Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
June 25, 2015, 10:00 am-3:45 pm
Sheraton Grand Sacramento
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Bandyopadhyay	Santanu	PD	King	Brian	TA
Barton	Michelle	Ind	Kovrig	Neill K.	PPP/TA
Benson	Mitchel	PPP/Ind	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Blackwood	Kathy	Ind	Leong	Tim	PD/PPP
Braden	Kale	PD	Lief	Christopher	PPP
Braxton	Phyllis	PD	Ly	Pearl	PD
Brown	Aaron	TA	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Bruno	Julie	PD	Messina	Kimberlee	TA
Buckley	Jerry	PD	Meuschke	Daylene	PD
Carr	Leslie	PD	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Chadwick	Jan	TA	Purtell	Valentina	Ind
Coleal	Sharlene	PD	Sandoval	Carmen	PD
Druley	Jennifer	PD	Schardt	Jan	PD
Goold	Grant	Ind	Scroggins	Bill	PD
Greaney	KC	Ind	Skinner	Erik	Ind
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Sokenu	Julius	TA
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Holland	Breanne	PD	Warren-Marlatt	Rebeccah K.	Ind
Howell	Lisa	PD	Webb	Catherine	PD
Khachatryan	Davit	Ind			

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind	Rodriguez	Mario	Ind
Morrow	Blaine	PD	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Noldon	Denise	PD	Spano	Jeff	TA
Purnell	Rogeair	NA	Van Ommeren	Alice	Ind

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Tyson	Sarah	Ind
Leigh	Tom	Ind	Walker	Pam	PD
Leufgen	Jillianne	Ind			

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

I. General Session 1

A. The session opened with introductions and Education Moments from Jerry Butler, Gary Adams, Jan Chadwick, and Kimberlee Messina.

B. Barry, Matthew, Daylene (subbing for Paul), and Theresa reported on IEPI progress to date and answered questions as they arose; areas highlighted included the following:

1. Indicators
   a. Target-setting by all colleges has gone really well, with a high level of cooperation and responsiveness.
   b. 111 of 113 colleges have set targets and certified the process.

    c. 38 colleges went beyond the minimum requirement and set targets for all the v. 1.0 metrics.

    d. The public summary website will be unveiled on June 30.

2. Technical assistance

    a. The PRTs have completed initial visits at the eight Spring/Summer colleges. Six requested written Summaries of Initial Observations, and four of those have been submitted; the other two requested oral summaries only.

    b. Second visits are being scheduled now, though none is firm yet.

    c. All evaluation survey requests have been issued, and we are awaiting responses; the RP Group will complete its formal report early next month. Preliminary results are generally positive, though not surprisingly there is a clear need for logistical improvements (e.g., client colleges informing their participants better about the PRT's purposes; more clarity about the process as whole for both the PRTs and the colleges).

    d. Fifteen colleges have requested Fall 2015 initial visits, and three more have requested initial visits in Spring 2016.

    e. The pool of approved volunteers for the second cycle totals 162, with more coming in. They have all received a notice about the upcoming webinar and workshops, so they can mark their calendars. Preliminary matching is done, and the tentative teams (not yet with Leads) will go to Executive Committee tomorrow.

    f. We have made numerous improvements in the process based on the Spring/Summer experience.

3. Professional Development

    a. One additional location for the Fall SSRD workshop has been identified.

    b. The second Enrollment Management workshop is scheduled for August 20-21 at Riverside.

    c. Future topics under discussion include SLOs (October and November), fiscal controls (January-February), integrated planning (February), and data planning (April)[all dates tentative]. We are also looking at a Student Equity workshop through the RP Group.

    d. For the online clearinghouse, the draft taxonomy and submission forms have been created, and the website design is underway.

4. Policy, Procedure, and Practice

    a. Developing a communications strategy for IEPI has been discussed at length, and we are moving forward with plans for a Fall rollout.

    b. We are also looking at a simpler way for the Chancellor's Office to provide data for multiple initiatives.

5. Theresa and Barry responded to questions regarding integration of Workforce Task Force findings with IEPI, and Bill Scroggins noted that IEPI would be important in getting the colleges to understand workforce issues.

6. Theresa observed that how the budget augmentation might play out with respect to IEPI organizational structure and Workgroup activities is still in discussion. There is support for keeping it under the institutional effectiveness umbrella, given the support that both the Administration and the Legislature have expressed for our efforts to date. Meetings with the Governor's staff and Legislative staff are likely to occur in August or September. Theresa noted that the augmentation language uses the phrase "dissemination of effective practices" rather than "professional development."

II.   **Workgroup Sessions**

    A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

      1. Discussion of Audit Indicator

        a. Types of opinions were reviewed, including Financial, State, and Federal Awards opinion and internal control issues.

        b. Repeat findings is an option as an indicator.

        c. The purpose for the indicator was reviewed, including using it at colleges in a collegial consultation planning process to encourage healthy dialog as well as being responsive to statutory requirements.

  d. The goal should be for a year and a half out (e.g., if setting goal in spring 2016, the goal should be for the opinion that is released in December 2017 on the 2016/17 Fiscal Year).

  e. Material weaknesses are important to include.

  f. Splitting the indicator up into several would be helpful, such as 1) opinion for financial, 2) material weaknesses, and 3) repeat audit findings.

  g. Mario will collect more information and get back to the group.

2. Discussion of Skills Builder.

  a. This is a short-term metric.

  b. It includes each year's exiting students who took a SAM A, B, or C course with no cert or degree completion.

  c. It measures wages one year after enrollment compared to one year prior, adjusted for inflation.

  d. It includes people in the EDD database in both years.

  e. There was a discussion about how a college might set goals and how it might be difficult for a college to set goals.

  f. There is an interest in this measure and also reemployment rates for CTE areas.

  g. The next step is to bring examples of other employment and wage data reports to the next meeting, including WIOA reports, CTE Outcomes Survey, etc.

3. Lessons Learned were discussed.

  a. If there is no target, it should display a blank rather than a zero.

  b. For percent of budget that is wages, we should have it say either that this is an upward bound or be able to indicate that it is $<$, $>$, or $=$ to the number indicated.

  c. For the next accreditation visit, it should be switched to the semester and year rather than a date, which is typically not known.

  d. In terms of how people reported to their board, most presented the information as an information item, often coupled with other indicators like the Scorecard and posted on the web. One college presented as an action item and one did an IE Board Workshop.

  e. Columns should be re-ordered, putting historical data to the left and targets to the right.

  f. We should develop an FAQ on disclosure requirements.

  g. WED version 2.0 is expected to focus on fewer indicators. We should do a briefing at an upcoming meeting.

  h. More instructions would be helpful.

4. Discussion of how IEPI can help with data and reporting fatigue.

  a. We should create a list of all reporting requirements, including CCCCO, Gainful Employment, ACCJC, etc.

  b. We should consider developing a central spot, like IEPI, for all data or links to all data.

  c. We should develop data visualization tools.

5. Next steps:

  a. Bring a list of recommendations that the workgroup has made.

  b. Review employment and wage reports.

  c. Review data and reporting requirements.

  d. Follow up changes to audit indicator.

  e. Invite various people from other areas to the indicators workgroup to discuss coordination of data.

  f. Have an agenda item on Gainful Employment, invite others to our group and develop a proposal on how to make it work better for CCCs.

  g. Have a meeting focus on Indicators 2.0.

  h. Develop detailed agendas in advance and call for attachments to review.

  i. Review Launchboard changes.

  j. Review reporting requirements for Student Equity, SSSP, Basic Skills, etc.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)
1. Discussion of progress to date: Observations on Initial Visits by PRT Members
    a. Santanu Bandyopadhyay reported on the Yuba visit. Yuba is a two-college district. Sixty-eight folks were listed for participation in the visit.
        i. Yuba's great "problem statement," which presented a more detailed description of their areas of focus, helped the team a great deal in planning the visit.
        ii. There were differences between the colleges in perception of the issues. Santanu emphasized the need to tell teams visiting such districts to be prepared for personnel to raise political issues, even though they might not be among the areas of focus. Relying on district-level personnel can be a help here.
        iii. One issue the team encountered was management of two breakout sessions simultaneously when the visiting team is so small.
        iv. The team had a sense that the college would have liked them to be more prescriptive. Matthew re-emphasized that the first meeting is used to gather information from the college and determine the scope of the concerns at the college. However, the level of prescription must be flexible and meet the needs of the college requesting the visit.
        v. The team members found the conversations open and respectful; the college was positive and appreciated the expertise the PRT brought to the campus during the visit.
        vi. There is concern about what the second visit will look like. The college wanted the PRT to move speedily to the Menu of Options step.
    b. Jerry Butler reported on the Solano College visit. Solano is a small single college and provided a focused needs statement.
        i. The visit was well-organized.
        ii. The CEO is in transition so there were some governance issues that needed attention.
        iii. The union representatives appeared more negative about the visit than the other groups, and evidently had the impression that the visit would be something along the lines of an accreditation visit.
        iv. The PRT leader was sensitive to the college's needs and wanted to facilitate the planning process. He took care to soften the language in one of the statements and was sensitive to the needs of all stakeholders on campus.
        v. Overall, however, the college appeared eager for the PRT to be there.
        vi. Jerry voiced some concern about what the second visit will look like from the college's perspective. Will the same folks at the college be involved in the second visit as the first? If not, what impact will that have on the continuity of the visits? Will the group of college people involved expand? How will new college participants know what happened in the past visits?
        vii. Members reiterated discussions in earlier meetings that getting more stakeholders involved in the development of the original LOI is highly desirable, and in particular that if any of the concerns listed in the LOI are 10+1 related, the Faculty Senate should be involved.
    c. Brian reported on the Shasta College visit. Shasta College is small; it is easy to get everyone in the room, and everyone is familiar with each other.
        i. The team met on Sunday before the series of meetings on Monday.
        ii. The meetings were well organized.
        iii. Brian took the time to share the "IEPI way" at the beginning of each meeting, and explained the PRT role as peers volunteering their expertise to help the college.
        iv. The observations from the day's discussions were shared orally at the end of the day. All who participated during the day were invited to come to the summary meeting, and many did come.
        v. Brian mentioned that teams should be sensitive to the college culture when planning what to wear to the college. Wearing formal suit and tie when the culture is more informal might send the wrong message (e.g., that the site visit is more along the lines

of an accreditation site visit or a visit from the Chancellor's Office). The intent is to have the college feel at ease with the visit and not have any looming expectations that the visit is from an external agency.

     vi. Brian came back to his own district with some useful ideas.

   d. Bill reported on the Berkeley City College visit.

     i. This was the very first site visit by any team.

     ii. The team leader for the site visit changed close to the visit date so there was no time to get together with her beforehand.

     iii. The team leader was very effective, but was not as familiar with Appreciative Inquiry (AI) as the rest of the PRT, all of whom had participated in the PRT Workshop that included that subject.

     iv. The PRT had the sense that the college wanted the PRT to provide a prescriptive process to follow. Participants also seemed to want the PRT to support the college's position regarding some conflicts between the college and the district.

     v. It would have been very helpful to get all the participants in a room at the very beginning and explain why the team was there; valuable time was spent with each group re-explaining the purpose of the visit. Everyone at the college really needs to understand the purposes of the first visit.

     vi. There was an institutional off-site training the day of the visit, so some of the folks with whom the PRT had planned to discuss the areas of focus were not available. So it was more difficult to tell what they needed at the college because some of the important stakeholders were not on hand.

   e. Workgroup Discussion

     i. Prepare the client CEO, and through her or him the college, better for the visit.

     ii. Funding formula and other issues at multi-college districts cannot be addressed by a PRT in a single college site visit, yet this was an important issue for one college. District-level PRTs will be encouraged where appropriate beginning in the next cycle.

2. Early Returns on Evaluation of the PRT Process

   a. The Fall PRTs will benefit from evaluation of the initial visits, including observations from both team members and colleges. The results will be taken into consideration for both training and visits.

   b. Highlights of early returns

     i. Most PRT members agreed or strongly agreed:
      (A) With positive statements about PRT functioning.
      (B) That the training received was very effective.

     ii. Logistical arrangements require some improvement.

     iii. PRT members spent between six and 16 hours in preparation for the initial visit.

     iv. Colleges and team members both want more information on the nature of the next visits.

     v. College respondents saw the fit of their PRTs as good (with one exception at one college).

     vi. Several college respondents saw the scheduling of visits as problematic. Matthew has collected data on 2015-16 term dates, holidays, etc., and scheduling of the Fall and Spring visits will benefit. In addition, the process will have more lead time, which will permit the colleges to suggest date options that are better for their own personnel.

     vii. Matthew noted that some questions asked for visit 1 should be modified or eliminated next time because they were much more relevant to visits 2 and 3.

   c. It is clear that better management of college expectations for the initial visit is needed.

   d. At our July 17 meeting at the Hyatt, we are scheduled to have the formal evaluation report on the PRT process from the RP Group.

3. Next PRT cycle
   a. To prepare client colleges better in the Fall, Matthew will send all client CEOs an abbreviated description of the whole PRT process, so they can better inform campus participants.
   b. Fifteen colleges so far have requested visits for the next year. Of all these colleges, only two did not want a fall visit.
   c. Matthew Lee will coordinate around conferences, important meetings, beginning and ending term dates to find the best fit of schedule for training and for initial visits.
   d. It is the sense of the committee not to schedule visits just before Labor Day weekend or 9/11.
   e. All PRTs in the Fall will have new members and the training is slated to be in Sacramento during September and October. We will have to work around some conflicts with other events.
   f. With at least a one month lead time, PRT members will be better prepared with interview questions and documentation for each identified college.
   g. Training workshops will use the panel again, asking panelists to suggest three do's, three don'ts, and one success story. Appreciative Inquiry (AI) has been extremely useful and we want to allow enough time for the AI component of the workshop. Workshops will need additional panelists, presenters, and facilitators, and we will rely on the Academic Senate for recommendations if we need to go beyond the pool members already approved.
   h. The pool for team members has sufficient faculty representation at present, but needs more CBOs and folks from certain other categories.
   i. One member suggested that PRTs might help colleges with their ACCJC Quality Focus Essays, since that is a new requirement.

C. *Professional Development (Daylene)*
1. Update on Upcoming Regional Workshops
   a. A Student Support (Re)defined workshop is scheduled for September 11 at Shasta College. Additional workshops on this topic are planned for this fall.
   b. Enrollment Management
      i. August 5-6 at College of San Mateo (with ACBO and ACCCA) and August 20-21 at Riverside City College.
      ii. Day One will focus on developing an enrollment management plan and Day Two will focus on implementation. There is a $75 fee to attend a workshop.
      iii. Follow up assistance can be provided though IEPI resource teams to dive deeper into enrollment management issues at campuses.
      iv. CACCRAO (admissions/registrars) needs to be aware of the training.
   c. Other workshops will take place throughout the year. As much as possible, IEPI will partner with other organizations.
   d. General discussion/questions:
      i. What resources can colleges access for workshops? Some colleges have limited funds. Workgroup members also discussed specific training that certain faculty need.
      ii. There was a discussion on the importance of workshop presenters being true practitioners on the topic and that the flyers (invitations) prominently describe the content that will be addressed.
      iii. Workshop flyers should encourage colleges to come in teams.
      iv. There should be a close connection between workshops and PRT team members so that they can help to inform content at the workshops.

2. Online Clearinghouse
   a. The group reviewed the draft taxonomy for the Online Clearinghouse materials and provided feedback:
      i. Include "other" and "teaching and learning" categories. Also talked about the need for a separate "distance/online education" category.
      ii. Another approach that was discussed was to establish five major categories for Student Performance and Outcomes: teaching and learning, education goals, student services and support, initiatives, and special programs.
      iii. The clearinghouse curator (librarian) should develop the framework and then identify the search key words or tags to maintain consistency.
      iv. Need the ability to search by audience, topic, key word, title, date.
   b. The curator's job will be to review content on a regular basis for currency. Content removed would be moved to an archive area of the clearinghouse.
   c. After someone uses a resource, should there be a question to the user/viewer about the usefulness of the material?
   d. Need a module type of look to the portal (kind of like a "LibGuide" with tabs for books, journals, and websites related to searches). Need a uniform look and feel and a way to highlight "hot topics."
   e. Catherine Webb and Breanne Holland provided an overview of the draft submission form. Feedback:
      i. Use pre-defined options for context: location (rural or urban), size of college, single vs multi-college. There was another suggestion for submitters to just identify the college or organization and then the curator (or other clearinghouse staff) can identify campus characteristics.
      ii. If we're trying to leverage resources, we might want to look at getting agreement with CSUs and UCs to access their online resources. We also should use PRT members as potential sources of content.
      iii. Type of material: add "other" category
      iv. Add target audience to form
      v. The workgroup discussed copyright/intellectual property issues. Sharlene offered to serve as a resource.
      vi. [From afternoon report-out session] CCCCO hired someone from Foothill College (High Tech Training Unit) to provide training to staff on compliance issues. This approach might be considered for content submissions to the clearinghouse.
3. Discussion of Final State Budget Related to CCC Professional Development (Theresa Tena and Pam Walker)
   a. The state budget, which provides $12 million for statewide and regional trainings to disseminate effective practices, specifically calls out the Civilian Conservation Corps and inmate education as top statewide priorities.
      i. About 2,000 individuals currently participate in the Civilian Conservation Corps. The objective is to look at ways to connect them to additional education and identify/create model courses/programs.
      ii. 20 to 30 colleges have been involved in some capacity with inmate education. CCCCO is trying to find a way to bring these colleges together to share their experiences and best practices. This includes services provided to former inmates transitioning back to the community.

  b. Other Discussion:
    i.   What resources will we use to operate/add to the online clearinghouse? Theresa said it would come out of the $12 million provided by the state budget. It might involve an RFA to manage the resources. There was a suggestion that the PD workgroup participate in the design of the RFA.

 D. *Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)*
  1. Development of the IEPI Communications RFP
    a. Approval for the IEPI Communications RFP will be sought from SCCCD's Board on Aug. 26, 2015.
    b. Summary of the process for contracting with a communications vendor
      i.   Identifying the type of vendors that would be a good fit for the IEPI communications contract:
        (A) Vendor should be familiar with government budgets.
        (B) Vendor should be familiar with higher education communications strategies.
        (C) Vendor should be able to work within firm timeframes.
        (D) We are willing to evaluate potential vendors from all over California.
      ii. Discussion of candidate bid process
      iii. Evaluation of vendor candidates accomplished between CCPRO, CCCCO, and SCCCD
  2. Parameters of the Communications RFP
    a. Vendor will not use contract funding for entertainment or travel.
    b. Contract funding will be used for creative work and resources needed to develop communications items and strategies.
    c. CA legislative staff and policymakers will observe that IEPI communication efforts are congruent with CA's best spending practices.
  3. Long-term Plans: External and Internal Audiences
    a. Internal
      i.   Develop communications strategies to help college staff and administrators understand the benefits of TA teams visits and PD opportunities.
      ii. Focus on clearly communicating IEPI mission and purpose to college administrators.
    b. External
      i.   Invite policy makers to observe IEPI efforts.
        (A) Observe PD efforts.
        (B) Observe TA efforts.
        (C) Continue to provide invitations to Advisory Committee meetings.
      ii. Strengthen understanding of IEPI efforts to CCC stakeholder groups.
        (A) Eliminate the question, "What is IEPI?"
        (B) Clearly define our purpose and mission to CCCs and CCDs.
      iii. Communicate IEPI efforts to standards oversight and regulatory compliance commissions.
  4. Strengthening Relations with ACCJC through Communications
    a. Theresa Tena participated in an ACCJC conference earlier in June, and she plans to continue to foster a good relationship with ACCJC.
    b. ACCJC sees IEPI as helping CCC's meet accreditation standards.
    c. ACCJC and IEPI might be able to work together in helping colleges meet accreditation standards, in which IEPI provides guidance in meeting ACCJC standards.

III.   General Session 2
 A. Matthew, Barry, Daylene, and Theresa shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions (see above), and responded to a few questions.

IV.   Adjournment