



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

IEPI Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Chancellor's Office
May 12, 2017, 9:30 am-2:30 pm
Meeting Summary**

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	Lomeli	Alejandro	TA
Bruno	Julie	PD	May	Ginni**	PPP
Burke	Kathleen**	TA	McGinnis	William G.**	TA
Carr	Leslie	PD	Messina	Kimberlee**	TA
Cox	Jana	PPP	Meuschke	Daylene**	Ind
Curry	Keith	PPP	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Dozier	Julia	PD	Rutan	Craig	PD
Gribbons	Barry**	Ind	Schardt	Jan	PD
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Skinner	Erik**	Ind
Heumann	Michael	Ind	Stoup	Gregory	Ind
Jaffe	Louise**	Ind	Todd	James**	Ind
Janio	Jarek**	Ind	Vo-Kumamoto	Tram	Ind
Lee	Matthew C.	TA	Wah	Linda	PPP
Leong	Tim**	PD	Webb	Catherine	PD

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind	Jez	Su Jin	PD
Atalig	Christine	Ind	Johnson	Catherine	Ind
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Larson	Erin**	TA/ PD/PPP
Broom	Cheryl	Ind	Madden	Sean	NA
Collins	Linda	PD	Pacheco	Robert	TA
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Schrager	Cynthia	PD
DuBreuil	Michelle	PD	Spano	Jeff**	PD
Fisher	Stacy**	Ind	Trimble	Brad	PPP
Fuller	Ryan**	Ind	Van Ommeren	Alice**	Ind
Harrington	Deborah	PD	Wutke	Kevin	PD
Howe	Michael	PPP			

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Berliner	Rachel	PPP	Ricks-Albert	Stephanie	TA
Hoig	Todd	Ind	Siguenza	Bryanna	
Kretz	Andrew	PPP	Tyson	Sarah	Ind

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Liahut	Gerson	PPP	Urbano	Juan	PPP
Metune	Laura				

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

I. General Session 1

- A. Kimberlee and Steve shared Education Moments.
- B. Matthew reminded members that reappointments and/or new appointments are still needed from many organizations for 2017-18.
- C. Mario walked through highlights of the May Revise and associated documents, which included the welcome news of six positions for the Chancellor’s Office, as well as some trailer-bill clarification of the Guided Pathways initiative.
- D. Michelle updated the Committee on the PLN, which had its one-year anniversary on April 25. There are now over 6,500 users, which exceeds the goal for this period. She also presented a video introduction to the PLN.
- E. Barry and Theresa reflected on the past year’s IEPI accomplishments. Barry offered kudos to Theresa and all the folks in the IE Division for their dedicated and tireless work, and to IEPI’s partners, including the Academic Senate, Chabot-Las Positas CCD, and Foothill-DeAnza CCD. He also praised the wealth of perspectives that the Advisory Committee has brought to bear on all the issues, and the robust and rich dialogue that has characterized every meeting. 100% of districts and colleges once again adopted the framework of indicators and set targets, and development of Year 4 and Year 5 indicators is well underway. PRTs began technical assistance at 27 institutions in 2016-17, and continued services to 28 more institutions; more than 140 volunteers received training as PRT members. Theresa highlighted the 14 IEPI workshops offered (many more than once) in 2016-17, as well as the two Applied Solution Kits now available, to be joined next year by three others now in preparation. She also noted that the IE Division is deeply involved in getting the Guided Pathways initiative off the ground.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)

1. Update on Tableau Statewide
 - a. Nothing has been purchased, yet. The CCCCCO will use the tool as well.
 - b. Erik said they are considering developing another “ASK” for visualizations. He added that would be great if we could tap into Canvas data.
 - c. Barry suggested hiring a consultant to help build out visualizations.
 - d. A lot of our metrics are about “completion” but we also need to caution against doing this at the risk of a less rich learning experience. Louise will send Barry information on data from a study a CSU professor is doing on employment data (EDD) for their native students and transfer students.
 - e. Tram talked about how K-12 is using College and Career Readiness indicators (e.g., how much they work while in school).
2. Ideas related to Tableau (i.e., Warehousing Visualizations, Contracting for Additional Visualizations, User Groups, etc.)
 - a. Library of visualizations – We talked about putting them on the PLN. Barry will work with the PLN to get them uploaded. Any useful visualizations should be sent to Barry. The visualizations should be helpful in informing decisions.
 - b. State buying Tableau or similar product. Gary Adams mentioned that Strong Workforce uses a product called “Looker.”
 - c. Barry will talk to Theresa about getting regional user groups for 2017-18.
 - d. It was suggested to talk with Washington State to learn how the implementation has gone for their system.

- e. James presented new visualizations from Modesto. eLumen doesn't provide the visualizations that they need.
 - i. Program Review – Modesto will use embedded prompts for CTE areas looking at CTE Launchboard and other indicator metrics (e.g., equity, math/English, etc.).
- 3. Questions Received Regarding Portal
 - a. Data populated in portal in April.
 - b. Issues
 - i. Time to Degree and Participation Rates – questions from the field about what they are. As new indicators are put on the portal, there needs to be ample time to disseminate information to the field. Action Item – redouble efforts to communicate the new noncredit metric to the field.
 - ii. MIS has talked about trying to release the Scorecard data earlier. They may reduce the Scorecard review period from 45 to 30 days. Releasing the data on March 15 would help.
 - iii. Suggestion to have methodology training in the fall.
 - iv. It was discussed whether we should we develop an ASK for each group (e.g., presenting to BOT, etc.). Consideration for BOT presentation should include focusing only on the areas of priority for boards or leading indicators. How do you normalize and embed these practices? Barry noted that we might want to consider a California-specific training for ACCCT related to indicators.
 - v. It would be helpful to talk with various groups about goal-setting processes, concerns, confusion, etc. (e.g., ASCCC Plenary).
 - vi. Erik added that we need to communicate how all the accountability systems relate to each other. There may be an opportunity to trim a little. Louise suggested that maybe we need to look at removing some of the lagging indicators. Erik suggested that we should consider holding off on pruning until we have a plan in place for addressing the biggest indicators in need of attention.
 - vii. We need to figure out how to have meaningful indicators, connect to practice and ultimately inform policy.
 - viii. Barry added that they should hold a convening across systems, including ACCJC Institution-Set Standards, to help build understanding of the different systems. There was a consensus for this suggestion.
 - ix. Barry also suggested they should look at contracting with someone to staff the effort.
 - x. It might be helpful to ask what the top 5 areas of focus are for the system, as well as document how colleges are embedding the goal-setting into the program review and planning processes.
 - xi. Louise suggested that they should consider adding a descriptive chart on the student population (e.g., transfer bound, career/job, etc.).
- 4. Indicators Related to Pathways for Year 5 (2019)
 - a. Purpose
 - i. It is not accountability, but rather to help guide colleges. The timeline over 3-5 years.
 - ii. What is Guided Pathways? Helping students get on a path, stay on a path, transition to a new path, and ensure that students are learning.
 - iii. Four pillars: Faculty advising, map the path, get on the path and intervention.
 - iv. Curriculum Pathways – specific courses
 - v. Redesigning development education
 - vi. Redesigning advising students and looking at it from the student's perspective. Everything being structured to help students.
 - vii. Removing barriers
 - (A) Knowing where students are.
 - (B) Helping students return to path.

- b. Current Indicators from Related Efforts
 - i. Looking at indicators from AACC national guided pathways indicators. These may not end up in the IEPI portal.
 - ii. Handout from Alice on possible KPIs for pathways. Ryan Fuller reviewed KPIs.
 - (A) We need to see how other states have filtered based on different groups (e.g., skills builders, etc.).
 - (B) Need to look at 1st-time students. Intent will be hard to filter out.
 - (C) Barry – Observations not included in KPIs include barrier removal, interventions, and access to counselors.
- c. Issues for Consideration
 - i. We need to look at what we are collecting.
 - ii. How many units completed within major?
 - iii. Looking at courses where there are a lot of Ws.
 - iv. What do you do with multiple declared majors?
 - v. 6 units, 12 units is not as helpful.
 - vi. Failing a class in the 1st semester.
 - vii. An attempt to complete at least 1 course in major.
 - viii. Getting back on path, barriers, student engagement, interventions, progress to attaining goals, changing plans.

5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- a. Strong Workforce and Pathways. Barry wants to earmark a good amount of time for Pathways discussion and talk about Strong Workforce in the morning.
- b. SWP Indicators

6. Additional

- a. Erik Cooper asked if there can be time reserved for additional Show ‘N Tell.

7. Meeting Adjourned

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

1. Matthew walked the group through the current status of PRT Cycles, including Mini-PRTs and the PRT COP.
2. The group discussed concerns that PRT members had expressed about their client institution. Matthew stated that he would follow up through appropriate channels.
3. Evaluation of the PRT Process
 - a. Bob Pacheco introduced the latest *Spotlights*, and summarized the benefits that Ventura College received from PRT technical assistance with respect to its accreditation issues. He pointed out that the College had been very straightforward in addressing those issues, and in calling out the PRT’s assistance in its Self-Evaluation Report. Members suggested producing one Spotlight issue focusing on the *PRT’s* experience, and Bob endorsed that idea.
 - b. Bob then led a discussion of the Cycle 3B training evaluation findings. Members suggested permitting experienced PRT members to skip the morning session and arrive for lunch. They also suggested a working lunch, since after lunch, many folks start to get anxious to leave for home, and using the time at lunch would reduce the length of the afternoon session, depending on what content is to be offered.
 - c. The Cycle 3A, Visits 1 and 2 evaluation report treated the two visits separately, which will be the structure from now on. Bob noted that a theme for both clients and PRT members was insufficient breadth of representation among client-institution personnel during the visits. One member suggested adding a question to the expertise survey on prior Appreciative Inquiry training. Matthew said that pointed questions about very specific skill sets (e.g., AI, Change Management, particular IT platforms) might replace the soft-skills questions, which have not proven useful.
4. The group endorsed the idea of sending out the new PRT Process Checklist to all active Leads, not just those for upcoming cycles. Matthew said he would do so.

C. Professional Development (Craig Rutan)

1. Noncredit Summit
 - a. The summit was a long time coming and came about through a partnership of ACCE, ASCCC, 3CSN, Career Ladders Project and IEPI. It was a big success with 280 attendees and 34 sessions.
 - b. There is a hope to have the summit annually, as well as to develop a community of practice. Currently, this is taking the form of a monthly webinar series.
 - c. Gratitude was expressed to IEPI for helping to provide structure around how to focus the goals of the conference and best meet them, along with taking care of various logistical and planning tasks.
2. Workshop Reviews
 - a. EdInsights has begun aggregating data from across many workshops so that we can get better data regarding how effectively workshops are meeting IEPI's goals.
 - b. Evaluator Training Workshop:
 - i. This workshop had primarily (80%) classified staff attendees, which is different from previous workshops. Gratitude was expressed that opportunities are being made available for classified staff, who oftentimes are overlooked.
 - ii. Reviews were generally positive, but not as high as many previous workshops.
 - iii. Recommendations:
 - (A) Some sessions were not relevant to many attendees, yet rated very highly by others. Consider utilizing breakout sessions for similar workshops in the future and solicit input for what topics to address.
 - (B) Offer more follow-up assistance to colleges after attending workshops.
 - (C) Incorporate more interactive elements; the presentations were primarily lectures from a PowerPoint.
 - c. Dual Enrollment Workshop
 - i. Teams were encouraged to come with both secondary and post-secondary partners. Attendees from secondary schools felt that the information skewed towards addressing post-secondary institutions.
 - ii. Overall very highly rated, particularly the interactive format that was utilized even in content-oriented presentations.
 - iii. Recommendations:
 - (A) Offer different options for table discussions, as colleges in various stages of program development were there.
 - (B) Offer more concrete support for implementation, perhaps similar to the webinar series following the noncredit summit (see above)
 - d. There was a discussion regarding whether workshops are planned in consultation with the PRT letters of interest. Those could be a source of information of what PD colleges would be interested in.
 - i. It was noted that perhaps having a joint PD/TA Workgroup meeting could be advantageous.
3. Emergency Preparedness
 - a. Scott Valverde was taking point on this, but he is no longer at the Chancellor's Office. IEPI is still figuring out how to pick up and continue the work.
 - b. Currently, the planning committee needs a CBO.
4. Flex Days
 - a. A general introduction to what Flex Days are and how they are currently being utilized was given in order to introduce a discussion of how IEPI may be able to take advantage or support colleges' use of them.

- b. Previously there was interest in the possibility of utilizing colleges' Flex Days for IEPI workshop presentations at colleges that aren't easily able to attend workshops themselves.
 - i. There are a host of logistical problems with this, particularly given the outdated Guidelines for Implementation of the Flexible Calendar Program from 2007. Current standards/expectations don't lend themselves to IEPI being able to successfully implement this strategy, but there is interest if the circumstances are right.
- c. There was significant interest in making more professional development resources about Flex Days available, as it is misunderstood and underutilized at many colleges.
 - i. In particular, there was interest in developing a Professional Development ASK to address Flex Days and organizational learning in general.
- 5. PD Calendar
 - a. In light of hiring needs within IEPI, planning things well in advance has been a challenge.
 - b. Under development are enrollment management, accessibility standards, and guided pathways workshops.
- 6. PLN and ASK Materials Review Processes (PD and P3 Workgroups combined)
 - a. A proposed final process for how resources get published on the PLN was accepted to be published on the PLN.
 - b. Similarly, the ASK vetting process was presented and accepted to be published on the PLN.
- 7. Craig Rutan is transitioning to the ASCCC Curriculum Chair and will no longer be leading the PD Workgroup. Cheryl Aschenbach will be replacing him starting in July.

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

- 1. General updates
 - a. P3 meeting materials are now available on the IEPI website. Fewer print materials will be made available at our July meeting.
 - b. Summer 2017 presents an opportunity to further flesh out the PLN.
 - c. Brad Trimble, our new ASK Coordinator, will work to achieve clarity and transparency with ASKs. He is going to make sure that all ASKs are operating efficiently and in communion with each other. He is going to make sure that PLN users do not have to hunt for answers with the ASKs.
 - d. Progress reports on ASKs summarize challenges and successes.
 - e. Colleges who are currently participating in AACC Project and GP Project will also be able to participate in and benefit from the GP Program.
 - f. Mini PRTs to be revisited as a topic of conversation between IEPI and Strong Workforce.
- 2. ASK Project updates
 - a. Current
 - i. Data Disaggregation (DD)
 - (A) Craig Hayward has traveled much in support of DD ASK. 11 events total this calendar year.
 - (B) There is an audience issue right now with the DD effort. Not enough attendance. Desire for there to be a greater balance of storytelling and the mechanics of DD. Technical conversation of DD might turn some people away. See DD progress report for more information on challenges.
 - (C) Suggestion made that DD be sold differently to colleges.
 - (D) A lot of interest in DD as it relates to veterans' access to higher education.
 - (E) Desire to put on longer workshops.
 - (F) Discussion of 9/15/17 workshop in the far north.
 - (G) Discussion of conference presentation at Strengthening Student Success in October. There will be a preconference workshop on storytelling.
 - (H) Redesign of DD ASK upcoming. There will be video and animation and an overall more sophisticated feel. Refinement of old tools and creation of new tools.

- (I) Several members identified for still-to-be-established advisory group. Still need to identify CEO and CIO members.
- ii. Integrated Planning (IP)
 - (A) IP ASK advisory committee still needs to be formed.
 - (B) IP ASK project team meets weekly.
- iii. Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)
 - (A) Advisory committee met on 4/28. It was a success. About 40 members attended.
- b. Future
 - i. Change Leadership/Management
 - (A) Early stages of development. Much to learn from already established ASKs.
 - (B) Definition needs to be established.
 - ii. Guided Pathways
 - (A) Will differ from current ASKs.
 - (B) Career Ladders Project and ASCCC are important leads in this effort. Faculty involvement and support especially crucial.
 - (C) ASCCC to identify faculty members for assistance in Fall 2017.
 - (D) Advisory committee will be large. Will include at least two student reps. The ASK will require engagement and input from all stakeholder groups.
 - (E) Workshops to focus on action planning.
 - (F) ASK to coordinate closely with GP Project (the philanthropic effort).
 - (G) Capacity-building sessions for colleges seeking specific kinds of help. Targeted technical assistance for individual colleges.
 - (H) Much to learn from CCRC and AACC.
 - (I) We need to be cognizant of the fact that all CCCs are as different as they are alike. We have to take a “learning stance.”
 - (J) Desire to harness energy of colleges like Sierra who are already implementing pathways.
 - (K) ASCCC will have GP taskforce.
 - (L) We all have to keep in mind that we are compelled to do what’s best for our students. We need to meet colleges where they’re at.
 - (M) GP will impact all CCCCCO divisions. GP effort is always evolving.
 - (N) Questions raised by LAO on GP.
 - (O) There will be an application process for GP Program. There might be workshops about the application process but it’s too early to say.
 - (P) GP Program won’t be trotted out, most likely, as an IEPI effort, but rather as an effort of the CCCCCO at large.
 - iii. Potential Accreditation Collaboration [DID NOT DISCUSS]
- 3. \$150 million for Guided Pathways; where are we going?
 - a. Communicating IEPI work
 - i. Interact Communications will be sending video team to Sierra College to tape students, faculty, and administrators to share GP effort. A script for video will be written. Video should be ready 7/1/17.
 - ii. GP page or set of pages to be added to IEPI site. This will be a repository for all GP materials. This will be up and running by 7/1/17. Materials will likely only reside on IEPI site temporarily, until an autonomous website is established.
 - iii. Template GP materials to be created for individual colleges to customize and circulate on campuses.
 - iv. Desire to communicate how GP Program, GP Project, and AACC Project intersect. Need for an infographic to illustrate this. Pam describes infographic as a tree, with AACC as the lowest branch, then the Project as another branch, and finally the Program as the canopy.

- v. CCPRO is a core component of Interact’s GP communications campaign.
- b. Evolving work as we know more
 - i. What can we learn from CTE pathways already in motion? Can these pathways inform the creation of other pathways?
 - ii. We need to as a system unite behind a common understanding of what GP is in order for integration of various programs to occur.
 - iii. Keith would like there to be a team of people who visit colleges to help with GP implementation. He describes it as a roadshow. This roadshow would alleviate colleges’ stress over GP. Keith also suggests that there should be a GP discussion board to field questions from colleges. Pam believes that the PLN could support this. Linda Collins reiterates her conception of GP effort as including a roadshow component. Keith would like there to be a pool of speakers to draw from who can come to colleges to talk about GP on designated professional development days.
 - iv. Trustees need to see roadmap on GP in order to get mobilized. They need materials that are easily digestible.
 - v. Desire in the field for hard copy materials.
 - vi. Gerson offers student perspective. He believes that email blasts about GP will largely go unread. He thinks that pathways should not start until a student’s second year of community college. He thinks that students need a year to explore their options before committing to a pathway, because most students come to college not having any idea what they want to do. He believes that GP needs to be integrated with existing initiatives.
- 3. Joint meeting with PD Workgroup
 - a. Kevin Wutke presents on vetting of PLN and ASK resources
 - i. PLN Content Review Committee consists of four people now instead of just one. The purpose of the committee is to determine whether a PLN submission is official institutional document or not.
 - ii. Unofficial institutional documents are vetted by two constituent representatives. All vetters must agree that piece is publishable in order for it to be published. Then there is an accessibility check by PLN staff before publication.
 - iii. See Kevin Wutke’s handout (included in the minutes).
 - iv. No definition right now for “promising practices.”
 - v. Published submissions are categorized and searchable.
 - vi. Comment sections at the bottom of published articles will be monitored. Only registered PLN users will be able to leave comments.
 - b. Mike Howe presents on ASKs
 - i. ASK work teams are made up of subject matter experts.
 - ii. A literature review takes between three and eight months.
 - iii. ASKs are always evolving, always being fine-tuned.
 - iv. The ASK area on the PLN is meant to be intuitive. The ASK area should anticipate where PLN users will want to go.
 - v. Every ASK has its own advisory group. There is no universal ASK advisory group.
 - vi. The desire is for the ASK user not to have to click seventeen times through different pages in order to get to what they need.
 - vii. Question from Tim Leong about whether ASKs serve student services.
 - viii. ASKs are framed the way they are because they need to communicate to colleges that in order to be successful colleges need to know not just about IP but also DD and SEM, etc.
 - ix. Is there a shelf life to ASKs? Will it always be necessary for there to be a DD ASK, for example?

- x. The more word-heavy an ASK is, the less useful it is. The desire is for people to get through ASKs quickly, not get bogged down with a lot of text they don't have time to read.
- xi. PLN users will be notified by email whenever an ASK is updated.
- c. Future collaboration between workgroups [DID NOT DISCUSS]

III. General Session 2

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

IV. Adjournment