

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
CCC Chancellor's Office, Conference Rooms 3A-3C
January 26, 2015, 10:00 am-4:00 pm
Minutes

Members in Attendance

Santanu Bandyopadhyay	Michelle Barton	Yolanda Bellisimo
Mitchel Benson	Kathy Blackwood	Aaron Brown
Julie Bruno	Leslie Carr	Sharlene Coleal
Claudette Dain	Roberta Eisel	Diane Fiero
Barry Gribbons	Craig Hayward	Joyce Johnson
Davit Khachatryan	Matthew C. Lee	Christopher Lief
William G. McGinnis	Kimberlee Messina	Daylene Meuschke
Kindred Murillo	Andrew Napier	Valentina Purtell
Meridith Randall	Erik Skinner	John Stanskas
Joe Stanton	Christopher Tarman	Theresa Tena
Dianne Van Hook	Deborah Wulff	

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Darla Cooper, Evaluator

Guests in Attendance

Brice Harris, Chancellor, California Community Colleges
Maureen Chenoweth, for CCC Classified Senate
Gary Adams, Chancellor's Office
Rodd Hoig, Chancellor's Office
Mario Rodriguez, Chancellor's Office
Jeff Spano, Chancellor's Office
Dan Troy, Chancellor's Office
Alice Van Ommeran, Chancellor's Office
Pam Walker, Chancellor's Office

I. Welcome Barry Gribbons

II. Introductory Remarks Chancellor Harris

- Twenty-five years ago CCCCO, with a 40-percent larger staff, was heavily focused on oversight and compliance. After losing more than a third of the staff due to budget cuts, the focus on oversight and compliance declined. This grant helps to meet the need to ensure that colleges are supported in their efforts to improve institutional effectiveness. Its purpose is not to ding colleges for not being in compliance, but rather to support them in improving institutional effectiveness.
- The legislation provided for establishment of a new division in the CCCCO with Theresa Tena as the Vice Chancellor, Institutional Effectiveness.

Introductory Remarks Chancellor Van Hook

- This grant is an opportunity for professional development (PD) for *colleges*, and will set a model for the rest of the community colleges in the country.
- PD used to be done through commissions (e.g., CACC, predecessor to CCLC).
- Approximately 24 colleges have expressed interest informally in getting help since Chancellor Van Hook sent her communication to CEOs on December 23.

III. Ice Breaker and Introductions

Barry Gribbons

- Participants brainstormed answers to three questions: 1) What do our colleges do really well? 2) What kind of assistance could be provided to colleges that would help them move forward? 3) If you were a beverage, what type of beverage would you be? They then reported out the highlights of answers to the first two questions.
- Be mindful that not all colleges have the resources to meet demands placed on them (Chancellor Van Hook)

IV. Overview of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI)

Barry Gribbons

1. What is the purpose and what are the goals of IEPI?
 - Refer to handout in folder
 - Partnership is emphasized. Seventeen different organizations are represented today.
 - Purpose is to advance institutional effectiveness of CCCs and radically change the impact on students.
 - Expertise from within CCCs will be used to advance our colleges and build capacity. Not relying on outside experts.
2. What are the major activities and timelines for the following components of IEPI?
 - a. Indicators
 - Statute has four indicators: Student Performance and Outcomes, Fiscal Viability, Accreditation Status, and Programmatic Compliance with State and Federal Guidelines.
 - Indicators developed should draw upon existing indicators (e.g., Scorecard, ACCJC status, 311 report) in Year 1. IEPI advisory group may consider expanding indicator system in subsequent years.
 - Indicators have to be implemented with college-level and statewide goals by June 30, 2015.
 - Timeline: Colleges need to engage collegial consultation processes as soon as possible after adoption of the indicators. Next steps: 1) Identify indicators and collect existing data (which happen simultaneously) and 2) Hope to send the data to colleges by the end of February.
 - Discussion
 - Trustee representative expressed need for BOT involvement in setting targets. Barry said this will likely look different at each college because statute does prescribe how colleges should go about setting targets.
 - ASCCC representative – need to notify Senates that conversations need to be had starting in March. The ACCJC annual report and institutional goals called for by this grant need to be tied together in some way.
 - Need to be mindful of the language around accountability (e.g., institution-set standards, targets for the Scorecard, targets with IEPI, etc.). Define what we mean by targets. Emphasize that this isn't brand new.
 - Need to communicate the benefits of the indicators.

- b. Technical Assistance Teams
 - Extended engagements with colleges, not a one-time fix
 - 1st visit – take time to understand the issue(s)
 - Minimum of three visits
 - \$150,000 seed grants to launch implementation of ideas for improvement at district or colleges receiving a TA visit.
 - We're prepared to have teams available for all 112 colleges over the next five years.
 - Need a process to sequence visits and identify which colleges will receive visits in Spring 2015.
 - IEPI will have a letter of interest for receiving a team visit (to be developed over the next week). Included should be when the next ACCJC visit is for the colleges. After June 30 the indicators will be useful in evaluating need.
 - Mechanically IEPI, Executive Committee will review interest letters and CCCCCO has final decision on which colleges will receive assistance.
 - Letter of interest will initially come from the CEOs but subsequent steps will be taken to ensure that local academic senates are engaged.
 - Colleges receiving a TA team initiated by IEPI do not incur cost associated with the visit. Colleges that are not most in need but that still want a team can receive one by paying half the cost. A third option under discussion is that colleges can pay for technical assistance for a specific issue.
 - General areas of need from colleges who have reached out to Chancellor Van Hook include enrollment management to meet fiscal stability, ability to collect data, integrated planning processes, and change management (i.e., how colleges can get the conversation started).
 - c. Professional development
 - Drive-in/Fly-in workshops. Two in the north and two in the south.
 - Hot topic – Enrollment Management (collaboration with CIOs, CBOs, RP Group)
 - IEPI will work collaboratively with the Success Center and contribute to its online clearinghouse.
 - d. Policy
 - Discussion might include Title 5, Ed Code, ACCJC policies.
3. What are the communication and outreach strategies?
 - Creating a website to be ready in two weeks. Request for Advisory Committee to send ideas about what should be on the website.
 - IEPI is making presentations to as many groups as possible to get information disseminated. Advisory members are asked to be ambassadors.
 4. What is the organizational structure of IEPI?
 - Executive Committee
 - Advisory Committee, including Workgroups
 - Resource persons and groups will be included when needed.
 5. How will IEPI be evaluated?
 - RP Group is evaluating the project.
 - Monthly formative evaluation updates will be provided by Dr. Darla Cooper.
 6. What other questions do you have?

- Comments by Theresa Tena
 - Initial concerns in the field were that colleges asking for assistance would receive a Scarlet Letter, that this was another form of accreditation, and that the additional requirements would be another burden on colleges. We want to help without the Scarlet Letter, and without reinventing the wheel.
- Questions that will need to be answered
 - Q: A college might spend \$250,000 for outside help when they get into accreditation trouble. How is this different from what independent consultant groups provide?
A: Barry: Colleges won't have to pay for help when it's needed.
Theresa: These indicators are being built from the ground up and IEPI will be able to provide rapid resources when needed. Erik: This is a system initiative, not profit-driven. There is a place for those consulting firms, but ours is a different role.
 - Q: What are the indicators of success for this initiative?
 - Q: (Almost all indicators are lagging) What's the process for folding in leading indicators?
 - Q: Who will be selecting the teams, how will they be selected and what role will the colleges play in the selection of team members?
 - Q: What are the deliverables that colleges can expect from the teams?
- What do folks love about the initiative?
 - Collaborative
 - Non-punitive
 - Everyone involved will be folks that are committed to CCCs, and understand the system.
 - Takes the stigma away from asking for help
 - Integrates the efforts of the statewide organizations
 - Repositions improvement as everybody's responsibility
 - Customized meaningful assistance to each college, like RP Group's BRIC grant
 - Fosters change by turning the system on its head, from "We are better than others" to "Here's what we can do better."
- What pitfalls do we need to avoid?
 - Communication problems
 - Ask colleges what worked and what didn't in prior consulting experiences. (RP Group has a report from BRIC that talks about what worked and didn't.)
 - Media relations: Be careful with information that's released so there's not a comparison among colleges. Energy should focus on what will be written and then on how the information will be communicated and shared, how we can get the message out (e.g., "This is a group of colleges that have signed up to do an even better job!").
 - All campuses do some things really well. Teams should acknowledge their strengths, and ask about them.
 - Should be solution oriented. It's not about failures and sanctions.
 - End the dichotomy: It's not that we are good or not, effective or not; it is a continuum of effectiveness. The bar will always move, because we can always get better.

- V. Advisory Committee Barry Gribbons
1. How will the Advisory Committee advance IEPI?
 - Need input on Advisory Committee charter
 2. How can the chair help make the meetings fun and rewarding?
 - Committee and Workgroup chairs are charged with getting the work done while having fun.
- VI. Meeting schedule Matthew Lee
- Meeting schedules are in the packets.
 - On the Committee roster, if any information is wrong or missing, members are asked to email Matthew Lee.
- VII. Facilitated Workgroup Session Matthew Lee
- Note: Matthew will send out survey after the meeting to solicit interest from advisory group members on which indicator they want to work on.
- Members divided into groups to discuss four sets of questions in turn. The questions represent some of the issues that the Workgroups will tackle at the next meeting.
1. Indicators: What are the four highest priority indicators for each area?
 2. Professional Development: What are the two highest priority workshops we should offer? With which organizations should we partner?
 3. Technical Assistance Teams: What two things do you like most about the draft Letter of Interest? What two recommendations would you make to improve the Letter of Interest?
 4. Policy: What two policy issues should we look at related to Institutional Effectiveness? Note: There was insufficient time to address this question.
- VIII. Other Business Matthew Lee
- Sharlene Coleal – Reimbursement forms
 - Participant expense agreement will be prepopulated and sent to advisory group members for signature. Used as basis to reimburse people serving on IEPI committees.
 - Exhibit A – Participant certification needs to be signed by supervisor
 - Travel reimbursement (form in packet)
- IX. Homework Matthew Lee
- X. Next Meeting: In Workgroups, February 5, Sacramento Matthew Lee
- XI. Adjournment Matthew Lee