



**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee**  
**April 2, 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
Barnes	Julianna	PPP	Kovrig	Neill K.	PPP
Bellisimo	Yolanda	TA	Lamanque	Andrew	PPP
Benson	Mitchel	Ind	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Blackwood	Kathy	Ind	Leong	Tim	PD
Braxton	Phyllis	PD	Lief	Christopher	PPP
Brown	Aaron	TA	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Buckley	Jerry	PD	Mehdizadeh	Mojdeh	Ind
Burris	David	PD	Messina	Kimberlee	TA
Carr	Leslie	PD	Meuschke	Daylene	PD
Chadwick	Jan	TA	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Coleal	Sharlene	PD	Nguyen	Thuy	PD
Dain	Claudette	PPP	Purtell	Valentina	Ind
Dieckmeyer	Diane	TA	Randall	Meridith	PD
Druley	Jennifer	PD	Schardt	Jan	PD
Fiero	Diane	PD	Skinner	Erik	Ind
Garcia	Valentin	TA	Stanskas	John	Ind
Goold	Grant	Ind	Stanton	Joe	TA
Greaney	KC	Ind	Steenhausen	Paul	PD
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Tarman	Christopher	Ind
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Holland	Breanne	PD	Vo-Kumamoto	Tram	Ind
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Webb	Catherine	PD
Johnson	Joyce	PD	Wulff	Deborah	Ind

**Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance**

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Bray	Susan	PD	Orloff	Micah	PD
Cooper	Darla	NA	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Harrington	Deborah	PD	Spano	Jeff	TA
Larson	Erin	TA	Van Ommeren	Alice	Ind
Morrow	Blaine	PD			

**Guests in Attendance**

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind	Mohr	Rhonda	TA
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Tyson	Sarah	Ind
Leigh	Tom	Ind			

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

**I. General Session 1**

- A. John Stanskas shared an inspiring Education Moment with the group.
- B. RP Group Preliminary Report on IEPI Workshops, March 17-27, 2015 (Darla)
  - 1. 181 surveys were completed by workshop participants, for a 40% response rate. There was a good mix of respondents.

2. Participants noted the need to share the message and get to work on the indicator goals on their campuses.
  3. Those who criticized the length of the workshops were divided between those who said it was too long and those who said it was not long enough.
  4. Darla observed that people who attended in teams found the workshop more helpful than those who attended alone, and that having a senior administrator present was important.
- C. Other Progress to Date
1. Indicators (Barry and Theresa)
    - a. The Chancellor's Office loaded baseline data on the Indicators Portal in time to share with all the workshops.
    - b. The Chancellor's Office issued a memo today summarizing indicator and goal-setting requirements.
  2. Partnership Resource Teams (Matthew)
    - a. PRTs have been identified for five colleges this Spring and one for early Summer; one more will be assembled for a college that is replacing one that requested a move to the next cycle.
    - b. A workshop will be held tomorrow at the Chancellor's Office for members of the Spring and Summer PRTs.
    - c. We will undoubtedly have to replace and add members to PRTs as we go forward, depending on schedule conflicts and other factors.
  3. Professional Development (Paul)
    - a. The Professional Development Workgroup originated the idea for the recently concluded "What Is IEPI/Goal-Setting" workshops.
    - b. The Workgroup will continue planning for future workshops, including one on enrollment management in August, in cooperation with ACBO.
    - c. Development of the Online Clearinghouse portal is on track for September 2015. In the meantime, adding a "Greatest Hits" selection of resources to the IEPI website is under consideration.
  4. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)
    - a. Theresa shared information about the draft Timeline with the group.

## II. Workgroup Sessions

### A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

1. Discussion of Possible Additional Indicators
  - a. Placement rates
  - b. Access
    - i. This can include access to colleges, to programs, and through programs.
    - ii. Beginning limited to district boundaries is problematic.
    - iii. We can consider regional measures, maybe including participation rate by region.
    - iv. We could consider participation rate by zip code for any community college and for any institution of higher education.
    - v. We should also consider dual enrollment and inmate education implications.
    - vi. We should consider age bands, including under 18.
    - vii. GIS can be a useful tool in looking at participation rates.
    - viii. We may want to look at participation rates overall and be able to detail into college-specific data.
  - c. Employment and Wage Data
    - i. We need to work on matching programs with standard industry codes.
    - ii. Gainful employment is an option, but is very narrow in what is reported.
    - iii. CTE Outcomes may be a source that can be explored more.
    - iv. EDD data exclude self-employed and federally employed, which can be up to 25 percent of the population and not equally distributed across programs.
    - v. It would be helpful to provide data that can be used for CTE requirements.

- vi. We may want to phase in.
- vii. We need to be clear about the purpose of these data, not accountability but for planning and make sure that it is going to be helpful for this purpose.
- d. Student Equity
  - i. Canned reports, like Datamart tools, would be helpful with lots of detail that help identify problem areas.
  - ii. It may not make sense to require target for all (hundreds of) indicators, but rather encourage colleges to focus on disparate impacts.
  - iii. We should try to link with student equity plans.
  - iv. We should develop checklists of best practices.
- 2. Setting too many goals might undermine progress.
- 3. We should look at ways to integrate efforts across IEPI, SSSP, Student Equity, etc.
- 4. We should look at visualization tools and maybe data dashboards.
- 5. Discussion of Timeline
  - a. Version 2.0 may be best to go live in year 3, allowing time for planning.
  - b. For year 2, we may want to require 4 and add additional indicators at colleges' choice, as well as looking at employment indicators.
- 6. Next Steps
  - a. Discuss District vs. College Goals.
  - b. Further flesh out employment and wage data plans.
  - c. Further discuss Year 2 and V2.0 plans, recognizing that they likely will be different.

**B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)**

- 1. Discussion of progress to date
  - a. There are approximately 93 people in the expert pool and approximately 35 PRT members will be scheduled to visit seven sites.
- 2. Reflections on PRT webinar
  - a. PRT training began on 3/30/2015 with a webinar through CCC Confer. The webinar is now available at [www.cccconfer.org](http://www.cccconfer.org) through the Webinar>View Archives link; the date is 3/30/2015 and the Meeting Name is IEPI.
  - b. Webinar participants noted that there were some issues with the video and audio tracking, but everything seemed well organized and the topics were covered well.
  - c. The RP group will complete the formal evaluation of the webinar, and the Workgroup will receive a report of the results.
- 3. April 3, 2015 PRT workshop
  - a. At the PRT workshop, each team will receive the Letter of Interest from the college they will visit, which identifies the areas of focus for technical assistance.
  - b. The training is in concert with 3CSN (IEPI partners through the RP Group), who will act as the instructional designers for the workshops.
  - c. Purposes of the workshop, which will focus on the college visit process, also include bonding as a team.
  - d. The workshop will include a 50 minute panel with David Morse and Kimberlee Messina on technical assistance Dos and Don'ts; discussion of six essential characteristics of "the IEPI way," and application of appreciative inquiry techniques to the upcoming visits.
  - e. One member suggested using an authentic case study exercise at the beginning rather than an ice-breaker. This approach should pique participants' interest and get them engaged in what they will experience.
  - f. Emphasis will be on enforcing a positive approach to technical assistance that is collegial rather than compliance-oriented.
- 4. Other training issues
  - a. PRT training will not be able to cover everyone that needs training, so there will be a need for supplemental training. Suggestions included the following:
    - i. Capture the April 3 workshop on video and ask PRT members to review it.

- ii. Bring PRT members in the night before to bond as a team, and to apprise new members of progress to date.
    - iii. Get a bio of each team member and distribute; share Expertise Profiles among the whole team.
    - iv. Provide a writing sample for team leads to review, if much writing is required. (Matthew noted that the writing would be minimal, and the lead was most likely to do it.)
    - v. Depend largely on team leads to contact new members and bring them up to speed.
  - b. Suggestions for refreshing training
    - i. Train all new PRT members every cycle, and refresh former PRT members every three years.
    - ii. Divide the in-person workshop in half, with only new members attending the first half for the basics, and with both new and experienced PRT members attending the second half, when the LOI is discussed.
    - iii. The team lead should be the person who is always most up to date on requirements and practices associated with PRTs.
    - iv. Use CCCConfer for the refreshers for all members who have already been on at least one set of visits.
    - v. Direct members' attention to Clearinghouse resources on PRT best practices.
5. Training the trainers: Future training workshops
- a. A call for PRT pool volunteers is expected to go out twice a year.
  - b. Future training should be updated in light of new aspects of IEPI and continue to use webinars/videos for basic training. Electronic delivery should suffice for much of the training.
6. Evaluation of PRT Process
- a. Darla Cooper of the RP Group led this discussion.
  - b. The "Workgroup Input on Evaluation PRT Teams and Process" document was discussed. The evaluation of the PRT process is expected to have three elements:
    - i. The PRT members' evaluation of the process, consisting of feedback after each visit delivered through a survey with both objective and open-ended questions
    - ii. Client colleges' evaluation of the process, also consisting of feedback after each visit delivered through a survey with both objective and open-ended questions
    - iii. PRT members' self-evaluation after the conclusion of the follow-up phase
  - c. The following additional aspects of evaluation were discussed briefly:
    - i. Whether the team lead evaluates the team
    - ii. How the team lead is evaluated by others (e.g., whether the team lead is a good fit for the team or the college)
    - iii. Whether members would like to serve on another team.
    - iv. The colleges' own engagement in the process (e.g., their willingness to participate, whether their attitude is welcoming, what got in the way), based on PRT members' observations.
    - v. The timing of the visits (e.g., whether one day is enough, the timing of the second and third visits, whether three visits are enough)
    - vi. How does IEPI know whether to use a lead or a member again? Matthew noted that he would be talking to the leads after each visit, in part about how well the team functioned, and that team members with concerns about the lead should contact Matthew.
    - vii. Unintended impacts of the visits should be included in the colleges' evaluations after the third visit.

7. Innovation and Effectiveness Plan Template
  - a. Use of the template by the college is optional, but provides one model to consider. Ideally, the college should integrate these objectives in their existing planning processes. The committee felt the template was appropriate.
8. Summary of Initial Observations Template
  - a. Some of the suggestions/ideas discussed with the college may be of a sensitive nature, so information should be entered with that in mind.
9. Adding Best PRT Practices to the Online Clearinghouse
  - a. This will be discussed further as the clearinghouse is built and grows. The clearinghouse should include best practices for training and visits.
10. Other Issues
  - a. Workgroup members suggested toning down the rhetoric about visits to all 112 colleges, since visits are not a mandate.
  - b. One members had heard concerns that all of this is a preliminary step to performance funding.

### ***C. Professional Development (Paul)***

1. Debrief of March 2015 Regional Workshops
  - a. Workgroup members continued the discussion from the advisory committee's opening session about the March workshops. The group agreed that inviting teams from colleges and having them leave with an action plan were both effective approaches.
  - b. Paul provided a handout with the results of the "single most important idea" exercise from the March workshops. (Please see <What is the single most important idea for community college effectiveness.docx>.)
  - c. Comments
    - i. Workshop members stressed that IEPI should continue its efforts to outreach and raise awareness/understanding of the initiative and its purpose. IEPI should have standing updates and/or strands at organization meetings and conferences.
    - ii. Other thoughts: IEPI needs to work on training around budget and fiscal matters. We should consider modifying the existing portion of ACCCA's Admin-101 on fiscal matters and utilize the expertise of local CBOs to adapt.
2. Ideas for Future Regional Workshops
  - a. Partnering with RP Group on Student Support (Re)defined workshops
    - i. At the March meeting, workgroup members discussed among themselves Student Support (Re)defined (SSRD) as a possible workshop that IEPI could sponsor this spring and/or fall. Based on extensive interviews with students, SSRD identifies six factors associated with success (a sense of feeling directed, focused, nurtured, engaged, connected and valued). The resulting framework developed by RP Group could help colleges as they strive to achieve their institutional goals and improve student outcomes.
    - ii. At this meeting, Darla Cooper of the RP Group presented on the SSRD research and answered questions from workgroup members.
    - iii. Afterward, workgroup members discussed sponsoring regional workshops on SSRD. Comments:
      - (A) Such workshops might serve to reenergize campuses.
      - (B) Colleges that have already been through SSRD trainings and incorporated its principles should be asked to participate in these workshops. These colleges could provide examples of what they are doing and serve as resources for other workshop attendees.
      - (C) Workshops should focus on applying the six success factors and include development of an action plan as part of the day's activities. (Possible title of workshops: "Student Support (Re)defined in Action.")

- (D) IEPI should consider using SSRD as a student-centered overlay/framework for other proposed workshops.
- (E) A separate, future research study should look at whether CCC faculty and staff also feel directed, focused, nurtured, engaged, connected, and valued in their jobs and at their institution. (And if they don't, what could be done to change that?)
- b. Partnering with Association of Chief Business Officials (ACBO) on enrollment management workshop
  - i. Tom Burke with ACBO would like to partner with IEPI on a workshop (August 7 at College of San Mateo). Details on speakers and program agenda are still being worked out. IEPI would plan on sponsoring or co-sponsoring other regional workshops on the same theme later in August.
  - ii. Workgroup members stressed the importance of including multiple perspectives in enrollment management workshops, including human resources officers, staff, researchers, and public information officers.
- c. Other workshop topics to consider for 2015-16:
  - i. Other strategies for achieving colleges' 2015-16 goals
  - ii. Improving student equity and reducing achievement gaps
  - iii. Integrated planning
  - iv. Student learning outcomes assessment and use of results
    - (A) Could include I.B.6, the standard on disaggregating learning outcomes by subgroups (could be tied to improving student equity and reducing achievement gaps, above)
  - v. Fiscal management/controls, including long-term budget planning
  - vi. Board governance and improving shared governance structures
  - vii. Other topics workgroup members identified as good ideas:
    - (A) Data fluency.
    - (B) "How do you support student success?" Emphasize the role that staff play on campus in fostering student success.
    - (C) Based on findings from the Partnership Resource Teams, additional workshop ideas may be prioritized.
- 3. Online Clearinghouse (Portal)
  - a. Awards for Innovation in Higher Education: Highlighting CCC winners
    - i. Christian Osmena from the Department of Finance spoke about the state's recent Innovation Awards for Higher Education, which included more than a dozen CCC winners.
    - ii. The administration is interested in disseminating these success stories and providing support to colleges that are interested in adopting these effective practices.
    - iii. Workgroup members agreed that it was a good idea to showcase the CCC winners in the planned online clearinghouse.
  - b. Update on project development (Blaine Morrow, TTIP South)
    - i. Training element – Grovo
      - (A) Blaine gave a demo of the site, which has been branded as "Learn Academy."
      - (B) Grovo allows for different user levels. For example, a supervisor can establish teams to receive training.
    - ii. Organizations should start identifying their top three to five documents/materials and submit them for inclusion in the portal.
  - c. Partnering with Common Assessment Initiative (CAI) on professional development
    - i. There has been interest from CAI in using the planned portal to house its future training content. Paul and Blaine are planning follow-up conversations with CAI's lead on professional development.

- d. “Greatest hits” of resources for IEPI Website
  - i. Jerry Buckley had the idea to create a “greatest hits” list of resources to house on the IEPI website until the portal is ready.
- e. Planning is underway to hold a Webinar on the clearinghouse. The purpose is to provide an update on its development and to solicit additional input on desired features and content.

**D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)**

1. Introductions and minutes
  - a. Personal introductions
  - b. Approval of the March IEPI Policy Workgroup minutes
    - i. Discussion of minutes – terminology, main ideas, changes in deliverables
    - ii. Approval of minutes
2. Introducing the IEPI timeline
  - a. Explanation of the IEPI visual timeline contents
  - b. What else could we add to the visual timeline?
    - i. Add – audit findings due January
    - ii. Replace – “IPEI” with “IEPI” on timeline legend
  - c. Possibility of another visual to describe the entire IEPI process
    - i. Encompass both Technical Assistance and Professional Development.
    - ii. Possibility of creating an IEPI infographic
3. Suggestion to develop Strategic Communication teams
  - a. There’s “initiative fatigue” among colleges/districts, so we need invigorating voices to speak on behalf of IEPI efforts.
  - b. We need champions for IEPI mission in strategic regions across California.
  - c. Enlist members of IEPI Advisory Committee for Strategic Communication teams.
4. Language within the Framework of Indicators
  - a. There are inconsistencies in language among the ACCJC, Scorecard, and IE framework of indicators
  - b. Seek alignment of IEPI’s “goals” nomenclature with ACCJC’s nomenclature describing “floors/ceilings” and “targets.”
5. IE monitor portal and the goal-setting procedures
  - a. We need to be clear about which aspect of the institutions (colleges and/ or districts) is reporting.
  - b. We should not address colleges and districts in a manner that conveys mutual exclusivity.
    - i. There is flexibility regarding who reports and certifies IE goal setting.
    - ii. This flexibility, without CCCCO guidelines, may instigate needed conversations about developing shared governance process for IE goals setting.
6. District/Colleges Technical Assistance (TA) visitations procedures
  - a. TA visits will happen at colleges; discussions underway to expand to all system entities – districts, centers, ACCJC candidacy status
  - b. College and district needs vis-à-vis operations
    - i. The student success outcome and SSSP funding happens at the college level, whereas other funding is allocated from the districts
    - ii. The district also receives reporting and reports on fund balance, audit findings, and ACCJC findings
  - c. The decision on who ought to certify goals setting should be made locally.
7. Potential for collaborative policy development with ACCJC
  - a. How do we make sure that IEPI best practices are aligned with ACCJC institutional operational standards?
  - b. Example given of ACBO’s participation in developing annual reporting standards
  - c. Interpreting federal guidelines in collaboration with CCCs administrators
  - d. Can we work collaboratively with ACCJC on other data interpretation issues?
    - i. Scorecard – confusion with 6-year cohorts

- ii. Professional development efforts
  - iii. SLOs
- 8. Aligning IEPI work with regulatory guidelines and accreditation standards
  - a. Tracking recommendations made to colleges from PRTs
    - i. ACCJC offers tracking of recommendations for institutions on sanctions.
    - ii. We do not want to spread questionable best practices.
    - iii. We should scrutinize and track recommended best practices.
    - iv. ACCJC has federal pressure to take institutional standards and breaking them down to the department-level (e.g. math dept. and humanities dept. are assessed differently).
      - (A) Can IEPI help frame the discussion for some of these forthcoming changes?
      - (B) Can IEPI offer trainings to update accreditation assessment policies?
      - (C) How do we support performance assessments?
  - b. Can you standardize best practices?
    - i. We do not want to be perceived as an ACCJC compliance measure.
    - ii. We need to verify that our professional development measures and best practices are both homegrown and aligned with ACCJC policies.
- 9. Goal-Setting and Shared Governance
  - a. Goal-setting without punitive response when goals are not met
  - b. Measure the “effectiveness” of goals, rather than the expediency in meeting these goals.
  - c. Make goals work in congruence with ACCJC institution-set standards in order to safeguard against arbitrary goals.
- 10. Does ACCJC train people on goal-setting?
  - a. There is not much training on institution-set standards and integrated planning.
  - b. IEPI should consider how to train our institutions in these areas.
  - c. How can we support newer standards focused on student achievement and accountability?
  - d. ACCJC has provided limited trainings on accreditation goal-setting and the methodologies ACCJC uses to assess institutions upon visits.
- 11. How does IEPI align with WASC/ACS accreditation standard and the new ACCJC BA standards?
  - a. For the time being, adult education may be best served by the districts.
    - i. We are not currently prepared to support the WASC ACS standard during year one.
    - ii. We hope to become a stronger support for adult education in years to come.
    - iii. Non-credit institutions do fall under the purview of CCC institutional effectiveness.
  - b. CCC Baccalaureate Degrees
    - i. Have professional accrediting bodies
    - ii. Begin thinking about how IE can support colleges adhering to ACCJC BA standards.
- 12. Support for part-time faculty in order to support Student Success
  - a. While part-time faculty support is important, it is not a one-size-fits-all issue.
    - i. The politics behind the issue change between colleges and districts.
    - ii. To identify a best practice, procedure, or objective standard would be difficult.
  - b. Bearing in mind the 50% Law, we might be able to seek out colleges/districts that have developed professional development measures.
    - i. Equity funds may help faculty become involved in college services and operations.
    - ii. How can we engage part-time faculty in initiatives like IE?
    - iii. Should not engage this issue at the policy level, rather we ought to explore how to support them from a professional development level.
    - iv. In the end, we want to support student success by supporting part-time faculty.
  - c. There are challenges from the fiscal and collective bargaining perspective.
  - d. Classified staff involvement in IE
    - i. Classified participation in CCC initiatives is low.
    - ii. Find those colleges where the student services staff and instructional staff play important roles in supporting the effectiveness of their institutions.



13. Interest in reducing redundancies

- a. Master plans
- b. Equity plans
- c. SSSP plans

14. Concluding Items & Deliverables

- a. Provide visuals to describe IEPI (including Professional Development and Technical Assistance).
- b. Continue discussion of the potential for Strategic Communication teams.
- c. Connect IE goal-setting with ACCJC institution-set standards.
- d. Try to see how IEPI can be a recourse for ACCJC with regard to standards training.

**II. General Session 2**

A. Barry, Paul, Matthew, and Theresa shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions, and responded to a few questions.

**III. Adjournment**