IEPI

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Hyatt Regency
1209 L St, Sacramento
January 19, 2018, 9:30 am-2:30 pm
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	Kay	Beth	Ind/PD
Bellisimo	Yolanda	TA	Lamanque	Andrew	PPP
Blackwood	Kathy	Ind	Larkin	Patti	PD
Bruno	Julie	PD	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Burke	Kathleen	TA	Leong	Tim	PD/PPP
Contreras	Daniel	PD	May	Ginni	TA
Curry	Keith	PPP	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Dain	Claudette	PPP	Messina	Kimberlee	TA
Dozier	Julia	PD	Meuschke	Daylene	Ind
Eikey	Rebecca	PPP	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Fisher	Stacy	PPP	Oberg	Anjeanette	PD
Foster	Sam	Ind	Purtell	Valentina	Ind
Freitas	John	PPP	Roberson	Carrie	PD
Greaney	KC	Ind	Sandberg	Mary	PD
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Sanders	Brian	
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Stoup	Gregory	Ind
Janio	Jarek	Ind/PPP	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Johns	Krista	NA	Todd	James	Ind
Johnson	Joyce	PD	Wah	Linda	PPP

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind/ PD	McNeice-Stallard	Barbara	PPP/PD
Atalig	Christine	Ind	Mondorf	Anneliese	
Bell	Autumn	PD	Pacansky-Brock	Michelle	PD
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Pacheco	Robert	TA
Bray	Susan	PD	Ramirez-Faghih	Caroline	Ind
Broom	Cheryl	NA	Schrager	Cynthia	PD
Collins	Linda	PD	Simpson	Trish	PD
Crossland	Catherine	Ind	Smith	Carrie	PD
Dettman	Sarah	NA	Spano	Jeff	PD

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Jez	Su Jin	PD/ PPP	Stashower	Keren	PD
Larson	Erin	PPP	Tan	Connie	NA
Leal-Carrillo	Nadia	PPP	Ward	Teresa	PD
Madden	Sean	PPP/PD			

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Adan	Sara	Ind	Chatwood	Andrea	PD
Antrobus	Rachel		Momjian	Gohar	
Assagai	D'Karla		Reynolds	Steven	
Brunell	Amanda		Robertson	Candace	PD

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

I. General Session 1

A. Julia Dozier and Madelyn Arballo each shared an Education Moment.

B. Theresa welcomed two guests from the ACCJC: Gohar Momjian and Steven Reynolds. She then introduced three new staff members in the IE Division: Anneliese Mondorf, Trish Simpson, and D'Karla Assagai.

C. A Moment of Appreciation for Advisory Committee Members

 1. Theresa and Barry noted that many members of the Advisory Committee had been involved since the very beginning of the initiative, and that the Committee lies at the heart of IEPI. Its work has been ongoing, and the quality of discussion among smart people with diverse perspectives has been remarkable. The result has been action, not just talk: PRTs, Workshops, the PLN, the ASKs, the Indicators system, and all the rest.

 2. As Barry and Theresa called out their names, all members of the Committee who had served an extended period of time were presented with certificates of appreciation and IEPI-embossed padfolios.

D. IEPI 2.0 Brainstorming

 1. Theresa and Barry introduced the session with some historical context, including the developments of the past six to eight months. Theresa noted the need to integrate efforts to help improve institutional effectiveness across the various divisions of the Chancellor's Office. Barry gave special recognition to Julie Bruno and the ASCCC, who have been tireless supporters of IEPI since the beginning. He observed that the context of our work has changed (e.g., in the decline in accreditation sanctions), so the nature of our work is also changing. We need to build on the fabulous efforts to date, and continue what is working well, but also determine what else we can be doing to help improve institutional effectiveness.

 2. Initial comments from Committee members included the following:

 a. Keep up the spirit of engagement and participation across constituent groups: Participate-Collaborate-Innovate!

 b. Keep attending to accreditation issues.

 c. Sustaining the work over time is a challenge.

 3. Committee members engaged in brainstorming at their tables, and reported out highlights of their answers to the five prompts, which were recorded by volunteers on posters, as follows:

 a. *How would you define institutional effectiveness?*

 1. Sustainable
 2. Responsive
 3. Common understanding
 4. Student success
 5. Collegiality
 6. Success
 7. Evidence based strategic planning and implementation

8. Student centeredness
9. Continuous quality improvement
10. Creating models for best practices to help advance efforts
11. Reflective practice
12. Institutional missions is front and center
13. Resources used to effectively pursue success
14. Culture of experimentation
15. Innovation
16. Safe space for collaboration
17. Participatory decision making and shared governance
18. Linkage between CTE and skills needed for jobs
19. Appreciation from community and impact on community
20. Careful goal development and follow through
21. Clear and inclusive communication
22. Partnerships with K-12, CCC and universities
23. Current and relevant
24. Transparency
25. Fiscal viability
26. Professional development for faculty, staff and board members
27. Access for all
28. Equity
29. Jobs with living wages
30. Provides a safe environment especially for most vulnerable groups
31. Knowledge building and knowledge sharing

b. *In what ways have IEPI and the Advisory Committee been most effective?*
1. Increased knowledge of indicators on campuses and how they can be used (leading vs lagging indicators, how to measure and predict improvement)
2. Increased engagement
3. Built systemic connections
4. IEPI is the only initiative that really focused on institutional practice.
5. Encouraged peer collaboration
6. Cultivated networking amongst different constituencies
7. Encouraged and supported self-reflection
8. Reflection led to the restructuring of committees
9. IEPI has been the beginning of a culture change in the CCC system.
10. Increased focus on outcomes and less on compliance
11. Collaborated with PRTs
12. Provided workshops which have allowed for clear communication and consistency
13. Shared leadership with the field
14. Branded IEPI which helped gain visibility
15. Provided money to institutions which allowed for them to advance student success
16. Focused on integration
17. Knocked down silos
18. Helped colleges advance agendas through PRT process
19. Partnerships have made a difference across colleges and organizations
20. The process was trusted
21. Work groups were empowered to have the right people in the room and were trusted to do the work.
22. The launch of the PLN
23. The PRTs have been very effective for institutions as well as team members who were then able to bring that experience and knowledge back to their own institutions.

24. The PRTs found underlying issues as to why challenges were occurring, which was extremely valuable.
25. Collaboration across constituent groups
26. Not fear based
27. Helping to solve accreditation problem
28. Emphasized the importance of data-driven decision making
29. Workshops had framework which helped colleges to focus
30. Not just conversation but action
31. Influence on fiscal policy
32. Emboldened a big picture view of what colleges do
33. Improved metrics to make them meaningful and relevant
34. Listened to what colleges want and responded to that need
35. The IEPI helped reframe the image of the chancellor's office to being more listening, responsive and human.
36. Non-credit benefit of learning from the credit institutions successes and achievements
37. Transferable model
38. Transferable measures

c. *Where should IEPI 2.0 go to help institutions advance their innovation and effectiveness?*
1. IEPI 2.0 should provide a forum to help create communities of practice, including by region to address Innovation and Effectiveness.
2. Help support culture change.
3. Provide responsive workshops and opportunities for collaboration based on college needs.
4. Use the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) to help bring together strategic partnerships to facilitate conversations.
5. Encourage more engagement from the Chancellor at IEPI meetings.
6. Invite Deputy Chancellors to attend meetings and perhaps have an agenda item to support their attendance.
7. Invite legislators to participate/visit IEPI meetings regularly.
8. Ensure that what is put in proposed legislation and funding matches the needs from the field.
9. Use IEPI as the forum for the discussion about funding and strategic directions.
10. Expand professional development, including support for the Association of California Community Colleges Administrators (ACCA) and other organizations.
11. Strengthen communications through a platform to ensure all groups know of training opportunities.
12. Provide funding for colleges to send faculty and staff to attend Professional Development.
13. Look at ways to deploy workshops and training locally and regionally.
14. Create mentorship opportunities (e.g., new deans).
15. IEPI 2.0 should look at ways to help colleges better self-diagnose, which might include a strategic conversation with a smaller team before an LOI is submitted.
16. Look at how changes at the CCCCO trickle down to IEPI and what are the implications of those changes.
17. Provide a platform for system dialogue.
18. Focus on equity and diversity on campuses (e.g. HR, Cultural Competencies).
19. Use IEPI as a vehicle for rolling out all CCCCO initiatives.
20. 2.0 should set up the Advisory Committee as the group in between CCCCO and IEPI and allow it to serve as a think tank for the CCCCO.
21. Use the Advisory Committee to effectively serve as a translator of CCCCO initiatives.
22. Engage resource partners to help support the desires and decisions of advisory.

23. Encourage more engagement between different initiatives.
24. Explore whether Student Success needs to be redefined.
25. Ensure a vision for the future becomes consistent across the system.
26. IEPI 2.0 should help prioritize metrics.
27. Explore structure of the CCCCO model and changes needed for the future.
28. Provide management training needed for Guided Pathways (GP).
29. Simplify process for colleges implementing GP.
30. Create a simplified process to help colleges get started with GP.
31. The transient nature of executive positions at colleges creates disruption. IEPI 2.0 could explore how the culture of change can be sustained.
32. Infuse workshops with more concrete examples of what other colleges have done.
33. Provide opportunities for technical assistance with or without PRT.
34. IEPI 2.0 should create mentorship between California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) and colleges to maintain institutional knowledge.
35. Provide opportunities for the Chancellor (CCCCO) to become more involved with IEPI.
36. Help shift the focus from separate colleges to more of a system focus.
37. Create a system for alumni tracking.
38. Provide financial support for students to be involved in IEPI work groups and leadership roles.
39. Provide Professional Development opportunities for student leadership
40. Create focus groups for new initiatives before they're approved so that colleges have a voice.
41. Look at ways to reach out to colleges who haven't requested a PRT.
42. Perhaps publicize topics PRTs have focused on and make PRT stories more easily accessible.
43. Explore the benefits of going to colleges rather than colleges sending teams to IEPI.
44. Provide financial support for students to be involved in IEPI work groups.
45. Expand faculty and classified staff participation in IEPI.
46. Encourage consolidated efforts, which is needed for success.
47. Develop ways for IEPI 2.0 to become a communication hub for funding formula.
48. Examine how to respond effectively to entrepreneurial students.
49. Explore ways to teach digital literacy (think about LinkedIn model).
50. Develop a mentor/teacher model to support success.
51. Look at how to market the Professional Learning Network (PLN) effectively.
52. Utilize a Common Learning Management System (CLM) for Professional Development (PD).
53. Develop ways in which the PLN can be useful to advance first level of training that happens through workshops and trainings.
54. The IEPI 2.0 should create a 12-18 month calendar for PD events, being more thoughtful and intentional about offerings and less reactive.
55. Reach those colleges who struggle to attend PD events in far north.
56. Provide an effective link between CTE programs and business/employer needs.
57. Continue to do what's working.

d. *What are the implications in [responses to the question] above for IEPI and the structure and tasks of the Advisory Committee?*
   1. The Advisory Committee should continue and have a larger role on statewide initiatives.
   2. Allocate money to colleges to send faculty and staff to PD training.
   3. Measure use and effectiveness of PLN resources.
   4. Explore ways to make PLN resources more engaging. Consider gathering input from students to inform the redesign.

5. Explore ways to get people to use the PLN.
6. Develop a Mentor Program.
7. Explore how PRTs can use the PLN to increase use of the content.
8. Look at current work group structure and explore whether the right groups and partners are in place.
9. Go back to doing the Advisory Committee as a whole with breakouts as needed.
10. Increase capacity building with regard to Change Management.
11. Prioritize 45 measures into something that is manageable.
12. Ensure technology is supporting the work, not driving it.
13. Keep size of the group as is but let folks exit as needed.
14. Consider term limits for members.
15. More engagement of executive leadership from CCCCO
16. Increase staff at IEPI.
17. If workgroup structure remains, add technology workgroup.
18. Consider workgroups convening outside of currently scheduled meetings.
19. Consider adding other CCCCO groups to IEPI Advisory Committee.
20. Clarify the pathway at CCCCO for developing and implementing policies and procedures.
21. Revisit the idea to hold workshops on college campuses.
22. Encourage legislative staff visits to college campuses so that they can be familiar with the work we do.
23. Expand size of committee and number of members especially faculty, staff and students and invite employers.
24. Create a separate workgroup dedicated specifically to Guided Pathways (GP).
25. Agendas distributed in advance so Advisory members could gather data from their representative groups.
26. Dedicated workgroups meet more regularly outside of IEPI meetings and bring back ideas.
27. Shift the meetings from hotels to college campuses.
28. Research possible PD topics to fill gaps in offerings.
29. Encourage Chancellor's Office to use this group as the boots on the ground, keep the broad and diverse representation to help with other initiatives.

e. *What leave-behind questions do you have?*
1. Does IEPI need to be more strategic in assessing the outcomes and effectiveness of the broader Advisory Committee?
2. Who do we serve and how do we make that explicit through funding and accountability? Have pre-focused on workforce outcomes and multi-year pathways but don't want to leave out community members which would ensure continued support.
3. We should look at system shortcoming for students. Why must a student leave their Community College to earn a BA? Much higher hurdle to CCC starting students.

E. Governor's Budget
1. Frances Parmelee, Assistant Vice Chancellor in the Finance and Facilities Planning Division of the CCCCO, gave an overview of the Governor's Budget. Highlights included the following:
   a. The Governor's priorities are in line with the Vision for Success.
   b. Increases in apportionment, including 2.5% COLA and 1% growth.
   c. $175 million will be one-time funds to support the transition to a new funding formula (including a hold-harmless provision), which was developed with input from the Fiscal Affairs Workgroup. Elements of the new formula, details of which still need to be worked out, include the following:
      i. 50% based on FTES
      ii. 25% based on the level of BOG and Pell recipients

        iii.   25% based on success metrics
    d.   The Governor expects colleges to incorporate the goals of the Vision for Success into their educational master plans, and has directed that the CCCCO consult and develop a proposal for consolidation of categorical programs by May 2018.
    e.   The budget includes $100 million over seven years for the Online College, which is aimed at so-called "stranded workers," will offer competency-based education, and will award badges rather than degrees or certificates. The new College will have four years to achieve accreditation.
    f.   In response to questions, Frances indicated that the CEOs workgroup that the Chancellor has established will be looking at both the funding formula and the consolidation of categoricals.
    g.   In response to a question from Julie about feedback from constituency groups, Theresa said that feedback from the field would come through the CEOs workgroup now, though other input might be solicited electronically.

II.   Workgroup Sessions

A. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew and Yolanda)

1. Given the limited amount of time available, Matthew did not provide PRT process updates.
2. Members suggested the following ways of sharing information on the impact of the PRT process:
    a.   Post the common Areas of Focus on the IEPI website and perhaps elsewhere.
    b.   Post a list of all the institutions served to date separately (i.e., not showing their respective Areas of Focus), possibly with links to any applicable *Spotlights*.
    c.   Ask permission of client CEOs to share their Areas of Focus, and post them as permission is obtained.
    d.   Post videos of PRT clients and PRT members talking about the process.
3. Evaluations
    a.   Matthew walked through the evaluation survey and raw results from the Northern California Partnership Resource Community of Practice. Results were very positive overall.
    b.   *Sustaining Institutional Effectiveness: One Year after the PRT Process*
        i.   Matthew thanked Bob for all the work he has done on the evaluation of the PRT process, particularly in putting together this report.
        ii.   Bob thanked the institutions and the interviewees, as well as the Technical Assistance Workgroup for its input on methodology for the evaluation early on.
        iii.   Bob then asked the group whether they thought the report captured adequately the changes in institutional practices and experience due at least in part to the PRT process, and whether it was clear. Comments from the group were in the affirmative overall, and included the following:
        (A) The report was clear; the boldface entries alone conveyed a lot.
        (B) It demonstrated the value of the process to the institutions and to the PRT members.
        (C) It also demonstrated the value of the third visits, especially for promoting sustained progress. Members suggested that in descriptions of the third visit, which represents the final PRT activity but not the final client-institution activity (since each institution continues to implement its Innovation and Effectiveness Plan), it might be better to use the word "pivot" or the equivalent rather than "closure," which might imply an end of the institution's work.

III.   Adjournment