Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Sheraton Grand
1230 J St, Sacramento
March 9, 2018, 9:30 am-2:30 pm
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	May	Ginni	TA
Bandyopadhyay	Santanu	PD	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Bellisimo	Yolanda	TA	Mehdizadeh	Mojdeh	Ind
Brown	Aaron	TA	Meuschke	Daylene	Ind
Burke	Kathleen	TA	Oberg	Anjeanette	PD
Carr	Leslie	PD	Roberson	Carrie	PD
Coleman	Laura	Ind	Sanchez	Mark	TBD
Eikey	Rebecca	TA	Sanders	Brian	Ind
Fisher	Stacy		Sandoval	Carmen	PD
Foster	Sam	Ind	Schoenecker	Paula	TA
Freitas	John	TA	Slattery-Farrell	Lorraine	TA
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Sokenu	Julius	TA
Heumann	Michael	Ind	Stanskas	John	Ind
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Stoup	Gregory	Ind
Janio	Jarek	Ind	Tarman	Christopher	Ind
Johns	Krista	NA	Tena	Theresa	NA
Johnson	Joyce	PD	Todd	James	Ind
Kay	Beth	Ind/PD	Wah	Linda	Ind
Lee	Matthew C.	TA	Wojcik	Alketa	PD

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind/ PD	Pacansky-Brock	Michelle	PD
Atalig	Christine	Ind	Pacheco	Robert	TA
Bray	Susan	PD	Schrager	Cynthia	PD
Broom	Cheryl	NA	Simpson	Trish	PD
Crossland	Catherine	Ind	Smith	Carrie	PD
Dettman	Sarah	NA	Tan	Connie	NA
Fischerhall	Chase	TA/PD	Trimble	Brad**	PD
Madden	Sean	PD	Ward	Teresa	PD
Mondorf	Anneliese	TA	Wutke	Kevin	PD

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*	Last	First	Primary Wkgrp*
Adan	Sara	Ind	Levy	Rita	PD
Brown	Dave	NA	Macias	Denise	NA
Chatwood	Andrea	PD	Robertson	Candace	PD
Finche	Wrenna	TA/PD			

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

I. General Session 1

A. Michelle Pacansky-Brock and James Todd each shared an Education Moment.

B. Matthew noted that reappointments/renominations and new appointments/nominations for next year's Advisory Committee are needed, and asked members to notify their organizational leaders about whether or not they wished to continue in 2018-19.

C. IEPI 2.0: Brainstorming on themes from the last Advisory Committee meeting

1. Theresa and Barry introduced the session. They asked participants at their tables to review the results of the last meeting as shown in the meeting summary, and brainstorm responses to five prompts. Results were reported out by table, and recorded by volunteers on posters, as follows:

   a. *What are some major themes from the discussion last time, including strengths and changes for the IEPI?*

      1. IEPI Is centralized vehicle for PD
      2. Peer to peer collaboration
      3. Human use of data
      4. Spirit of engagement
      5. Connections, collaboration, and partnership; decrease in silos
      6. Diverse Representation
      7. Cross-constituency – IEPI offers space
      8. PRT Process: Shared experience of team, time away from office, safe space for sharing challenges—no fear of judgment or reprisal
      9. Transparency
      10. Student-centeredness
      11. Participatory/shared governance
      12. Inclusiveness and decision making
      13. Communication
      14. Growing Knowledge of what IE might be
      15. ID PD – PRTs, Workshops
          (A) Focus on college- identified needs
          (B) Clarified wariness around "compliance" tolls
      16. Break Silos
      17. Assist CCCOs to support improvement on ground and enhance access to CCCCO
      18. Focus on college ops, addressing barriers to success—both system and local
      19. Trustee training
      20. Illumination of funding formula and apportionment
      21. Professional development
      22. Recognition of Challenges common to many colleges—not being alone in the struggle
      23. IEPI is a bridge to CCCCO
      24. IEPI is bridge between experts and those in need of expertise
      25. IEPI is HUB/Nexus of Info
      26. Empowerment to enact local change

27. Access and equity, for both students and personnel (e.g., Adjunct faculty access to Prof. Dev.)

b. *What major challenges are on the horizon for our colleges and our students?*
1. Guided Pathways
   (A) Brings new culture
2. Guided Pathways – shared system wide vs unique to local institutions
3. Balancing – CTE and Transfer
4. Cultivating and sustaining leadership, which is different from management
5. Struggle w/change management/leadership
6. Metrics can obscure whom we are serving, their voice and stories
   (A) Successes that are human, motivational unmeasured/unmeasurable
   (B) No uniform story exists: CCCs do not need to be just like CSUs
7. Lack of nimbleness for institutions to response/change
   (A) Resurgence of for-profit will harm CCCs competitiveness unless we shift re: Access
   (B) Year round offerings
   (C) Registration
8. Tension between long term planning and shifting sand beneath institutions
9. Funding formula
   (A) Reduction of mission
   (B) How to serve variety of students?
10. Enrollment Management
    (A) Funding Formula shift of focus
11. Technology
    (A) Tools
    (B) User group cross functional
    (C) Variety of systems w/in colleges that are not integrated
12. Future Trends in Education – forecast 5, 10 years
    (A) Taken by surprise is not advantageous
       (1) AB705, GP
13. Lots of data – But gap in how to use data well/effectively
14. Proactive – Research – Plan
15. Changing times /advocacy
    (A) AB705
    (B) Funding
    (C) Planning and communication
16. Changing demographics of students and their career aspirations
17. Incongruent systems – K-12 and CSU
18. Human Resources & changing job responsibilities @ all levels – CEO – CIO—CSSO –Classified roles are changing
    (A) How do we reflect collegially to ID and shift w/new job requirements and functions?
    (B) Roles and silos
19. Time – strained resource
    (A) Solution: TIME MACHINE
20. Mission "Morph"
    (A) Deep analysis of value/benefit
    (B) $ not focused on all student experience
21. Funding for non-credit – an example

c. *How can the Advisory Committee help address them?*
1. Meet more often (workgroups) composition of workgroups
2. Teaching implementation/best practices, modeling cross-functional approach

3. Help to scale up workshops
   (A) Jump off for local retreats
4. PD to support change – Leadership vs. Management
5. Shared metrics that don't lose sight of who the students are: "human" aspects
6. Effective Data-users
   (A) PRT & GP implementation
   (B) Ongoing need
7. Defining where "there" is
   (A) Help colleges reach "there" by creating basic-simple models that can be locally modified based on their needs
8. Change management/leaderships
   (A) Training
   (B) Tools that can be implemented on local campus
   (C) Climate – BOT, CEOs, VPs willing to take risk
9. IEPI support for colleges to be nimble
10. Help w/roles and silos
11. Policy Changes
    (A) Centralized discussion
    (B) Relevancy of "what we are holding onto"
12. Whole group conversations
    (A) Emerging/strategic
    (B) Aware of college "issues"
13. Focus on Current issues as tasks
14. Refocus on priorities – change groups/priorities
15. Articulate vision for success and have workgroups demonstrate/report on work that supports OR new workgroups
16. Expand workgroups to include
    (A) Technology
    (B) Guided pathways
    (C) Communication
17. More whole-group conversations on emerging issues and include CCCCO
18. Communication/input from various organizations and local college support/perspective
19. Oversight – Collaboration
20. Support communication between workgroups – revise workgroup charters
21. Guided Pathways
    (A) Necessity of teaching implementation of best practices
    (B) Need to model cross-functional approach and support/more access and teaching of it
    (C) Attention: to barriers; not just instructional design
    (D) Invite a new culture
22. Advisory GP and Advisory IEPI
    (A) Formal connection missing
    (B) Identify level of shared system wide model vs unique to College of the Canyons
23. Create climate at top to instill transformative change that empowers top leaders to take risks.
24. Data and decision making support needed from IEPI
25. Systematic redesign
    (A) Policies and practices

d. *How can we adjust the IEPI Advisory Committee structure to advance colleges, districts, and centers innovation and effectiveness?*
How can we adjust the Advisory Committee to advance the Vision for Success commitments and goals?

1. More workgroups, e.g., A technology group, a GP group (even though GP has its own advisory committee), A communication/education group to spread word about IEPI
2. More actionable items after Adv. Comm. Also homework assignments
3. Workgroups should have pre-work and actionable items (homework) to make meetings more productive
4. More "whole group" conversations on weighty issues
5. More Group Discussion on various topics, e.g., Funding Formula
6. Become more Proactive Vs. Reactive—Get out in front of emerging issues
7. Fostering bottom up decision making
8. More explicit articulation of vision goals and commitments
9. Mapping workgroups to vision goals
10. Overall representation to include classified, students and both FT and PT Faculty
    (A) Also expand CCCCO participation
    (B) Student voice needs to be included
11. Intentionally mixing up roles during large advisory meeting
    (A) Model cross-functional teams
12. Overcoming "knowing-doing" gap
13. No change to current workgroup structure
14. Who's responsible for what with respect to Guided Pathways? (Better coordination between IEPI and GP)
15. Indicator Workgroup – role to help with implementation of metrics simplification
16. Spreading knowledge gained from PRT visits
17. Bring back P3 workgroup in some way—It's important work
18. Vision for success metrics
    (A) Tension: Local control vs. system level
    (B) Translating system goal to local
    (C) Need to make it "our" vision
19. Translating top level direction for on the ground implementation
20. Pedagogy – PD support needed
    (A) Maybe own workgroup
21. PLN workgroup separate from PD Workgroup?
22. PD workgroup should return to practice of coming up with potential topics.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. *Technical Assistance Process (Matthew and Yolanda)*

1. David Brown and Denise Macias of Design Media presented information and solicited feedback on the design and organization of the Applied Solution Kits (ASKs) on the PLN.
   a. David gave a little history of the ASKs, and noted that Design Media was hired to improve both the organization and the presentation of materials.
   b. He then went to the ASKs website (which was projected on the screen in the room), and explained the work that had been done and was underway.
      i. There will be links from the ASKs to the other PLN resources.
      ii. The material is organized by ASK, and also by topics/tasks that cross boundaries among the ASKs, giving users multiple entry points to the information.
      iii. They are moving toward presenting materials in both PDF and Word formats.
   c. David then asked for questions and feedback, focusing on the Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) ASK. Comments included the following:
      i. The introductory paragraphs do not say what SEM is.

        ii.   Long Resource Guides in PDF form are fine, but each needs a one-page summary to introduce it.

        iii.   Look at PRT Areas of Focus to help identify more relevant topics/tasks.

    d. David handed out comment sheets, and asked the group to use them to identify some common topics/tasks that would be useful entry points from the technical assistance perspective, and to provide other feedback.

2. Evaluation

    a. Bob Pacheco thanked the Workgroup members for their input on the evaluation reports, and entertained questions on the Cycle 3B, Visits 1 and 2 evaluation report (which the group had received by email before the meeting). There were no questions.

    b. Members suggested that a report of common themes from PRT assistance over the past three years might be useful.

    c. They also requested a bit more detail in the Innovations and Improvements annual report regarding the source issue that resulted in the listed change.

3. The group made some suggestions on how to reach out to institutions that have not yet expressed interest in receiving PRT assistance. Among them were the following:

    a. Establish and publicize a "help bell" that an interested institution could ring.

    b. Send out a Mini-PRT to help organize the institution for a full PRT process.

    c. Reach out—with delicacy—to institutions that are known to be in some difficulty.

    d. Use a personal approach (e.g., set up a phone meeting with each CEO who has not submitted an LOI to explain the process and solicit an LOI).

    e. Get the word out more forcefully that an institution does not have to be "broken" to submit an LOI: Most institutions simply want to improve their structures and processes in specific areas.

    f. Review recent Quality Focus Essays of applicable institutions, identify issues on which PRT assistance might be useful, and provide that information to the applicable CEOs.

    g. Permit the CIO to submit an LOI, with the CEO's approval.

4. The abbreviated time for Workgroup meetings did not permit coverage of the PRT and COP update, nor on members' input on other technical assistance models/approaches their institutions would value. Those items will be held for the next meeting.

B. *Professional Development (Jeff and Carrie)*

1. Opening Remarks

    a. Reflection on past efforts. Desire expressed to close the loop on these efforts.

    b. Desire to implement "IEPI 2.0" will require the expansion of PD efforts going forward. Desire to refresh our PD offerings based on the needs of the field. Necessary to keep in mind that IEPI cannot be everything to everyone in terms of PD.

    c. Suggestion made to create an 18-month PD calendar so folks know what's coming up.

    d. New PD direction requires the changing of human behavior (e.g., Guided Pathways, PLN).

    e. Guided Pathways work has delayed follow-up on theory of change work from Fall 2017. Point made that Guided Pathways efforts have not derailed our PD work but have afforded us the opportunity to learn certain lessons from the CCC system.

    f. Question raised regarding the alignment of PD offerings with Vision for Success goals.

    g. Upcoming events

        i.   Currently and Formerly Incarcerated Students Summit (April 2018)

        ii.   SEM Academy (June 2018)

        iii.   EEO trainings (Fall 2018)

2. Presentation on PLN (Beth Kay, Foundation for California Community Colleges)

    a. Next iteration of PLN on the horizon.

    b. Background given on the inception of the PLN under the leadership of Paul Steenhausen. At that time, there was much openness to suggestions, much synergy. Beth would like that spirit of open-mindedness and collaboration to continue today.

c. The PLN website was very thoughtfully designed in the beginning to resemble the CCCCO website. But the system didn't recognize that the PLN was a part of IEPI, which was a problem. Now the PLN site looks more like the IEPI website.

d. Over the last 15 months, Beth and her team have campaigned to add more registrants to the PLN. As a result, the number of users has jumped from 5,000 to over 11,000.

e. FisCAL training is most popular course on the PLN.

f. Average PLN user time is only 20 minutes. The PLN has over 480,000 page views, which sounds impressive, but isn't actually in the broad scheme of things.

g. Question raised regarding repeat users.

h. The PLN was originally built on Word Press, and has now migrated to Drupal to improve ability to collect data on users.

i. Question raised regarding why the PLN has a login requirement. It might be better to make resources completely open to improve dissemination. The answer to this question has to do with curation and copyright. All parties who have provided the PLN with content would have to agree to share propriety resources.

j. How do we draw more people to PLN? How can PLN homepage attract more users?

k. Point made that faculty are open to online instruction, contrary to some folks' assumption.

l. One important piece of feedback from PLN users is that the PLN isn't integrated enough.

m. The learning management system Cornerstone has a module called "Connect" that will be added to the PLN as a pilot later this year in order to foster system-wide communication. A diverse group of colleges will test out Cornerstone over the next 8 to 10 months. Individuals will record the resources they've used in order to curate PD for their college. Cornerstone is linked to colleges' HR departments. Question raised regarding HR departments having too much oversight of employee activity on the PLN.

3. Presentation on the ASK (David Brown, Design Media)
   a. Design Media has redesigned and repackaged ASK materials in order to resolve some issues regarding organization and accessibility.
   b. Cornerstone will add a social media element to the ASK.
   c. Design Media looking to refine the ASK by seeking input from the field. The community might help determine how to organize and access the ASK.
   d. Question raised regarding who PLN "power users" are.
   e. Question raised regarding tracking most popular search terms on PLN.
   f. Design Media interested in receiving user feedback at every step of the way.
   g. Suggestion made that Design Media ought to attend 4CSD and 3CSN conferences.
   h. Suggestion made that Design Media ought to set up computers at Advisory Committee meetings and conduct additional user tests as they did in October 2017.
   i. Suggestion made regarding Creative Commons licensing.
   j. Question raised regarding modeling PLN after online shopping (e.g., showing user what other users viewed based on what they viewed).

C. *Indicators (Barry and John)*
   1. Update Metric Simplification Project (MSP)
      a. The MSP group led by Omid Pourzanjani have met once and are scheduled to meet three times. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 12, 2018.
         i. The group will identify a core set of indicators by April 2018.
      b. The Indicators Workgroup's input was shared with the MSP group.
      c. The focus of the MSP is student achievement indicators.
         i. Access measures will not be included.
      d. There may be a drill-down ability of equity metrics for each indicator. This is important so that there is the ability to capture, for example, students age 25 and older who have low completion.
      e. It was discussed that there should be a strategic discussion with ACCJC related to indicators.
         i. The workgroup decided not to push the commission at this time.

   ii. It was also noted that there is an accreditation workgroup that is informing ACCJC about the needs from the colleges.

 f. The metric group is focused on the seven student journey maps.

 g. Because there is a longer plan to collect data mandated by the legislature it was suggested the requirement to fill out the reports be removed.

 h. It was noted that it is important to define the purpose and then set up indicators and collect data. It's difficult to do those steps out of sequence and be effective.

   i. The MSP are only looking at student achievement and there is concern with limiting funding to achievement indicators.

2. What to do going forward

 a. The Indicators Workgroup going forward could focus on colleges using data for improvement.

   i. There may not be a need to define indicators once the SMP finalize their work, so the group could focus on how to use data effectively.

 b. It was suggested to promote data use to inform program review and planning.

 c. The group could promote data use by students as well as staff.

 d. It would be helpful to explore tools that promote data use.

 e. The group could take on student outcome measures, the fourth pillar, "Ensure Learning."

 f. It was suggested that the group explore better ways to manage Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) data collection.

   i. This could be a one to three year project for the workgroup.

 g. It was suggested that the group continue to discuss use of data, including support of Institutional Research (IR) offices.

 h. The group could continue to promote visualizations.

   i. Promote through trainings to help inform Mini-PRTs and Institutional Research (IR) staff.

 i. It was suggested to keep skill builders in the metrics in non-credit and credit.

 j. It was noted that it would be helpful to get away from the data machine and really tap into the work that the RP group has done to help move forward.

 k. The group agreed to wait to determine steps until after they have looked at the outcomes from MSP.

III. General Session 2

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

IV. Adjournment