

## **Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI)**

### **Notes from First Professional Development Advisory Work Group Meeting**

**February 5, 2015 (10am to 3:30pm)**

1. Paul Steenhausen, Executive Director of the Success Center for California Community Colleges and Co-Chair of the IEPI Professional Development Work Group, introduced himself and welcomed members of the work group. Other members of the IEPI Executive Committee and work group (Julie Bruno, Jerry Buckley, and Daylene Meuschke) also welcomed the participants.
2. Steenhausen provided an overview of the planned professional development components of IEPI: regional workshops (beginning this spring), periodic Webinars, and development of an online clearinghouse of professional development resources.
3. Attendees reviewed the charge (responsibilities) of the Advisory Work Group.
4. Members of the work group spent the morning discussing potential topics for the spring 2015 regional workshops. A number of work group members commented on the confusion and uncertainty—even apprehension—concerning IEPI’s purpose. This confusion and uncertainty includes how IEPI fits into all of the other initiatives (Student Success Initiative, Student Equity, AB 86 Adult Education, Online Education Initiative, etc.) currently underway. College personnel want to know: How is IEPI part of the system’s overall success agenda?

***Need to Address Nature and Purpose of IEPI.*** There was strong consensus among work group members that for IEPI to be successful, IEPI leadership needs to set the tone early and address this speculation and confusion. The first series of workshops, then, should ask and answer basic questions such as:

- What is IEPI...What is it *not*?
  - How is IEPI relevant to the colleges? What can it do for faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees, and why should colleges want to be a part of it?
- The opening general session should have the State Chancellor’s Office—in a clearly stated and visually appealing way—present the vision for IEPI and show how the system’s various projects, programs, and initiatives fit together within the overarching goal of institutional effectiveness and student success.
- Breakout sessions could address topics/themes such as:

- What are the indicators and their purpose? The breakout session also could include guidance on how colleges should set their goals (targets) for the indicators.
- Ideas on how to create a process/forum/framework on campus that links and integrates the various programs in support of institutional effectiveness and student success.
- How colleges might message IEPI and get buy-in (and active participation) from others on campus.

**Invite Teams.** Work group members had the idea to invite to the workshop teams of six or seven from each college (such as the college’s CEO, CIO, CSSO, CBO, faculty, staff, and perhaps a trustee). At least one of the breakout sessions could be cross-college and attended by peers in the same position (e.g., CEOs with other CEOs, CIOs with other CIOs, etc.). Later in the day, time should be set aside for team members from each college to get back together and develop an action plan to take back to campus. Each workshop, then, could have 200 to 300 attendees.

**Pre-Workshop Survey.** Prior to the workshop, colleges should be surveyed on their perceptions, successes, and needs to help inform workshop emphases and materials. Invitations could come with a short (one minute) video. Between now and the workshops, IEPI Executive Committee members should be sure to adopt common messaging at conferences and other events. The workshops should be captured and made available to colleges that were unable to attend.

**Scheduling.** As far as timing for the initial set of workshops, work group members noted that March and April were very busy months for accreditation and other conferences. The best times seems to be the last week of April and first week of May. In addition to a workshop in Northern and Southern California, the IEPI Executive Committee should consider a workshop in the Central Valley.

**Workshop Ideas for Summer 2015.** IEPI should consider hosting a second set of regional workshops in summer 2015. Since colleges will have just adopted their local goals (targets), a theme/focus of these workshops could be around helping them achieve their goals (for example, how to improve remedial rates and manage change). Another thought was to focus just on enrollment management in the summer workshops—going beyond FTES calculations to broader topics such as using technology to anticipate and meet student demand for classes and adopting strategies for improving student retention (“retained FTES”). Whatever the final theme of these summer workshops, IEPI should be sure to coordinate with other CCC organizations to leverage already-existing resources. The work group will need more time to explore whether faculty would be drawn to workshops in the

summertime. If not, perhaps workshops that relate more to other classifications could be developed.

5. **Online Professional Development Clearinghouse.** The work group spent the afternoon discussing the planned online professional development clearinghouse. Steenhausen passed out a list of topics/issues that attendees at six earlier regional summits had brainstormed for the clearinghouse. Work group members split into small groups and discussed the top priorities they thought should be included in the initial phases of the clearinghouse project. Afterward, the small groups shared the priorities they had identified.

Topics for *accreditation* included:

- How to make SLOs relevant/meaningful (beyond just satisfying ACCJC)
- Integrated planning.
- Setting institutional standards that make sense.
- Board governance.
- How to get more involvement by faculty and staff in the accreditation process.

Topics related to *student success* included:

- Design principles for effective remedial pathways for students.
- How to use multiple measures for assessment.
- Concurrent/dual enrollment.
- Creating stronger pathways from noncredit to credit coursework.
- Effective instructional practices in other states.

Topics related to *fiscal/audit/compliance* included:

- Budget 101 (budget basics for faculty, staff, and administrators)
- Admin 101
- Ed Code/System Regulations 101
- Federal grant compliance
- Overview of unions.

Work group members also identified topics/issues that did not fall into one of the three above categories, such as training modules on how to use the clearinghouse.

Work group members agreed that CCC associations and organizations are among the best places to start for existing content for the clearinghouse. For example, ACCCA could be asked to vet and submit material related to Admin 101. An editorial board (work group members plus other experts joining on an ad hoc basis depending on the subject matter)

would be charged with asking for such materials and then reviewing the submitted content for clarity and overall quality. Blaine Morrow of TTIP South, who is under contract with the Online Education Initiative (OEI) to build the clearinghouse, said he intends to use OEI funds for the initial packaging and, as needed, purchase of materials. (Selected content would be attributed to the author.) The IEPI work group would also be charged with (1) the ongoing identification of *new* topics that are needed, (2) creating an “open call” for content/materials, and (3) reviewing/judging submissions. Work group members agreed that a feedback mechanism (such as a virtual suggestion box for clearinghouse users) will be vital for the ongoing improvement of the clearinghouse. Also, launch of the portal should be accompanied by training on how to optimize its use.

6. The work group concluded its discussions by about 3:30pm.