



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee Hyatt Regency Sacramento September 15, 2017, 9:30 am-2:30 pm Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	Janio	Jarek	Ind
Barton	Michelle	Ind	Kay	Beth	Ind
Beach	Randy	Ind	Lamanque	Andrew	PPP
Bellisimo	Yolanda	TA	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Blackwood	Kathy	Ind	Leong	Tim	PD
Brown	Aaron	TA	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Bruno	Julie	PD	Meuschke	Daylene	Ind
Buckley	Jerry	PD	Michaelson	John	Ind
Carr	Leslie	PD	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Coleman	Laura	Ind	Oberg	Anjeanette	PD
Contreras	Daniel	PD	Pasricha	Isha	TA
Curry	Keith	PPP	Purtell	Valentina	Ind
Dain	Claudette	PPP	Roberson	Carrie	PD
Dozier	Julia	PD	Sandberg	Mary	PD
Eikey	Rebecca	PPP	Sanders	Brian	
Ferguson	Chris	PPP	Sandoval	Carmen	PD
Fisher	Stacy	Ind	Slattery-Farrell	Lorraine	PPP
Foster	Sam	Ind	Stanskas	John	Ind
Fried	Sandy	PD	Stoup	Gregory	Ind
Greaney	KC	Ind	Swarm	Darryl	TA
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Tarman	Christopher	Ind
Hastey	Brent	PD	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Heumann	Michael	Ind	Urquiza	Maritza	PPP
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Wah	Linda	PPP

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Atalig	Christine	Ind	Lomeli	Alejandro	TA
Bell	Autumn	PD	Madden	Sean	NA
Bianchi	Rico	PD	McNeice-Stallard	Barbara	PPP
Broom	Cheryl	NA	Pacansky-Brock	Michelle	PD
Collins	Linda	PD	Pacheco	Robert	TA
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Purnell-Mack	Rogear	

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Crossland	Catherine	Ind	Ramirez-Faghieh	Caroline	Ind
Dettman	Sarah	NA	Simpson	Trish	PD
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Smith	Carrie	PD
Harrington	Deborah	PD	Spano	Jeff	PD
Hope	Laura		Stashower	Keren	
Howe	Michael	PPP	Trimble	Brad	PPP
Larson	Erin	PPP	Ward	Teresa	PD
Leal-Carrillo	Nadia	PPP	Wutke	Kevin	NA

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Adan	Sara	Ind	Parmelee	Frances	PD
Berliner	Rachel	PPP	Rapouw	Beverly	PPP
Finche	Wernna	PPP	Raymond	Nancy	
Levy	Rita	PD	Regino	Daniel	PD
McKowski	Michelle	PD	Robertson	Candace	PD

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

I. General Session 1

- A. Daylene, Yolanda, and Brad each shared an Education Moment.
- B. Matthew noted that Interact would be taking a group portrait of the Advisory Committee after the first general session, and would be doing video interviews with some members over the course of the day.
- C. David Brown of Design Media presented information on his firm's project to improve the design, user experience, and engagement level of the Applied Solution Kits on the PLN. He introduced his team, noting that they had been working since early June. Tasks have included adding more scaffolding and context and helping to break down silos to foster collaboration among the ASK teams. The discovery phase (e.g., understanding the user perspective) was completed at the end of July, the initial design was finished, and user testing of the prototype was underway. The project timeline calls for alpha testing in mid-October, beta testing in mid-November, and deployment in early December 2017. Volunteers from the Professional Development and Technical Assistance Workgroups are participating during this meeting in focused user testing.
- D. Ten new Advisory Committee members and resource persons introduced themselves.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry and John Stanskas)

1. Approval of Minutes
2. Preliminary Observations from Year 3 Portal
 - a. Sara Aden from California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) reported on preliminary data.
 - b. There was discussion about variability in reporting of Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) metric. Some districts may not have OPEB liability and others are just starting.
 - c. Additional Analysis Suggestions for Sara:
 - i. Include the median of each indicator with trend line for enrollments.
 - ii. Show the distribution of goals relative to current performance. To what degree are colleges setting higher goals?
 - iii. Include an analysis of the Noncredit metric.
 - iv. Context for data needs to be provided.
3. KPIs for Pathways and Implications for IEPI
 - a. IEPI does not have true momentum point measures.
 - b. What's the best process to move forward with alignment of the National (AACC), CA Guided Pathways, and CCC Pathways metrics? The Indicators Workgroup was asked to consider how all the metrics align.

- c. There have been some attempts to align metrics. For instance:
- i. Course Success (C or Better)
 - ii. First-Time Student (CA takes into account concurrent enrollment whereas the national project did not)
 - iii. Indicators

CA Guided Pathways

KPIs	Definition
<i>1) Early momentum</i>	
Earned 6+ college credits in 1 st term	Number and % of fall cohort students who earned 6 or more college-level (i.e., non-developmental) credits (with grade A-D or P) in first term
Earned 12+ college credits in 1 st term	Number and % of fall cohort students who earned 12 or more college-level (i.e., non-developmental) credits (with grade A-D or P) in first term
Earned 15+ college credits in year 1	Number and % of fall cohort students who earned 15 or more college-level (i.e., non-developmental) credits (with grade A-D or P) in first full academic year
Earned 24+ college credits in year 1	Number and % of fall cohort students who earned 24 or more college-level (i.e., non-developmental) credits (with grade A-D or P) in first full academic year
Earned 30+ college credits in year 1	Number and % of fall cohort students who earned 30 or more college-level (i.e., non-developmental) credits (with grade A-D or P) in first full academic year
<i>2) Gateway math and English completion</i>	
Completed college math in year 1	Number and % of fall cohort students who attempted and passed at least one college level (i.e., non-developmental) math course (with grade A-D or P) in the first full academic year. <u>Withdrawals should be counted as attempting but not passing the course.</u>
Completed college English in year 1	Number and % of fall cohort students who attempted and passed at least one college level (i.e., non-developmental) English course (with grade A-D or P) in the first full academic year. <u>Withdrawals should be counted as attempting but not passing the course.</u>
Completed both college English and math in year 1	Number and % of fall cohort students who attempted and passed at least one college level (i.e., non-developmental) course in Math and English (with grade A-D or P) in the first full academic year. <u>Withdrawals should be counted as attempting but not passing the course.</u>
<i>3) Persistence</i>	
Persisted from term 1 to term 2	Number and % of fall cohort students who enrolled in at least one credit-bearing course (including remedial) in term 2 (spring term)
<i>4) College course completion</i>	
Completed college credits	Number of college-level (i.e., non-remedial) credits earned (with grade A-D or P) by fall cohort students in their first full academic year divided by the total number of college-level credits attempted by these students. <u>Withdrawals should be counted as attempted credits but not credits earned.</u>

KPIs	Definition
5) <i>Attempted credits</i>	
Attempted 15+ credits (developmental or college level) in the first term	Number and % of fall cohort students who attempted 15 or more college-level or developmental credits in first full academic term
Attempted 30+ credits (developmental or college level) in the first year	Number and % of fall cohort students who attempted 30 or more college-level or developmental credits in first full academic year

- d. Colleges may also look at progress to degree completion, so that students can see where they are on the path.
 - e. We need to look at GE and major when looking at units.
 - f. Process for promoting alignment
 - i. The workgroup should look at a crosswalk of all indicators within the context of purpose. A crosswalk will be prepared for the committee to vote on at the next meeting.
 - ii. Who should be involved?
 - (A) Alyssa Nguyen from the RP Group (who has been the lead on participating in discussions on Pathways), Scorecard Advisory group, Fiscal Advisory Workgroup, ASCCC, IEPI, CIOs, CSSOs, CEOs, Strong Workforce, VTQ, Theresa Tena, and Laura Hope.
 - (B) A larger convening was recommended.
 - (C) Visualizations and a place where all of the indicators live were discussed.
4. Implications of System Goals for IEPI
- a. The six system-wide goals can be found here: <https://vision.foundationccc.org/>
 - b. The ASCCC went to a series of workgroup meetings held by the Board of Governors to provide input. The System’s Goals will be going before the Board of Governors on Monday, September 18, 2017.
 - c. The ASCCC expressed some concern with the metric that looks at percent of students working in their field of study. The metric may be changed to income difference, or a combination of income difference and working in the field of study.
 - d. Discussion for how to integrate/align
 - i. Concern was expressed with “specific skills” being called out in the first goal. It may not be meaningful when aggregated with the other goals (completion of degrees, etc.). In addition, “specific skills” did not come up in the workgroup meetings attended by faculty representatives. The workgroup agreed this concern should be carried forward during the public comment portion of the Board of Governors meeting. The groups’ desires will be shared with the CCCCCO.
 - ii. In regards to transfer metric, California Community Colleges do not have a lot of control over transfers to the UCs and CSUs, and the exclusion of private and out-of-state universities is limiting. It was suggested that the group looks at transfer readiness. It was noted that 8000 students with ADTs were not admitted at the CSUs. The RP Group is looking at what happens to students who get ADTs and do not enroll.
 - iii. Reducing equity gaps is critical but a single indicator is challenging. It was suggested that this group build equity into the indicators. This indicator is subject to sample size.
5. Equity Indicators
- a. Should we mirror equity reports and Scorecard, or maybe just the data elements in the Integrated Plan?

- b. Year 4: Year 1 and 2 completion rates for transfer-level math and English data need to be checked because SRJC has not done acceleration or multiple measures, and they've shown an increase.
- c. We need to crosswalk all the indicators from all the different initiatives. This task will be addressed at the next meeting. The RP Group's Pathways crosswalk will be sent to Barry Gribbons.
- d. The group should consider looking at how the IEPI indicators align with System's goals, which are purportedly aligned with the Pathways initiative.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew and Yolanda)

1. Matthew updated the group on the Cycle 4A (commencing Fall 2017) PRTs. Aaron suggested noting retired Leads and members as such on the PRT summary report.
2. No new mini-PRTs have been scheduled.
3. Matthew gave a status report on the Region 1 Community of Practice (COP), the first meeting of which is scheduled for Dec. 6-7, 2017. He is seeking a white paper reportedly prepared by the CEOs some years ago on changes in law and regulation that would promote institutional effectiveness, which is the focus of the upcoming COP meeting. Members suggested two possible sources of that paper, and Matthew said he would follow up.
4. Bob Pacheco reported on evaluation activities.
 - a. Bob noted that the evaluation team took very seriously the TA Workgroup's input on the one-year-after report, which is now in preparation, and thanked the group.
 - b. Bob walked through highlights of the latest *Spotlights*, which is on Southwestern College's PRT process. He noted the application of the PRT process to helping the institution address its accreditation recommendations.
 - i. Aaron observed that ACCJC training had changed markedly from the past: a "180-degree" difference, he said.
 - ii. Bill stated that in his experience, some institutions do not know the full extent of their issues when they express interest in receiving PRT assistance. He asked where the Spotlights are distributed, and Bob responded that they are posted on the IEPI website and on the RP Group listserv. Bill suggested that they be sent out to every District, with a note encouraging them to distribute them to their trustees.
5. Matthew walked through the latest evaluation reporting schedule for the TA Workgroup, as shown on the Workgroup agenda.
6. David Brown requested volunteers to participate in the focused user feedback on the redesign of the ASKs, and three members responded. While they were engaged in the feedback room, David walked through the redesigned site and provided more details to the remaining members.
7. Matthew requested feedback from the group on the Approaches to Technical Assistance: Menu of Options Update, which had been prompted by discussion at the Executive Committee retreat in July.
 - a. Suggestions and questions included the following:
 - i. Move the Areas of Focus entry to the beginning of each category, and provide some examples.
 - ii. An example for COP coverage might be community college bachelor's programs.
 - iii. Should we establish a mentoring program for new CEOs and trustees?
 - iv. Focused coaching should begin with a set initial term, with, say, three-month extensions as needed.
 - v. Add some coverage of recruitment of PRT and mini-PRT volunteers in the General Provisions section.
 - b. Matthew asked members to send him any more feedback they might have on the document within two weeks.

C. Professional Development (Jeff and Carrie)

1. History of Professional Development (PD) Workshops
 - a. Previous workshops have been the result of three sources: town hall meetings, Partnership Resource Teams (PRTs), and shifting needs of the field.
 - i. Town halls were held throughout California when IEPI began in which feedback was sought on the system's PD needs. This resulted in a list of topics for workshops.
 - ii. Colleges seeking technical assistance from IEPI submit a letter of interest to receive an IEPI Partnership Resource Team (PRT). These letters of interest had many common themes, which led to workshops that addressed some of the most common requests. A list of these topics, and which have been addressed by IEPI workshops, was distributed.
 - iii. Shifting needs of the field have also contributed to what workshops IEPI has offered—e.g., the guided pathways conferences are not a result of the town halls or PRTs, but the shift towards systemwide implementation of the framework.
 - b. Through the initial workshops, IEPI has developed “the IEPI way” of developing a workshop, which focuses on bringing teams to work together, and ensuring that teams leave with an action-plan to take back to their college or district.
2. IEPI PD Workshops Going Forward
 - a. There are fifteen workshops planned through the rest of 2017-2018, which largely close out the initial work from the above three areas. There is a desire to shift from being largely reactive in determining which workshops to offer and instead develop a plan to carry forward over the next 12-18 months.
 - b. A conversation about theory of change and the process by which to develop a long-term plan of PD Workshops ensued, with the goal to have a substantive discussion about what the 12-18 month plan could be at the next meeting. Some themes included:
 - i. It will be beneficial to have a/some big, visionary goals to focus on—the goals laid out in the Vision for Success are the most likely candidates—from which we can map out a plan.
 - ii. There is a significant need for reactive PD in our system right now, as colleges are dealing with crises stemming from changes at the federal level (e.g., DACA, Title IX). It would be good if IEPI could offer a quick response to these sorts of issues so that colleges aren't all independently creating their own solutions.
 - iii. The development of this plan could probably benefit from dialog with and input from other IEPI Workgroups, particularly P3.
 - iv. Many of the topics already covered would benefit from follow-up professional development activities, either through workshops or on the PLN.
 - c. A sub-group will discuss the planning of a 12-18 month vision for IEPI workshops, and will bring back initial work to a future IEPI Advisory meeting (ideally, October 27th).
 - i. Members: Beth Kay, Deborah Harrington, Keren Stashower, Linda Collins, Jerry Buckley, Barbara McNeice-Stallard, Brad Trimble, Anjeanette Oberg, Carmen Sandoval, Trish Simpson, Carrie Roberson, Jeff Spano
3. Professional Learning Network (PLN) Update
 - a. The PLN is meant to be a clearinghouse of innovative and exciting programs and practices from throughout the California Community College system. It kicked off in April 2016, and is currently in the midst of evolving from the minimal viable product to a more substantive and flexible site.
 - i. One aspect of this is a migration of the site from Wordpress to Drupal as the backbone of the site.
 - b. In addition, a significant push to increase the number of resources from the colleges on the site recently began, with six major strategies being implemented.

- c. A pilot of the PLN on Cornerstone—a professional learning management system—will begin in January at around five colleges, the Chancellor’s Office, and the Foundation for California Community Colleges.
- 4. Flex Update
 - a. The PLN has consulted with the Chancellor’s Office’s Academic Affairs division and 4CSD, the statewide professional development coordinators organization, to determine how to best support Flex Coordinators. There will be a forum created on the PLN for Flex Coordinators, which PD/Flex leaders will pre-populate with some content to begin the conversation.
 - i. This forum will be created after the transition to Drupal to ensure that no content is lost during the transition to a new platform.
- 5. ASK Update
 - a. Design Media presented a prototype of the new ASK designs. The primary new feature is a new pathway to the content—users will be able to select a task that they would like to complete, and then find a list of steps necessary to complete the task and the ASK resources related to each step.
- 6. General Housekeeping
 - a. Carrie Roberson from Butte College will be the new co-chair of the PD Workgroup along with Jeff Spano.

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Stacy and Rebecca)

- 1. Changing the charge of P3
 - a. We see our role as
 - i. Liaisons to the system, to field, to outside research orgs, to the CCCCO’s Tech, Research, and Information Systems division
 - ii. We will identify policy areas of concern for system
 - iii. Facilitate conversations
 - iv. Keep an eye on all research
 - v. Identify policy barriers, best practices
 - vi. Identify what is most important to the CA community college system, and to our colleges
 - b. Request to workgroup membership: Bring info to the Success Center about potential policy changes, etc. We will collect and summarize it, then give it to Chancellor’s Office (CO) for their action.
 - c. We do not make decisions, that is CO’s role.
 - d. Julie Bruno asked for confirmation that the consultation process / 5C still was in place. The Success Center confirms that those processes are still in place.
 - e. Group wants background on how policy issues have arisen.
 - f. Group wants a framework for looking at policy issues and mechanism for feedback.
 - g. Mission of P3 was clarified as day progressed
 - i. To prioritize issues, P3 suggested having issues vetted through the many workgroups of experts and have data associated with each proposal. (A)DOF suggested that we distinguish between systemic changes and issues that can be addressed at a lower level
 - ii. P3 Policy Review Process: Group liked the idea of beginning policy review process by having Success Center (SC) share CO-list, for review. List would be used to determine what additional data and research is needed to develop a proposal. With additional data, group can decide if issue is legislative or can easily be addressed through regulations.
 - iii. Additional questions were raised about the change in P3 Workgroup:
 - (A) What is the relationship between IEPI Exec Committee and P3?
 - (B) How will we integrate with other workgroups?
 - (C) What type of representation is needed in this group? How to ensure representation?

- iv. Discussed timeline for
 - (A) Vetting in groups
 - (B) Getting appropriate representation in meetings
 - h. Possible Review Process for Policy Issues was proposed:
 - i. Identify constituency groups and contacts
 - ii. Manage prioritization
 - (A) Short-term and long-term priorities, recommendations to CO
 - iii. P3 as a sounding board for policy / research issues on the horizon
 - (A) Identify initial questions to be answered. All issues addressed should relate back into the Strategic Vision.
 - (B) Focus on BoG legislative and funding priority list as well as the Vision for Success.
 - (C) Speak to what research is needed to address questions.
 - (D) Identify key stakeholders to be consulted in the review process.
 - (E) Provide continued guidance or feedback as the Success Center staff progress through the research and writing process.
- 2. Possible Policy Issue Discussed: Tutoring
 - a. There is a problem as it relates to the 50% law.
 - i. Peer tutoring from those with Bachelor's degrees?
 - ii. Need to collect more data from field.
 - iii. Andrew mentioned "enhanced noncredit" as it relates to tutoring.
 - iv. Discussed the relationship between supplemental instruction and tutoring.
 - v. Will this require regulatory or legislative change?
 - b. It was noted that everything really comes back to the 50% law, and tutoring is not on "the good side" of the 50% law.
 - c. A member asked for evidence/data that suggests that students do not have appropriate access to tutoring.
 - i. We plan to collect that data as well as how it will benefit students in their continued education/transfer rates.
 - d. Need tutoring to be available for basic skills students, not just for basic skills courses.
- 3. Concern about Integration
 - a. There is an overall concern with the integration of funding for initiatives.
 - b. Once funds become part of the General Fund, the dollars are more difficult to appropriate.
 - c. CBO perspective on funding formula: hard to integrate separate funding streams after the fact.
- 4. Additional Comments
 - a. There were questions about the relationship between noncredit and credit.
 - i. We must remember to keep an ear to the many other advisory committees throughout the system, because policy issues can rise out of those groups.
 - b. Should there be a portal where the field can submit ideas or issues for review or consideration?
 - i. These would not be taken verbatim, but used as a reliability check or a way to aggregate issues that re-occur
 - c. There needs to be two-way communication with constituency groups.
 - d. What are some venues for developing/informing the policy agenda?
 - i. CCCCCO legislative agenda
 - ii. Program staff on the ground (PLN?)
 - iii. PRTs
 - iv. Chancellor's call to the field for policy changes
 - e. Policy Shop will put together a proposed structure and mission for the next P3 meeting

5. Next Steps

- a. Success Center is to contact individuals/committees identified as key stakeholders to inform them of P3 Policy Review Process.
- b. PLN suggested as a resource to engage and capture feedback from program experts who are not participating in any formal workgroup.
- c. Prior to October's meeting, Success Center is to send out the P3 structure and mission/charge for review

III. General Session 2

- A. Matthew, Barry, Stacy, and Carrie shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions (see above).

IV. Adjournment