



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE

Participate | Collaborate | Innovate

**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee
Chancellor's Office
December 2, 2016, 9:30 am-2:30 pm
Meeting Summary**

Members in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adrian	Loretta	PD	Johnson	Joyce	PD
Arballo	Madelyn	Ind	Kay	Beth	Ind
Bandyopadhyay	Santanu	PD	Kovrig	Neill K.	PPP
Barton	Michelle	Ind	Lamanque	Andrew	PPP
Bellisimo	Yolanda	TA	Lee	Matthew C.	TA
Brown	Aaron	TA	Lumapas-Taylor	Quincy	PD
Bruno	Julie	PD	McGinnis	William G.	TA
Burke	Kathleen	TA	Mehdizadeh	Mojdeh	Ind
Cabral	Robert	PD	Messina	Kimberlee	TA
Carr	Leslie	PD	Meuschke	Daylene	Ind
Coleman	Laura	Ind	Midkiff	Michael	TA
Dain	Claudette	PPP	Oberg	Anjeanette	PD
Dieckmeyer	Diane	TA	Rutan	Craig	PD
Fiero	Diane	PD	Sandoval	Carmen	PD
Garcia	Valentin	TA	Skinner	Erik	Ind
Goold	Grant	Ind	Tena	Theresa	PPP
Greaney	KC	Ind	Todd	James	Ind
Gribbons	Barry	Ind	Van Hook	Dianne	Ind
Heumann	Michael	Ind	Wah	Linda	PPP
Holland	Breanne	PD	Walthers	Kevin	Ind
Jaffe	Louise	Ind	Webb	Catherine	PD
Janio	Jarek	Ind			

Resource Persons/Evaluators in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Adams	Gary	Ind	Johnson	Catherine	Ind
Bianchi	Rico	PD	Keeley	Mia	PD
Bray	Susan	PD	Larson	Erin	TA/ PD
Cox-Otto	Pamela	NA	Pacheco	Robert	NA
Davidson	Adore		Pilati	Michelle	PD
Dettman	Sarah	NA	Schrager	Cynthia	NA
DuBreuil	Michelle	PD	Spano	Jeff	TA

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
Fisher	Stacy	Ind	Stevens	Amy	
Fuller	Ryan	Ind	Stirling	Anna	PD
Howe	Michael	PPP	Valverde	Scott	TA
Jez	Su Jin	PD			

Guests in Attendance

Last	First	Wkgrp*	Last	First	Wkgrp*
deAnda	Rosa	PPP	Miller	Kaydee	PD
Hoig	Todd	Ind	Roberts	Matthew	Ind
Leufgen	Jillianne	Ind	Tyson	Sarah	Ind

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

I. General Session 1

- A. Kevin and Madelyn shared Education Moments.
- B. PLN Update
 1. Rico provided an update on users and features.
 - a. The PLN already has 4,820 registered users, and the Lynda.com segment has about 2,600 users.
 - b. Rico noted several of the most commonly accessed pages.
 - c. Coming attractions include learning teams, expanded search, and the launch of Skillsoft.
 2. Michelle Pilati briefly described the review and approval process for PLN submissions.
- C. Theresa noted that the PPP Workgroup is now grappling with the review process for the PLN as well as with ASKs. She also announced that the annual legislative report by IEPI will be shared soon.
- D. Matthew stated that PRT services for 61 had been approved to date, plus a few mini-PRTs.
- E. Barry reminded the committee of the Indicators Workshop at SRJC in January.
- F. Neill announced that 4CS had received one of the Leadership Development awards, and the organization is excited about the work to come.

II. Workgroup Sessions

A. Institutional Effectiveness Indicators (Barry)

1. Year 4
 - a. We are not expecting radical changes in Year 4.
 - b. We will work on finalizing Year 4 changes by March.
2. Demo of new portal with addition of new indicators. Stacy reviewed the new portal and indicators.
 - a. OPEB – colleges are required to enter historical data but not set goals.
 - b. Historical goals are now shown. Once goals are certified, the historical goals are not made available on the public site.
 - c. College Choice
 - i. #31 – required. Add option to include math/English throughput rates.
 - ii. #32 – optional
3. Gary, Matt, Kathy and Laura presented the Launchboard update.
 - a. Note that employment data are in the 2nd quarter and not annualized. Ditto for 4th quarter.
 - b. There is interest in the proportion who attained a living wage.
 - c. Barry will send PPT from Gary Adams to the IEPI Indicator Workgroup.
 - d. Launchboard 3.0 will include separate tab for noncredit.
 - e. Change in earnings is an important metric for Skills Builders.
 - f. Demo of Launchboard
 - i. SWP Metrics tab is useful for colleges completing their local data plans for Strong Workforce (data pulled from all students who exit the system).
 - ii. Snapshot tab has dated data because they've been focused on launching the SWP tab. The Snapshot tab will be updated in January. Anytime the cell size is less than 10 for

disaggregated data, it is suppressed. Those suppressed cells are rolled into the “other” category.

- iii. The Equity Gap data are available through the Snapshot tab
4. Feedback from Scorecard Advisory Committee
 - a. Scorecard is more accountability-focused whereas IEPI is focused on aspirational goals/improvement.
 - b. Potential additional metrics for the Scorecard: Transfer Level Completion Rate, Participation Rate and Median Time to Degree. For now they’ve decided not to add to the Scorecard but want to keep an eye on it.
 - c. Data on Demand and/or Data Mart: Transfer rate might be added.
 - d. WEDD at CCCCO is working on getting unitary level data for licensure (SB66).
 - e. Discussion of time to degree:
 - i. Ryan Fuller has played around with calculating time to degree by FTES. More specifically, how much FTES did it take for each degree achieved? This is different from the system goals. There are challenges because FTES isn’t intuitive to folks outside the system. The group suggested it might be better to look at units.
 - ii. Barry also asked if we could disaggregate time to degree by science and non-science.
 - iii. Data are interesting in that they don’t show students who complete as taking many extra units.
5. Agenda for next meeting
 - a. 3-Year completion metric (if possible, TRIS will provide data at the next meeting)
 - b. The next meeting we’ll take a few colleges and look at leading and lagging indicators.
 - c. Most completion happens between years 3 and 4.
 - d. Noncredit Course Success
 - e. Average number of units: Part-Time vs Full-Time disaggregation
 - f. Discuss possibly removing: Course Completion Rates, CTE Rate and Basic Skills Progression
 - g. What makes sense to have 1 vs 6-year goals
 - h. Over the next year: Validate which indicators are leading and lagging.

B. Technical Assistance Process (Matthew)

1. Matthew updated the group on the status of PRT processes.
 - a. Full PRTs, cycles 1-3B (Spring 2015-Spring 2017)
 - b. Mini-PRTs
 - i. The suggestion was made to add an institutional effectiveness/institutional research officer to the WLAC Mini-PRT if available.
 - ii. Matthew requested feedback before the holidays on the Mini-PRT FAQs.
 - c. PRT COPs
 - i. Matthew requested feedback by Wednesday, Dec. 7 on the COP Proposal.
 - ii. Kimberlee noted that a recent ACCCA survey indicated the desire for regional one-day PD sessions.
2. Matthew drew attention to the Improvements and Innovations Report that he and Bob had produced at the Workgroup’s request. Plans call for production of this report about twice per year.
3. Bob facilitated discussion of the Evaluation Report for the PRT training activities conducted during Fall 2016.
 - a. Some apparent ambiguity was noted in the college roles question, which Bob and Matthew will seek to remedy in the next iteration of the training surveys.
 - b. To address response rates that were lower than anticipated for the Workshops, Matthew will ask PRT Leads to ask all PRT members to complete the evaluation during the last five minutes of the team work session.
4. Matthew walked the group through the recently developed Guidelines for PRT Process Evaluation Cyclical Reporting. The guidelines call for the standard report to be produced after

survey responses have been received from PRT members and client institutions for at least 75 percent of the PRTs for each of the applicable visits (Visits 1 and 2 for the first report, and Visit 3 for the second). A report to include stragglers may be produced according to one of three options, depending on whether the addition of information from stragglers significantly alters the conclusions in the original report.

5. The agenda included Matthew and Bob's best estimate of the schedule for sharing training and visit evaluations with the Workgroup going forward.
6. Matthew and Bob noted several evaluation tasks, in addition to the routinized training and PRT cycle evaluation reports, that current plans call for Bob to undertake:
 - a. Periodic research briefs, each of which would examine a particular large issue or question (e.g., alignment with accreditation, administrative turnover) in more detail
 - b. Summative evaluation reports about one year after the final PRT visit, to gauge the extent to which anticipated improvements have been sustained
 - i. The group suggested notifying client CEOs at the third visit that activities related to the one-year evaluation would be forthcoming.
 - ii. The group also suggested including the back story/rationale for the institution's selection of the applicable Areas of Focus, and using that rationale as part of the assessment of the effects of the PRT process and of the client institution's progress.
 - iii. The extent to which the client institutions have been able to build capacity in sustaining institutional effectiveness should be part of these reports. Bill noted that IEPI needs to educate trustees, for example, that we are about building capacity, not just moving the needle on a given measure.
 - iv. Members noted that both client CEOs and Boards would want to see reports on the effects and value of the PRT process.
 - c. Harvesting best practices for posting to the PLN, from sources including the MOOs, I&EPs, PRT process summary reports, and one-year-after reports
 - d. Possibly focus groups of selected PRTs, and/or participation in selected visit debriefs with Matthew and the PRT Leads

C. Professional Development (Craig Rutan)

1. Update on recent and scheduled PD Activity.
 - a. Recent events included the Role of Curriculum in Institutional Financial Aid Eligibility.
 - b. Upcoming events noted were Dual Enrollment, Pathways, CTE, and Evaluators Training.
 - c. A list of the trainings with dates was distributed.
2. EdInsights gave an update on their evaluation findings of recent PD activities.
3. The group reviewed poll results from the 11/7 Specialized Training Committee meeting, with rankings for trainings not yet completed from the IEPI Specialized Training Program Workshop Schedule and Content Development Priorities for 2016/17. Attendees also reviewed the list of additional training topics submitted at the 11/7 Specialized Training Committee meeting, and provided input by ranking each topic's priority level as high, medium or low.
4. Jeff provided an update of the recent Leadership Development awards

D. Policy, Procedure, and Practice (Theresa)

1. Review Minutes from September 8, 2016
 - a. Edit to September 8 minutes is suggested. Agreement to make the edit and redistribute minutes.
2. Report out on Applied Solutions Kit (ASK) Project
 - a. Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) ASK
 - i. In February 2017, we will get a true look at enrollment throughout the CCCs. More focused attention on SEM is necessary right now due to the recent softening of enrollment. Effect of OEI and Exchange on enrollment is discussed.
 - ii. Scope of work for SEM discussed.
(A) Necessary now to identify where the system is, how the system defines SEM, what the barriers are, and what we're doing well on purpose. A system-wide

survey of the CEOs, CSSOs, CIOs, faculty, researchers, and marketers will be administered in order to find out what the system is doing well and to identify potential opportunities for case studies. The survey is still in the construction phase. The survey is set to launch mid-January. There will also be a literature review.

- (B) After the literature review and survey are complete, an advisory group will be created and will convene to structure and stage SEM. Desire for this advisory group to be composed of a diverse group of personnel from both urban and rural areas. Also seeking middle leadership reps for advisory group. Right now, it is difficult to determine who exactly to survey.
 - (C) Bill McGinnis's proposal from September 8 meeting regarding the problematic funding formula is discussed briefly. It is unlikely that there will be robust FTEs identified in February 2017.
 - (D) Links on PLN regarding budget are mentioned. ACBO website offers resources on funding and enrollment management.
 - (E) Suggestion offered to look to Michigan for solutions to repeatability.
 - (F) International student impact is discussed and recognized as a college strategy. The SEM project, however, will focus on California residents.
 - (G) SEM ASK may not be totally comprehensive; it will not propose new funding models; it will focus on student success.
 - (H) Strategies are discussed related to onboarding of students and discovering in an incremental way when students drop out during the semester.
 - (I) General discussion regarding under-resourced colleges' ability to spend more time on student retention. Advisory group will be open to student reps.
 - (J) Discussion regarding the demise of for-profit colleges, how the CCCs have a unique opportunity to serve those former students who are now without a college. Uncertainty regarding ease of credits transfer from a place like ITT Tech to a CCC.
3. Communication; promoting IEPI
- a. All CCCs have been contacted regarding communications efforts. Finding that all CCC efforts have been mostly passive except in the case of an emergency. There is a major gatekeeping function in place regarding sending emails to all staff personnel. How are we to share IEPI with colleges if there is such a gatekeeping function in place? Plan underway to perform more targeted marketing to break through gatekeeping.
 - b. A customized signature for all IEPI personnel that advertises IEPI and also the IEPI listserv is suggested. The very nature of the customized signature and sharing it via email spreads the "IEPI virus." Idea that workshop attendees could be "awarded" customized signatures stating that they're a part of the IEPI effort to improve the CCCs. This is a high-tactile, low-effort endeavor.
4. Review of ASK Project
- a. When and how will ASK items be vetted?
 - i. Clarification sought regarding PLN and ASKs. Discussion of "loose vetting," or a set of minimum requirements that prospective ASKs must meet. Desire for ASKs to showcase examples that come from colleges themselves so that other colleges might learn from those examples and apply their learning to their own schools. Belief that ASKs will get better and better as colleges use them. Belief that ASKs are not supposed to offer quick fixes to problems.
 - ii. Concern that the "sharing" resources already on the PLN might appear to users as in competition with ASK materials.
 - iii. Belief that feedback on ASKs should also be vetted before any revisions to ASKs are made. Apt comparison of the "sharing" resources to Wikipedia and the ASKs to JSTOR.

- iv. Desire to ensure that ASK projects and material distinction is apparent to PLN users.
 - v. Concern that CCCs already know how to solve their own problems, but can't quite bring themselves to do it. This is a cultural challenge.
 - vi. Question of whether ASKs will really do much good. Question of whether an ASK should be vetted only after it is successfully implemented at a college. The PLN needs to explicitly tell its users that ASKs are vetted in this way and should be taken as inspiration rather than as "tools."
 - vii. Silos and the notion of culture within the CCCs are discussed. Warning that cultural change and complex relationship issues inhibit progress. Opinion that we must address the cultural challenges that plague our institutions.
 - viii. The ASK timeline for delivery is discussed, and it is anticipated that materials will be available for the January PRT trainings.
5. Report out on ASK Project
- a. Integrated Planning
 - i. Next scope of work with RP Group has been in implementation since October. IP will be presented at the December 7-8, 2016 pathways event in Sacramento. Literature of what CCCs are doing will be reviewed. Also a review of what seminal institutions are doing to vet integrated planning. This info as well as feedback from the field will inform piece. Vetting comes from asking colleges what works and what doesn't.
 - b. Data Disaggregation
 - i. First phase of data disaggregation project is winding down. Seven tools have been produced (see one-pager distributed at the workgroup meeting). Each tool is built around a case study.
 - ii. A number of invitations has been received to present on data disaggregation at various conferences.
 - iii. Case studies are brought up. Each case study has to do with a specific college. Concern if there should be separate advisory groups to do the vetting. Desire to make sure that case studies involve evidence. We're not evaluating outcomes in terms of student success. Evidence means specific examples of using effective practices.
 - iv. Discussion of the term "evolving practices," as many of the practices out there are too new to really be deemed "effective."
 - v. The landing page for the data disaggregation ASK is nearly done and will be on the PLN soon.

III. General Session 2

- A. Matthew, Barry, Theresa, and Craig Rutan shared highlights of their respective Workgroup sessions (see above).

IV. Adjournment