The discussion was robust. Attendees offered many suggestions for additional resources to be developed. Craig Justice is currently developing a primer on how CCCs are funded. Justice’s project aims to update old materials. There are other outdated materials agency-wide that are long overdue for an update.

- ii. Concern about how PLN organizes ASK materials, how user-friendly the PLN is. How will ASK materials appear in a Google search?
 - d. Guided Pathways
 - i. The Pathways ASK will be called the “Guided Pathways” ASK so as to align with statute language.
 - ii. This ASK is still in early development. Urgency surrounding getting up and running soon.
 - iii. The GP ASK is a response to all the interest pathways has generated within the CCCs and at the Chancellor’s Office. The \$150 million reserved for pathways implementation has also sparked a need for this ASK.
 - iv. Suggestion made that GP ASK should involve Academic Senate as a co-developer because the faculty are so critical to pathways implementation. Pathways involves curriculum redesign.
 - v. P3 workgroup to receive at next meeting an update on progress towards finding a lead or co-leads for GP ASK.
 - vi. Term “educational pathways” discussed.
 - e. Change Management
 - i. CM ASK in early development stages.
 - ii. P3 workgroup to receive at next meeting an update on progress towards finding a lead or co-leads for CM ASK.
 - iii. The term “change management” can be confusing. Its definition varies depending on the context. The ASK needs to define the term precisely.
 - f. Integrated Planning
 - i. Colleges are requesting more hands-on assistance with IP. The upcoming workshop at Golden West College is an example of this.
 - ii. Role of trustees should be considered. We need their buy-in with our priorities.
 - g. RP Group ASK Coordinator Position
 - i. The Coordinator will be charged with, among other things, making sure that all ASKs are cohesive, and that they can be used both separately and together. The Coordinator also must liaison among the ASK leads, the IEPI and Chancellor’s Office co-leads, and the PLN.
 - h. Where are we now, and what is the role of P3?
 - i. It is time to fine tune the role of the P3 workgroup and determine how that role is communicated to those outside the workgroup.
 - ii. It is agreed that the P3 workgroup must decide which ASKs to develop. We must decide how to vet all ASKs.
 - iii. Suggestion made that the P3 workgroup look at results of accreditation visits and PRT visits.
 - iv. Should IEPI partner on workshops with ACCJC?
 - v. Concern that colleges may not understand all that IEPI is doing for them. Might an infographic be made to represent this?
- 2. Vetting of ASK Materials
 - a. Review and discussion of Barbara McNeice-Stallard’s vetting process graphic. Agreement that the graphic is a good start but not yet complete. We still need to know who is going to review the materials, and we still need to know the evaluative criteria. The difference between “promising” and “effective” still vague. The vetting process still needs to be decided upon and documented. We need to develop a step-by-step explanation of how the ASKs are going to be vetted.
 - b. Suggestion made that the vetting process should take into consideration how the ASKs will help colleges based on their location (urban vs. rural). Can one ASK really help every single college?

- c. The PLN must not guarantee a one-size-fits-all solution to a particular problem. The PLN must make clear that the solution to College A’s challenges may not be the solution to College B’s challenges.
- d. Suggestion made that PRT volunteer sign-up process should include a question about whether the volunteer would like to help vet ASK materials.
- e. ASKs need to evolve as common practices evolve. Theoretically there is no such thing as a “finished” ASK.
- f. ASK co-leads and RP Group to make necessary edits to Barbara’s draft vetting process document [REQUIRES FOLLOW UP]
- g. Discussion of need for State funding for non-CTE classified staff and faculty to attend professional development events that are specific to their particular assignments. Strong Workforce has funding for CTE instructors, but this sort of funding does not currently exist for non-CTE personnel.
- h. Suggestion made that faculty need either at least one semester of release time to revamp their curriculum or more targeted, discipline-specific PD training that goes beyond the current theme-based IEPI offerings. Question of whether the funding should be given to colleges and then disseminated to professional organizations from there.

III. Presentation on Data Visualization

- A. Jeff Gold of the CSU Chancellor’s Office made a half-hour presentation on the CSU Student Success Dashboard, a very useful data visualization tool.
- B. Examples of the uses of the Dashboard included the following:
 - 1. Matching graduation rates with State needs.
 - 2. Leveraging data assets to make a difference in planning and decision-making.
 - 3. Comparison of high-impact practices.
 - 4. Answering faculty questions such as “What happens to my students after my class?”
 - 5. Identifying courses that have the combination of highest enrollments and lowest success rates.
 - 6. Examining achievement gaps in detail.
- C. Development of the system began four years ago.
- D. Jeff answered questions from the group during a working lunch.

IV. General Session 2

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

V. Adjournment