IEPI
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Westin Sacramento
October 27, 2017, 9:30 am-2:30 pm
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Blackwood	Kathy	Ind	Leong	Tim	PD/PPP
Brown	Aaron	TA	May	Ginni	TA
Burke	Kathleen	TA	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Carr	Leslie	PD	Meuschke	Daylene	Ind
Coleal	Sharlene	PD/PPP	Oberg	Anjeanette	PD
Coleman	Laura	Ind	Roberson	Carrie	PD
Contreras	Daniel	PD	Sanchez	Mark	TBD
Eikey	Rebecca	PPP	Sandberg	Mary	PD
Fisher	Stacy	PPP	Sandoval	Carmen	PD
Freitas	John	PPP	Schardt	Jan	PD
Greaney	KC	Ind	Schoenecker	Paula	TA
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Slattery-Farrell	Lorraine	PPP
Hastey	Brent	PD	Stanskas	John	Ind
Howell	Lisa	PD	Stoup	Gregory	Ind
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Swarm	Darryl	TA/PPP
Janio	Jarek	Ind/PPP	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Johnson	Joyce	PD	Todd	James	Ind
Kay	Beth	Ind/PD	Urquiza	Maritza	PPP
Kovrig	Neill K.	PPP	Wah	Linda	PPP
Lamanque	Andrew	PPP	Wojcik	Alketa	PD

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind/ PD	Madden	Sean	PPP/PD
Atalig	Christine	Ind	McNeice-Stallard	Barbara	PPP/PD
Bell	Autumn	PD	Pacansky-Brock	Michelle	PD
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Pacheco	Robert	TA
Collins	Linda	PD	Purnell-Mack	Rogeair	PD
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Schrager	Cynthia	PD
Dettman	Sarah	NA	Simpson	Trish	PD
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Spano	Jeff	PD
Harrington	Deborah	PD	Stashower	Keren	PD

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Howe	Michael	PPP/PD	Trimble	Brad	PPP/PD
Jez	Su Jin	PD/ PPP	Ward	Teresa	PD
Leal-Carrillo	Nadia	PPP	Wutke	Kevin	PD

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Adan	Sara	Ind	Howe	Lisa	PD
Berliner	Rachel	PPP	Levy	Rita	PD
Chatwood	Andrea	PD	Robertson	Candace	PD
Finche	Wrenna	PPP/PD	Tilly	Darle	PD

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

I.   General Session 1

A. KC and Neill each shared an Education Moment.

B. Discussion of Aligning Indicators

1. Barry shared an inventory of all major indicators systems now in use in the California Community Colleges. He noted that no single indicator is used across all those systems, and asked the Committee how many indicators they thought would be ideal. Responses varied, but were typically under 10, in contract to the over 70 indicators now in use. Barry then asked members to do a "gallery walk" of poster-size versions of the inventory around the room, vote on the indicators they regarded as most useful, and write comments if they wished.

2. Comments after the walk included the following:
   a. Difference audiences (e.g., board members versus staff) will want and need different information from indicators.
   b. Context matters, and it is the meaningful discussion of indicators that counts.
   c. Colleges can formulate and apply additional indicators on their own.

3. The indicator clusters that received 10 or more votes as most useful were as follows (total number of votes in parentheses):
   a. Completion rate; Percent of degree, certificate or transfer students completing with 6 years (Overall, prepared and unprepared) (22)
   b. Career Technical Education completion; Percentage of CTE students completing degree, certificate or becoming transfer prepared within six years; Number of students who earned CTE certificates or degrees (22)
   c. Equity; Equity gaps; Reduce equity gaps by 40 percent within 5 years and eliminate them within 10 years (20)
   d. Transfers; Number of Transfers; Ratio of the number of students—by population group—who complete a minimum of 12 units and have attempted a transfer level course in mathematics or English, to the number of students in that group who actually transfer after one or more (up to six) years; Number of CTE students who transfer to a four-year institution (20)
   e. Persistence; Percentage of first-time students who enroll in three consecutive primary terms; Number and percentage of Fall students who enroll in the spring (14)
   f. Employment; Skills Builder (% median wage increase); Median wage gain for CTE students who do not complete (14)
   g. Percentage of students who earned a degree, certificate, or were skillsbuilders who attained a living wage (12)
   h. Percentage of first-time students who complete transfer-level English/Math within 1 and 2 years (12)
   i. Median time to degree (12)

    j. Successful course completion (DataMart); Percentage of students completing with a grade of "C" or better; Course success rate in a college-level course (C or better) (10)

    k. Degrees and certificates; Ratio of the number of students—by population group—who receive a degree or certificate to the number of students in that group with the same informed matriculation goal; Increase the percentage of degrees, certificates, or specific skills sets by 20 percent (10)

4. Barry then led the Committee through a brainstorming session on what the process of aligning and simplifying indicators across all these systems should be. A sampling of the many comments includes the following:

    a. Financial and instructional/student services indicators have been mutually exclusive, and need to be integrated.

    b. Part of the process has to consider elected officials, who expect to see results of particular indicators.

    c. For many years, the private sector has used the balanced scorecard approach, which could be adapted to use in the CCCs.

    d. Indicators have to have support from regions, K-12, universities, and employers.

    e. Include asking students whether they have gotten what they want from the system, even if it's only one course.

    f. We have a lot of students who do not fit the transfer/degree/certificate profile, and their achievements should also be considered.

    g. Any set of indicators is likely to last only three to five years. They need to be meaningful at the local level.

    h. Consider how to make indicator results actionable, and include qualitative ends as well as quantitative.

    i. Consider what would resonate well with faculty (e.g., real-time data on trends and choke points; easy-to-use reports).

    j. Establish trigger points for action if certain indicators fall below expectations.

    k. Indicators should help colleges know themselves, what they need to improve, and how; the process needs to be inclusive.

    l. Document the process of alignment, including the why and the how.

5. Barry asked members to comment on the Chancellor's Office convening a blue-ribbon panel with representation from a variety of constituents and functions in a two-day retreat, which would come up with a set of recommendations on which regional reviews and conversations would take place. Responses included the following:

    a. One question is whether the Chancellor's Office is interested.

    b. Consultation Council is very interested.

    c. The panel should consider how each indicator in the full set has actually been used over the past year by colleges, and ask colleges which of them is essential.

    d. The blue-ribbon panel approach seems very top-down, when what is needed is teams, including students.

    e. Need representation from people on the ground.

6. Barry thanks the Committee for their thoughtful participation.

II. **Workgroup Sessions**

  A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry and John Stanskas)*

    1. Approval of Minutes

      a. The minutes from September 15, 2017 were approved.

    2. Alignment of Indicator Systems

      a. Review Crosswalk and Feedback from Advisory

         i. The crosswalk and feedback from Advisory was reviewed.

      b. Recommended Process for Building Alignment

         i. It was suggested that a survey be sent to the field, including CIOs, researchers, senate presidents, non-credit deans, trustees, etc.

      (A) Ask respondents to indicate their top 5 indicators used to inform decision-making and planning processes.

      (B) What decisions were they making?

      (C) Some indicators could include major goals/subgoals, steps through the matriculation process, barriers through matriculation.

      (D) What are some possible equity indicators?

ii. Get students input early in the process, including before the survey is administered.

      (A) The group may ask the Student Senate to define what a good college is and what they would like to get out of a college.

iii. Equity indicators should be developed. It would be helpful to use color gradation to demonstrate which indicator shows disproportionate impact.

iv. We should research options and develop white papers on current indicators systems.

v. Gary Adams / Strong Workforce will send the new dashboard for API.

vi. It would be helpful to meet with Legislative staff early and often while developing the redesigned indicator model.

vii. The group talked about issues with new legislation requiring CCC to collect information on the additional data elements (e.g., homeless youth).

viii. We should try to reduce the overall number of indicators to 5 to 10 and possibly allow for drilling into more details and additional indicators through a data library.

ix. We should use indicators that have been in use where possible.

x. The Fiscal Advisory Workgroup should be engaged in the process.

xi. The purpose of the indicators is to help colleges know themselves and how to improve.

xii. The process needs to be inclusive.

xiii. There should be consideration of how to help faculty lead conversations about improvement.

xiv. A paper should document how and why the changes were made.

xv. It would be helpful to know if there are any statewide groups looking at blending indicators (e.g., K-12 and CCC). It was suggested that we reach out to CDE to see if anyone is looking at measuring the college and career readiness alignment with colleges. They currently get 7 data elements from CCC to comply with their requirement to report college and career readiness. San Mateo CCD has worked with some of their local high schools to build the 9-12 coursework and coursework for the first 2 years of college into their intake/ed plan system.

xvi. Blue Ribbon Membership and Proposed Model

      (A) The membership should include Scorecard, Pathways, Strong Workforce, ACCJC, Consultative Bodies List, Legislative staff, LAO staff, CCCCO affected divisions, and representatives with connection to AEBG, ACE, etc.

      (B) The Blue Ribbon committee could include equity as part of their work.

xvii. This could also house a drill-down method for more specific data.

xviii. Decisions need to be made by June 30, 2018 in order for colleges to be informed of the upcoming change(s).

3. Year 4 Portal Recommendations

   a. Review indicator definitions

      i. A handout titled *Framework of Indicators (Year 4)* was distributed. The group was asked to review the definitions and get back to Sara Adan with any request for changes or corrections by mid-November 2017.

   b. There was discussion about the reorganization of the portal and it was decided that moving accreditation and FTE indicators before the student performance section and sub-heading for the student performance would be helpful.

        i.   The group was asked to confirm the indicators that are to be associated with the "College Choice" indicator (#11, 13, 14 and 15). Technology, Research and Information Systems (TRIS) will organize indicators by "remedial" and related items.

    c.   Confirm the college choice student achievement indicator will be a choice from indicators 11, 13, 14, and 15.

        i.   There is an issue with how colleges are completing #31. Options were provided for resolving the challenge, one of which is to include a drop-down for the four options (#11, 13, 14 and 15). Another option is to put instructions on #31 which would ask them to select their chosen indicator and then direct them back to the actual indicator to enter goals.

    d.   Input on defining CTE: TOP/CIP

        i.   There was discussion about how are we defining CTE certificates and degrees as well as the TOP codes. One of the suggestions was to incorporate the use of zip codes, but this couldn't be implemented until year 5.

       ii.   It was suggested that colleges advise students that the certificates are a stepping-stone to a degree.

    e.   Confirm optional goals for degree and certificate indicators

        i.   In light of the Strategic Vision direction, it was discussed that there may not be a need for the recently added "degree and certificate" indicator, but this is a consideration for Year 5.

       ii.   Santa Monica College did backward audits, which resulted in large increases in degree awards.

    f.   Other

        i.   Sara Adan will send out the two noncredit indicator suggestions that colleges made.

       ii.   It was suggested that for Year 5 we consider the RP Group measures of near the gate, at the gate, and through the gate.

      iii.   For Year 5 the group will consider dropping combined degree certificates.

      iv.   It was agreed to keep the "Portal" and related process as an ongoing agenda item so that the group can be updated with what they are hearing from the field.

4. Future Agenda Items / Next Steps

    a.   Create a plan for reducing the number of indicators.

    b.   Note that the crosswalk and process for creating alignment blending the above feedback with the feedback from Advisory will be drafted by Barry and sent out to the group. Please send feedback as soon as possible and the revised document will be sent to the Chancellor's Office for consideration.

        i.   It would be helpful to receive a memo from the CCCCO confirming that this is the direction they want to go.

       ii.   The group will document the history of how the indicators (approx. 80) came to be and why they are making a change.

A. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew and Yolanda)

1. New members Ginni May and Paula Schoenecker introduced themselves.

2. Matthew provided updates on the current PRT cycle and on the upcoming Northern California Partnership Resource COP meeting.

3. Evaluation of the PRT Process

    a.   Bob provided a brief introduction to the evaluation process.

    b.   Matthew asked for questions and comments regarding the Cycles 2A and 2B Visit 3 reports or the Cycle 4A Webinar and Workshops report. Highlights of the discussion included the following:

        i.   Bill asked whether a "Strong" rating was different enough from "Very Strong" to warrant attention. Matthew responded that in his judgment, both ratings indicated perfectly acceptable levels of performance.

      ii.   Some client institutions and even some Leads are still not entirely clear about the value of the third visit, and Matthew continues to try to clarify that to both.

      iii.   With respect to survey response rates, Paula noted that once the Seed Grant check is cut, client motivation to respond to the surveys likely declines.

      iv.   With respect to informing client-institution participants more systematically about the nature and purposes of the PRT process, Ginni suggested providing the client CEO and substantive point person a template with suggested attachments for sharing the Letter of Interest and other information.

4. Technical Assistance Menu of Options Update
   a. Matthew shared the latest version of the TA Menu of Options. Executive Committee, at its meeting the previous day, had deleted two sections (Guided Pathways Capacity-Building and Other Options in Brief) because they appeared to go beyond IEPI's brief for technical assistance. Comments and questions from the group included the following:
      i. Kathleen noted that focused coaching on noncredit program development would be useful. Matthew noted that that would be an appropriate Area of Focus for a Mini-PRT, too.
      ii. Members recognized that focused coaching should not be in competition with services from other technical assistance providers, such as the Academic Senate on noncredit curricula.
      iii. Bill emphasized the need for first-year coaching for new CEOs, but noted that IEPI would need to check with CCLC on whether their current efforts in that area essentially provide that service. He also suggested that coaching for board chairs would be very useful.
      iv. Integration of initiatives (e.g., SSSP, BSI, etc.) is still an area in which many colleges need help.
      v. It would be important to vet the pool of coaches thoroughly.
      vi. Coaching would likely be more directive and assertive than, say, PRT assistance.
      vii. Coaching would likely not be accompanied by any seed grants or other funding.

B. *Professional Development (Jeff and Carrie)*

1. Stage-Setting
   a. The PD efforts over the last couple years came primarily out of town hall meetings, PRTs, and emerging issues. In the previous meeting, a shift from being reactive to being proactive was discussed, so that people can be informed of the options 12-18 months out, and plan accordingly. A sub-group met to discuss this, and now they are expanding the discussion to get input from the entire workgroup.
2. The goal for this discussion is to develop a plan such that we can communicate what the framework for PD is and why we have made the decisions that we have.
3. Group norms: What allows you to be at your best in a group setting, and maximizes opportunities for collective intelligence and action?
   a. Listen with the intent to understand rather than respond
   b. Openness to innovation
   c. Feeling trust
   d. Feeling of freedom to speak one's mind and be wrong
   e. Knowing the shared vision or goal
   f. Ensuring that everyone has equal time to speak
   g. An environment free from external distractions
   h. The assumption of good will
   i. Confidential things remaining confidential
   j. Student-centered
4. Report-out from groups discussing what makes especially effective professional development:
   a. Common answers included…
      i. Highly engaging

  ii. Timely and relevant
  iii. Applicable, contextualized, and relevant
  iv. Has clear outcomes
  v. Informed design—the content is determined by people working in the relevant field
  vi. Offers sufficient time to learn over time
  vii. Easily available and accessible
  viii. Leads to growth
  ix. Inspires change
  x. Creates a culture that values PD
  xi. Goal-oriented
  xii. Collaborative
  xiii. Has equity-mindedness baked in

 b. Further answers that emerged during the conversation included…
  i. Delivery through diverse modalities
  ii. Iterative and scaffolded, building on one another
  iii. Emergent through collective wisdom in the field
  iv. Inclusive and culturally competent/responsive, e.g., by having a built-in point at which the degree of cultural competence of the professional development is considered and discussed
  v. Flexible, but fitting within a larger strategic context and vision
  vi. Student-centered
  vii. Evidence-based
  viii. Peer-to-peer
  ix. Involves modeling
  x. Self-reflective/metacognitive

5. What would it look like to do the opposite of what we have described as effective professional development?
 a. 8am-5pm PowerPoint presentations
 b. Presenters that simply read their PowerPoints
 c. Siloing those involved by function
 d. Including no breaks
 e. Having a non-conducive environment, e.g., a room without windows.
 f. Have the content developed by people who aren't involved in the actual work being discussed
 g. Basing it on what we assume that people want, rather than the needs that have emerged
 h. Including two days of content in one day
 i. Boxed or no lunches
 j. Too theoretical without any application—missing the real-life problems that people are facing
 k. Having attendees showing up simply because they have to be there
 l. Assume that participants know nothing, or teaching to the lowest level
 m. Not having enough seats or other layout issues
 n. Lack a way of evaluating/learning from what has been done before
 o. Using insider jargon that may not be known by all attendees
 p. Prescriptive without being learner-centered
 q. Doesn't involve the question, "what needs to come next?"
  i. Perhaps these are elements that we can start look for/at in our evaluator surveys. It may be helpful to have an example of one of those to look at in a future meeting to compare with this list to ensure that we are evaluating whether we are doing any of these things.

6. What the sub-group put together based on similar activities was distributed. Feedback on that document is welcome, as that group is planning on taking the discussion from today and revising the document.
7. IEPI Workshops
   a. A list was distributed of recently and upcoming PD workshops. The plan being developed is hoped to take effect in the fall of next year. Topics that have emerged for the spring include inmate education, the guided pathways workplan, accessibility, change leadership, and an SEM Academy. These aren't fixed—the work is just beginning.
   b. How are IEPI Workshops advertised?
      i. Through the IEPI website and various listservs. If they are trying to target particular groups, IEPI also targets messaging to particular groups (e.g., a message about the guided pathways workshop was sent to the CEO list).
   c. What is the status of the emergency preparedness training?
      i. It's still on IEPI's radar, but has stalled due to staff turnover.
      ii. The people who were involved in the discussion have expressed willingness to continue meeting among themselves.
8. ASK Task Paths
   a. A lot of the elements in the ASKs are interconnected, so the redesign is partially focusing on better integrating them so that they are inclusive without being duplicated.
      i. Part of this includes putting together Task Paths—generating a list of tasks that users may come to the ASK section looking to do, and then creating a path to accomplish that task, with associated resources from the ASK(s) to help.
   b. Release of the redesign is planned for mid-December.
   c. The Guided Pathways ASK is in the midst of developing a library of resources for colleges involved in doing the work. If you have any relevant resources, Rogeair Purnell-Mack asks that you send them to her, and they will put together an annotated library of them.
9. Additional Norms to add:
   a. Inclusive
   b. Cultural competence

C. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Stacy and Rebecca)
1. Present updated mission of P3 Workgroup based on Sept. meeting input
   a. The Workgroup first discussed rationale for the change in focus of the P3 Workgroup. Since the Chancellor's Office was lacking a team to evaluate policy, the Success Center developed the Policy Shop to add more capacity for this purpose. The Success Center is considered an extension of the Chancellor's Office. To help inform possible policy changes needed, the Success Center/Chancellor's Office thought local experience and information from the campuses would be needed to help identify the resources that are or aren't available, what is really needed and what is or isn't likely to be successful. This resulted in the proposed change in focus for the P3 Workgroup.
   b. It was clarified that the P3 Workgroup is not making policy decisions, rather provides necessary feedback to Chancellor's Office.
   c. How is the Success Center funded? It is a 501c3 organization and receives grant support through IEPI and a variety of sources, such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Kresge Foundation, Lumina Foundation, and Irvine.
   d. How are the priorities for possible policy change determined? Through the Chancellor's Office. For example, as the Chancellor's Office has been more involved in the conversations about Guided Pathways, discussions have occurred about how various programs (such as financial aid and tutoring) could be better aligned through possible policy change.
2. Clarify P3 Process Moving Forward
   a. In preparing for the meeting, the Workgroup would like to review a summary of the issue, which includes rationale for why issue is chosen, supporting data, relevant background materials, and guiding questions.

b. To be most effective in providing feedback on a particular policy issue, it is expected that P3 members act as a liaison between their various constituent groups and the Success Center, so that locally based experience and knowledge is used to inform the P3 Workgroup's recommendations.

c. There was concern about having enough cross-institution feedback from the field on the direction and/input on particular policy issues. The Workgroup recommends that the P3 Workgroup chairs expand the membership to include additional representatives to ensure more cross-institutional feedback.

d. The members of the Workgroup expressed interest in helping to set priority of policy issues in advance of the next legislative cycle. For example, each representative could share, at the P3 Workgroup, the different policy issues they've encountered in the other groups they participate in and experienced on their local levels. The P3 Workgroup would then discuss the different issues brought to the table at these meetings and decide on 3-4 to be the recommended as priority. Then the Success Center will then do some research and information gathering and present results to the Chancellor's Office.

e. The Workgroup discussed changes to the Mission:
   i. Add Chancellor's Office strategic vision goals
   ii. Add clarification on the Success Center to the mission and some clarification about the connection to IEPI
   iii. Add specific language regarding "making policy recommendations"
   iv. Mission:
      (A) The Policy, Procedures, and Practices Workgroup serves as an advisory group for the Policy Shop in the Success Center, a non-profit organization supported by IEPI. It will review and discuss background materials on policies or system-wide practices that impact institutional effectiveness and make recommendations on policy changes. They will provide the necessary feedback from the field, including information from other workgroups, campus colleagues/programs, etc. Focus will be on policies and practices related to the yearly CCC Budget and Legislative proposals approved by the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office Strategic Plan/Vision Goals. The workgroup may also identify issues for possible policy priorities.

3. Things to work on in the interim:
   a. What happens after a successful meeting? We didn't finish the conversation and can't make a recommendation yet.
   b. Defined workflow getting discussed: What does "Done" look like?
   c. Organization of work proceeding from start to finish: Outline of the development of the issues and the steps being taken to enact the recommendations – so we can reflect and evaluate
   d. Being cognizant of the number of issues we face and how much time we will truly need to accomplish these goals
      i. Determining real expectations of how much can be accomplished in the time allowed for these meetings
      ii. What happens for the members if we can't reach conclusions, or contribute as much as we hope?
         (A) Sub groups? Task groups? To continue the work separately?
   e. One-page summary from the Success Center from previous meetings in advance to give some more prep time
   f. Send out updates to all and receive feedback, concerns, questions, etc.

4. Financial Aid
   a. Financial Aid – started in January and called for major issues that system needs to address in regulatory and statutory areas
   b. Why is Financial Aid our focus?

       i.   Success Center was asked to talk to the divisions, do some research, and discover the outcomes that are being seen.

      ii.   Financial Aid was only our focus for the first round.

    c. Challenges: Technology (how we can leverage system-wide tech); Cal Grant B went up but needs to be expanded to head off increasing expenses; Student Aid Commission needs help and is short staffed; BOG fee waiver and eligibility index; number of these grants for full time students and completion; diffusing funding because the main group of students may not be eligible

    d. Compile questions and turn them into the Financial Aid administration

       i.   Would Success Center do this, or would this group do that? Either group, Success Center will send out the survey.

      ii.   Financial Aid doesn't address non-credit students

     iii.   Teach fiscal responsibility in non-credit and how to access aid outside the normal funding.

    e. It's difficult for the students to figure out – road map to help kids navigate the system

III.   General Session 2

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

IV.   Adjournment