Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
October 23, 2015, 10:00 am-3:45 pm
Sheraton Grand Sacramento
Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Bandyopadhyay	Santanu	PD	Mehdizadeh	Mojdeh	Ind
Blackwood	Kathy	Ind	Meuschke	Daylene	PD
Braxton	Phyllis	PD	Nezaam	Keith	PPP
Dain	Claudette	PPP & TA	Purtell	Valentina	Ind
Ferguson	Chris	PPP	Rutan	Craig	PD
Greaney	KC	Ind	Schardt	Jan	PD
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Stanskas	John	Ind
Hayward	Craig	Ind	Steenhausen	Paul	PD
Holland	Breanne	PD	Tarman	Christopher	Ind
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Lee	Matthew C.	TA	Webb	Catherine	PD
*McGinnis	William G.	TA			

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Atalig	Christina	Ind	Larson	Erin	PD
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Purnell	Rogeair	NA
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Rodriguez	Mario	Ind
Fisher	Stacy	Ind	Slimp	Ronnie	PPP
Kinney	Terry	NA	Spano	Jeff	TA/PPP
Lamantia	Tricia	PPP	Van Ommeren	Alice	Ind

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
deAnda	Rosa	PPP	Leufgen	Jillianne	Ind
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Tyson	Sarah	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 Jeff Spano and Catherine Webb.

B. Barry, Matthew, Jeff, and Paul reported briefly on IEPI progress to date and answered questions as they arose; areas highlighted included the following:

1. Indicators
   a. Discussions of Year 3 Indicators will continue, with a focus today on access measures and other doable candidates. One interesting suggestion has been the addition of an employee diversity indicator.
   b. The Workgroup will consider today adding a college-option indicator specifically related to remediation.
   c. Alignment of system goals with the indicators is also a subject of continuing discussion.
2. Technical assistance
   a. Three seed grant applications have now been received, and three more are likely to come in by the end of next month.

     b. Training for the Fall cycle is now complete. Captioning of the Sept. 18 workshop is underway; in the meantime, we do have DVDs of those sessions should the need arise.

     c. All Fall teams have now been staffed and all initial visit dates have been identified.

     d. Matthew notified all PRT Leads from both Cycle 1 and the Fall cycle of the upcoming IEPI integrated planning workshops, and asked them to share that information with client institutions that had identified integrated planning as an Area of Focus. He also notified them of the January SLO Symposium in Orange County, in case it might prove useful to those institutions that had identified SLOs as an Area of Focus.

   3. Policy, Procedure, and Practice

     a. Jeff introduced Terry Kinney of Interact, who described the upcoming focus groups the firm would be conducting, and answered some questions from members.

     b. Responses to the RFP for the Specialized Training are due Nov. 2, and the award is scheduled to be made Nov. 15.

     c. The Institutional Effectiveness Division is hoping to have some additional staff positions soon, perhaps by the next meeting.

   4. Professional Development

     a. Paul reviewed the current slate of workshops. Additional topics will likely include basic skills and SLO assessment.

     b. The Workgroup is working on two main elements of the Professional Learning Network (the new name for the online clearinghouse): A personalized MyPD Plan, and a discussion forum capability.

 C. Bill McGinnis announced an October 27 webinar by the Campaign for College Opportunity—The State of Higher Education in California: Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders—and invited members to participate.

II.   Workgroup Sessions

A. *Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)*

   1. Update on Year 2

     a. The recommendations from the previous meetings are moving forward, including the recommendation on the number of targets to be set (4+2+1+1).

     b. One change is that the Chancellor's Office has expressed on interest in an additional target related to unprepared or basic skills for Year 2.

     c. The group recommended changing the required "College Choice" target to focus on College Choice for Unprepared or Basic Skills Students.

     d. An additional College Choice indicator without this added focus should also be available to colleges as an optional indicator.

   2. Access

     a. For Year 3, we should have two groups of data available.

        i. One would be traditional participation rate for areas and students within the district's service geographic boundaries.

       ii. Additionally, a statewide map should be created using GIS showing the participation rates by zip code regardless of the community college the student attended.

     b. It's not presupposed that colleges would set targets for this indicator in Year 3. Once the Year 3 Indicators are set, we should revisit what the optimal number of indicators that colleges are required to set.

   3. Year 3 Indicators.

     a. Alice and Ryan presented the list of possible Year 3 Indicators that were feasible. From this list, the group suggested pursuing the following:

        i. Employment and Wage Data

       ii. Scorecard Skills Builder

      iii. Short-term Certificates

      iv. Student Education Plans

       v. Basic Skills course sequence completion

      vi.   Completion of college-level English and Math within 1 year, within 2 years

     vii.   Average Unit Load or Full-time/Part-time or Headcount per FTES

    viii.   Financial Aid Awards (BOG, Federal, State, and local)

     ix.   Number of CTE degrees and awards and the percentage that are degrees.

      x.   SS Elements (education plans, counseling, etc.)

     xi.   First-generation enrollment

     xii.   Student-Counselor Ratio

  b. Additional indicators proposed include:

      i.   Awards per FTES

     ii.   Additional Fiscal Indicators (to be drafted by the Fiscal Advisory Workgroup)

    iii.   Student Satisfaction (probably Year 4 or so)

     iv.   Percent full-time faculty

      v.   Percent Basic Skills Taught by Full-time Faculty

     vi.   **Diversity of New Faculty**

     vii.   Retention

    viii.   **Percent of Students Who Complete Any Units** (not all F or W)

     ix.   Percent of students who enrolled/placed in first math class transfer level, college level, one level below, two levels below…

      x.   Highlighted additional indicators above are for Year 3

4. System Goals and Indicators

  a. Developed before IEPI. July 2014 system goals were presented to the BOG. SB195 (Carol Liu) talked about setting system-wide goals.

  b. In the process of doing analysis to see if the system has met those goals. A report will come out soon. The system will likely need to revisit these goals as IEPI becomes more stable over time. Mapping will need to occur with college and system goals.

  c. Goals (handout distributed by Stacy):

      i.   Student Success (5 metrics from the Scorecard)

        1. Degree/Transfer Completion Rate (annual goal increase of 2.5%)

        2. Annual Volume of Associate Degrees for Transfer Awarded (annual goal increase of 5% for five years)

        3. Remedial Math Rate (annual goal increase of 2.5%)

        4. Remedial English Rate (annual goal increase of 2.5%)

        5. CTE Completion Rate (annual goal increase of 2.5%)

        Discussion: One member asked if the goals were going to be prorated. Stacy clarified that they are measured year by year within each of the 6 year and compare cohorts at similar intervals. It is 2.5% of the completion rate for each year.

     ii.   Equity in Completion Rate among Race/Ethnicity Subgroups (calculates equity index – proportionality index) – goal is to increase until at least 0.8.

    iii.   Student Services (percentage of credit and non-credit, excluding exempt, who have an educational plan)

     iv.   Efficiency (FTES generated per Scorecard Success Outcome) – degree/cert, transfer prepared or transfer (decrease FTES per outcome). There is not a specific numerical goal but the goal is to increase efficiency.

      v.   Access - Participation Rate for 18-24 years of age. There is not a specific numerical goal but the goal is to increase participation.

5. Data Visualizations

  a. KC Greaney presented Tableau visualizations from Santa Rosa Junior College.

      i.   Online Fact Book [http://fact-book.santarosa.edu/]

        (A) Includes connection to college Scorecard

        (B) Includes Scorecard measures (graphs and tables) – showed side-by-side comparison for Latino and White students

     ii.   CTEOS data [http://cteos.santarosa.edu/]

                (A) Provides the ability to isolate data using the "display mode"

                (B) Provides the ability to disaggregate or aggregate years

     iii.   Strategic Planning Scorecard [http://strategic-planning.santarosa.edu/]

                (A) Uses a visualization of a tree with the leaves filled in to represent progress toward goals.

                (B) Includes a link to Strategic Plan for the headcount goal with running 3-year average and goal line

                (C) Includes Enrollment by Sex for SRJC over time compared to the state, including a ratio

     iv.   Discussion - Advisory members feel it is important to be able to cross-tab but KC cautioned that it can get overwhelming for folks. KC leads with higher level graphic and provides the ability to filter as folks would like.

  b. Daylene presented the "heat map" College of the Canyons recently presented as part of the Student Equity data presented to the campus and discussed how the summary provided in this format helped folks focus on the areas of greatest concern for student groups where disproportionate impact was found.

  c. Discussion

     i.   Advisory members asked if data visualizations would be available in Year 3.

     ii.   Overall, the members in attendance like the Tableau software and would like it to be available system-wide.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

  1. Evaluation update: There have been no further developments since the last meeting.

  2. Preliminary results from Sept. 4 Webinar survey

    a. Matthew shared orally preliminary results from the Webinar survey. Findings were generally quite positive, though several participants wanted more information about the likely time commitment of serving on a PRT, the timing between the visits, and the details of reporting and member responsibilities.

    b. Members commented that the webinar should emphasize that PRTs are not intended solely for colleges that are "in trouble."

  3. Collecting candidate best practices for dissemination

    a. Matthew asked members to brainstorm and discuss answers to each of the following questions:

     i.   In a posted best practice or success story, what elements would be most useful to colleges seeking information in that area? Suggested elements discussed included the following:

                (A) Institutional identification, brief characteristics, contact information

                (B) To what extent did the practice achieve the intended impact?

                (C) What secondary impacts did the practice have, whether positive or negative (unintended consquences)?

                (D) What imaginative ideas did you try that did not work out?

                (E) How do you foresee this practice helping with student success or other aspects of institutional effectiveness?

                (F) If the institution had had an accreditation sanction in the applicable area, whether the practice passed muster at the next visit or evaluation

                (G) Samples of documents associated with the practice

     ii.   How should practices and success stories be organized on the clearinghouse website, and what tools should be available to find them easily? Suggestions discussed included the following:

                (A) Keywords (e.g., shared governance, handbooks, resource allocation), drawn in part from ACCJC or audit language

                (B) FAQ or cheat sheet on how to use the practices section of the website, distributed to all institutions annually

(C) Alpha index or table of contents for browsing categories of interest
b. Members reviewed three sample Cycle 1 Innovation and Effectiveness Plans and one associated Menu of Options, and Matthew asked them to identify items that would be good candidates for following up as possible best practices or success stories. Suggestions included the following:
   i. Development and implementation of an Adult Learner Re-entry Program
   ii. Improvements in the early alert program to identify students at risk
   iii. Design and implementation of enhanced one-stop entry services year-round, including pathways advisement
   iv. Increasing the number of well-trained outreach/retention teams
   v. Establishment of a Data Integrity Committee
   vi. Development of a testing process for ERP patches before implementation in production
   vii. Designation of one central office to take the lead on external reporting of institutional data
c. Members added some other ideas on disseminating best practices, such as the following:
   i. Identify themes arising in Areas of Focus identified in Letters of Interest, and consider holding professional development events to get the word out to all stakeholder groups (including Trustees) on rising issues.
   ii. Require PRT recipients, perhaps as a condition of receiving seed grants, to share their experiences.

C. *Professional Development (Paul)*
1. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Craig Rutan, Santiago Canyon College and Academic Senate (Area D Representative). Craig provided a summary of his work on ASCCC's planned Professional Development College.
2. Review of Notes from September Meeting. (September notes for all workgroups were forwarded by IEPI to advisory committee members after the meeting.)
3. Professional Learning Network
   a. Resource submission form
      i. Workgroup members went through the consolidated fields on the form for effective/promising practices. Members agreed that the streamlined fields were comprehensive without being overwhelming.
      ii. A workgroup member suggested adding a sentence at the end of the form stating that any resource person identified on the form would be notified of a submission. Workgroup members agreed that this was a good addition.
   b. Rubric for evaluating submissions
      i. Workgroup members went through the updated evaluation rubric, which reflects members' feedback from prior meetings. Workgroup members reacted positively to the updated form.
      ii. TTIP South is looking at ways to make the form more automated (such as using SurveyMonkey).
      iii. A suggestion was made to save frequently written comments in the rubric so reviewers can easily re-use (copy/paste).
      iv. Could add a notation on the back-end so users can search by type of material (e.g., PowerPoint, video, etc.).
      v. Need to ensure ADA accessibility and compliance of materials that are submitted. For example, if a video is not captioned, TTIP South will need to make sure it is captioned properly.
   c. Update on MyPD Plan component (Craig Rutan)
      i. Opportunity for staff, faculty, etc. to set their own goals and check them off as they go.

      ii.   Anna Sterling with @One is coordinating a focus group (drawn from members of the workgroup). The focus group is discussing a number of issues:

(A) What can be visible or not visible to others? There should be an ability to share or not share.

(B) "Canned" goals and free-formed goals.

    (1) Want system to be able to suggest training opportunities based on "canned" goals – eventually will be able to make suggestions based on free-formed goals.

(C) Focus group members agreed that "badges" are not a necessary feature.

    (1) Suggestion: Use a "progress/completion" indicator toward a goal as opposed to a badge. Maybe add a certificate of completion for those who complete a training?

  d. Social/discussion component: Forum ideas (Rico Bianchi)

      i.   Basic idea for the discussion board is that we would start with 5 to 10 broad categories (forums). From the forum, users could create topics and start threads.

(A) Discussions would be moderated to avoid inappropriate content or unrelated/spam topics.

(B) Workgroup members received a sheet with forum ideas and spent time discussing possible categories (such as "student success" and "regulations and policy"). The issue will be worked on over the next few weeks and revisited at the next workgroup meeting.

     ii.   Workgroup members discussed how viewable and searchable the discussions should be. Users will need to register to participate in a discussion but what about searchability? Will discussions be accessible via a google search? The workgroup will discuss this issue more at the next meeting.

    iii.   A workgroup member raised the question of how to make it desirable for people to connect and utilize the discussion board.

4. Regional Workshops

  a. Workgroup members went through the dates for upcoming workshops on Student Support (Re)defined, Diversity in Hiring, Inmate/Re-entry Education, and Integrated Planning.

  b. Basic skills

      i. $60M funding in state budget for the Basic Skills Transformation Grant Program.

     ii.   Competitive grant requires colleges to identify two or more strategies to improve outcomes for basic skills students.

    iii.   Could just put out an RFA, but want to think of ways the field can be supported in their development of an application.

    iv.   What if we offered IEPI-sponsored workshops in partnership with various CCC organizations, with the goal of attendees (who would be encouraged to come in teams) leaving with the outlines of an application and/or work plan?

(A) The idea could be to have a general session with a number of workshop strands (breakout topics). Workgroup members suggested possible session topics and strands, including:

    (1) Scaling "boutique" programs

      (a) What works for a small cohort – how to scale to larger populations.

    (2) Identifying meta majors (fields of interest to students) – then help students determine what to take in basic skills and then move forward in the major core courses.

    (3) Using predictive factors for assessment. Biggest predictor of success in math is whether or not students took a math class in their senior year of high school.

    (4) We have great examples of first year experience programs having success with students

(B) Chancellor's Office needs to have the RFA out around February.

              (1) If we did workshops, we would shoot to hold them when the RFA comes out.
- c. Student learning outcomes
    - i. Workgroup members discussed sponsoring events on making SLOs meaningful and disaggregating data by student subgroup (a new ACCJC requirement).
    - ii. There are a number of opportunities to integrate this topic into already-planned ASCCC events.
    - iii. The workgroup talked about other possible forums to present on this topic, such as the joint meeting in April 2016 in Sacramento.
    - iv. Workgroup members agreed that CEO participation on this topic and in these events is highly desirable.
- 5. Identifying and Addressing Possible Barriers to Participation in PD Activities (Craig Rutan)
    - a. The amount of time (such as through flex days) and funds that college personnel have for professional development varies by campus.
        - i. Often it is the Academic Senate presidents and curriculum chairs who attend events because they are the ones with the most reassigned time.
    - b. Adjunct faculty and classified staff tend to have the hardest time with these issues of time and resources.
    - c. ASCCC is finding that it has so much programmed it is running out of weekends!
        - i. We have to look at this – it can't keep going this way – too much programming is a burden on faculty (and staff).
    - d. Workgroup members discussed the desirability of getting trainers, topical experts, etc. to visit campuses vs. asking people from the campuses to go out to an off-site workshop.
        - i. Disadvantage of on-campus workshop: no cross-pollination, fewer opportunities for college-to-college collaboration/discussion opportunities.
    - e. A workgroup member suggested we examine how we're using webinars. There are opportunities to make webinars more engaging and a better tool for disseminating and exchanging information.
        - i. Rico offered to demo Zoom, a CCC virtual communication tool, at the next workgroup meeting.
    - f. To get a better handle on local policies for flex and PD budgets, IEPI should conduct a survey. Jan Schardt mentioned that 4CSD (of which she is a member) is planning to do a survey and offered to work with IEPI on it.
- ***D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)***
    - 1.
        - a.

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

IV. Adjournment