



Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Frequently Asked Questions June 15, 2015

What is the goal of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI)?

- The goal of this initiative is to help advance California Community Colleges' institutional effectiveness, and in the process significantly reduce the number of accreditation sanctions and audit issues, and most importantly, enhance the system's ability to serve students effectively. An important focus of the grant is to draw on the exceptional expertise and innovation from within the system in advancing best practices and avoiding potential pitfalls.

What are the major components of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative?

- **There are three major components of the initiative:**
 - Develop a **framework of indicators and college/district goals**.
 - The framework includes student performance and outcomes, accreditation status, fiscal viability, and programmatic compliance with state and Federal guidelines.
 - The framework draws heavily on existing indicators and publically available data.
 - The framework and goals system, at least v1.0, is statutorily required to be implemented by June 30, 2015 and updated annually.
 - Make **Technical Assistance Teams** (called Partnership Resource Teams, or PRTs) available to institutions that express interest in receiving assistance.
 - A short Letter of Interest (LOI) is submitted by the institution's CEO.
 - The team visits each institution that has submitted an LOI at least three times, for initial clarification of issues, development of strategies and timelines, and follow up. Additional follow up visits are available as needed.
 - Team members are drawn from a pool of experts nominated through or appointed by statewide professional organizations, the Chancellor's Office, and others. Team composition for each institution is approved by the applicable CEO and CCCCCO.
 - Team members receive travel reimbursement, and stipends if they are able to receive them based on their employer's policy and/or agreements.
 - **Grants of up to \$150,000** in seed money are available to institutions that receive team visits, to accelerate implementation of improvement plans, called Innovation and Effectiveness Plans. Grants will be available while funds are available.

- Selection of institutions to receive PRT visits considers institutional need.
- Colleges, districts, or centers may submit LOIs, and may receive PRT visits and request seed-money grants.
- Enhance **professional development opportunities** for colleges and districts related to institutional effectiveness.
 - An online clearinghouse now being developed will include both effective practices and pitfalls to avoid related to accreditation and audit issues, as well as other topics related to institutional effectiveness:
 - The online clearinghouse will be closely integrated with the Success Center for California Community Colleges' efforts.
 - Existing resources addressing the topics, such as those found on the ASCCC, ACCJC, RP Group, and CCCCO websites, will be linked to this clearinghouse.
 - Additional online resources will be developed as needed.
 - Regional workshops offered in the north and south supplement the online clearinghouse. These workshops are captured and made available online through the clearinghouse as well.
 - Workshops began in Spring 2015.
 - The IEPI Advisory Committee will continue to help identify topics that are timely and of broad interest.
 - The Initiative seeks to partner with other organizations in offering these workshops.
 - Professional development opportunities are available to all colleges/districts regardless of participation with Partnership Resource Teams.

Who Are the Initiative Partners?

- **Chancellor's Office:** Chancellor's Office Oversight: Erik Skinner, Theresa Tena, Jeff Spano, and Ronnie Slimp
- **Success Center for California Community Colleges:** Paul Steenhausen
- **College of the Canyons:** Overall Coordination: Chancellor Dianne Van Hook, Barry Gribbons, Jerry Buckley, Sharlene Coleal, and Daylene Meuschke
- **Foothill College:** Leadership in Partnership Resource Team training, in coordination with the Project Director
- **Academic Senate for CCC:** Julie Bruno
- **M. C. Lee Consulting:** Grant Program coordination
- **RP Group:** Evaluation and Professional Development working with 3CSN, Career Ladders, and others

How can you get involved?

- Volunteer for the Advisory Committee as openings occur.
 - The Advisory Committee includes 50 leaders statewide.
 - Members are nominated through the CEOs, CCCT, CIOs, ACBO, CSSOs, RP Group, and other statewide organizations.
 - Faculty are appointed by ASCCC.
 - The Advisory Committee meets every month, with each meeting encompassing both general sessions and workgroup sessions.
 - The existing workgroups include:
 - Indicators
 - Technical Assistance Process
 - Professional Development
 - Policy, Procedure, and Practice
 - Travel costs are reimbursed.
- Express interest in Partnership Resource Team assistance.
 - Letters of Interest from college district, and center CEOs have been invited and are reviewed on an ongoing basis.
 - Colleges, districts, and centers may submit a letter of interest at any time (see below).
 - Visits began in Spring 2015.
- Send us feedback.
 - If you have any ideas for issues on which professional development should focus (such as integrated planning, SLO assessment, Enrollment Management, Board Governance, etc.), please send them to us.
 - Send us any ideas for integration with other efforts or any other services you would like to see us provide. You can reach Barry Gribbons at barry.gribbons@canyons.edu or (661) 362-5500, Matthew Lee at matthew@mcleeconsulting.com or (626) 797-3372, and Theresa Tena at ttena@cccoco.edu or (916) 327-5887.

Additional Questions: Partnership Resource Teams/Technical Assistance

How can I express interest in receiving Technical Assistance?

A college, district, or center CEO can send a short Letter of Interest for a Partnership Resource Team to provide technical assistance. The format is on the IEPI website: www.canyons.edu/IEPI. If you are interested in receiving technical assistance through a PRT, let your CEO know and indicate the area(s) in which you are interested.

What is the process for selecting and scheduling Partnership Resource Team visits?

We expect to be able to make Partnership Resource Teams available to all California Community Colleges at some point in the next five years, should they express interest in receiving them.

- We schedule the visits based on institutional need and readiness.

- The evaluation of need and readiness draws primarily on information on areas of focus provided by the institutions in their Letters of Interest, indicators, and the timing of accreditation visits.
- A member of the Executive Committee also might call the college, district, or center CEO for additional clarification to ensure that we're not missing any important issues.

After this initial review, institutions may be asked to provide a one- or two-page status report on the areas of focus that is somewhat more detailed than the LOI, to help determine scheduling and prepare for the initial visit. If the areas of focus include issues that fall within the purview of the 10+1 Faculty Academic and Professional Matters, the local academic senate will work with the CEO in producing the short status report and sign off on it before submission to the IEPI Executive Committee. The IEPI Executive Committee develops a recommendation for the rosters of Partnership Resource Teams for approval by the Chancellor's Office and the local CEO.

What role does the college receiving the visit have in selecting team members?

The IEPI Executive Committee puts together teams based on the expertise of individuals and the needs of the institution. Team composition is driven by the needs of the institution and not by representation of associations/organizations/Chancellor's Office. The initial team composition is reviewed with the CEO to ensure that there are no unintended conflicts with team assignments. The CEO should check with faculty and administrative leaders to help ensure that conflicts of interest are avoided.

How do we get our seed money, and what can we use it for?

Your Innovation and Effectiveness Plan, which you will develop with the assistance of your Partnership Resource Team, should include a list of any additional resources (with dollar amounts) you need to begin implementing the plan. That list will function as your request for seed money, which you can use for any objective included in your Plan. IEPI staff will process the request as quickly as possible to expedite your receipt of the funds.

How will IEPI work with other organizations (ASCCC, RP Group, CCLC) that have mechanisms in place to provide colleges with technical assistance to ensure consistency of information and responses to issues?

IEPI will include technical assistance from statewide organizations and work to complement the technical assistance already available. IEPI brings additional resources to fund technical assistance visits as well as seed grants to fund improvement efforts.

How is the Partnership Resource Team assistance different from what is provided by consultants?

First and foremost, the Initiative is funded to bring resources to local institutions. Those identified as needing assistance will not have to pay for the technical assistance provided by IEPI. In addition to cost differences, IEPI draws heavily on community college personnel with the required expertise and familiarity with the system to assist colleges, districts and centers. Using this broad array of knowledge and skills, IEPI will provide

technical assistance on an enormous variety of issues, since Institutional Effectiveness is broad and covers just about any topic one could imagine.

What can institutions expect from the Partnership Resource Teams providing technical assistance?

Institutions can expect teams to work to understand the issues, help the institution develop solutions, and help the institution implement solutions in a professional manner focused on continuous improvement. The teams will not simply meet with each institution once, deliver a report on what it should do, and walk away. Rather, the teams will be responsible for working with the institutions and providing support to them as they develop their capacity and improve.

What other IEPI support will be available to colleges/districts/centers who utilize a Partnership Resource Team?

IEPI is planning to make available to colleges/districts/centers who utilize a Partnership Resource Team the ability to participate in a “community of practice.” Inclusion in the cohort is determined by when the initial PRT visit occurred – Fall or Spring. This opportunity is voluntary. This community of practice will promote sharing ideas across institutions and provide dedicated planning time, led by experts, for each institution to create a more thorough and robust action plan to increase institutional effectiveness. Each institution in the cohort will send a “leadership team” to revisit the IEPI Innovation and Effectiveness Plan or undertake another strategic planning activity in a facilitated two-day experience offsite. This academy/institute will typically occur three months to one year after the third PRT visit.

What does IEPI request from each institution that has received PRT visits?

IEPI asks each institution visited to “report out” their lessons learned at statewide venues, such as the RP Group Student Success Conference; Academic Senate Plenary; CCLC Annual Conference; and the ACCCA Conference. All necessary registration and travel expenses will be reimbursed by IEPI.

Will IEPI provide Partnership Resource Teams to districts and centers?

The IEPI was initially set up to serve individual colleges, but we recognize that some multi-college districts are interested in participating. Certainly, district-level participation in regional workshops and in goal-setting for the indicators related to fiscal stability and state and Federal programmatic compliance is encouraged. We have also set up processes for Partnership Resource Teams to serve multi-college districts whose CEOs have submitted district-level Letters of Interest. Each such district that receives PRT services may also request up to \$150,000 in seed money to expedite implementation of its own Innovation and Effectiveness Plan. Our intent is to complement PRTs that are being sent to colleges, while addressing the unique needs of multi-college districts, as we work to advance institutional effectiveness and student success.

Centers, too, may submit LOIs, receive PRT visits, and request seed-money grants to expedite implementation of their Innovation and Effectiveness Plans.

If my institution is having compliance issues, why would/should we contact the IEPI for assistance?

The IEPI will assist local institutions in advancing their institutional effectiveness, which could include accreditation or audit issues. This will be an opportunity to identify the most efficient and effective path for coming into sustainable compliance, and implement model practices before sanctions might otherwise be imposed. Given the goals of the initiative, IEPI will treat information collected through the initiative with sensitivity. However, institutions can also address compliance issues on their own.

How do I volunteer to serve on a Partnership Resource Team?

At least twice each year, the statewide Academic Senate issues a call for faculty volunteers. At the same time, IEPI sends out a call for non-faculty volunteers through the statewide associations/organizations represented on the Advisory Committee, through the Chancellor's Office, and through the IEPI listserv. In all cases, volunteers are asked to complete a brief online survey of their areas of expertise. If you would like to serve on a PRT, then complete the survey applicable to you. You must complete the whole survey to be added to the provisional PRT pool.

- Current non-faculty survey:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/IEPI-PRT-ExpertiseInventory2015-2>
- Current faculty survey:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Faculty_PRT_team_survey

The Academic Senate consults with local Senate presidents before moving volunteers to the approved pool and transferring the data to IEPI. The IEPI Project Director consults with each non-faculty volunteer's home CEO or designee to ensure that he or she has no concerns about the volunteer's service before moving each volunteer to the approved pool.

If you have already completed the survey within the past year, there is no need for you to do so again, unless your contact information, position, or areas of expertise have changed.

Tentative PRTs for specific institutions are drawn from the combined approved pool based on a careful match between the institution's needs and the volunteers' areas of expertise. Each final PRT is approved by the IEPI Executive Committee, the CCCCCO, and the receiving institution's CEO. If you are selected for a PRT, the IEPI Project Director will notify you by email at the address you submitted in the survey, to provide the necessary paperwork, arrange training, and begin the process of scheduling the initial visit to fit both team members' schedules and the receiving institution's preferred date options. (Part of that paperwork is a Participation Certification Form, which must be signed by the appropriate local administrator authorizing your service on a specific PRT, and then submitted to IEPI well before the initial visit.)

Experts who have already participated on PRTs report that it has been a rewarding and useful experience, and the need is great, so we encourage you to volunteer!

Additional Questions: Professional Development

What professional development workshops will be scheduled?

We expect to offer a minimum of two regional workshops in the north and two in the south each semester. College of the Canyons coordinates the workshops. The IEPI Advisory Committee identifies topics for the workshops that are timely and have broad interest. We are also interested in coordinating and possibly co-presenting workshops with other statewide organizations. The first six workshops were offered in March 2015 and included information about the Initiative, indicators, and local goal-setting for the indicators.

How does IEPI work with other initiatives in providing professional development?

Several initiatives are providing professional development. Specifically, the Success Center is developing an online clearinghouse of resources. Rather than duplicating efforts, IEPI works closely with the Success Center and will contribute to its online clearinghouse. Also, IEPI will actively reach out to other statewide organizations to develop partnerships in providing workshops, and ideally co-present workshops with other organizations, supporting their efforts rather than competing with them.

Additional Questions: Framework of Indicators

What areas are included in the statutory requirements for the indicators?

Education Code Section 84754.6 requires a framework of indicators focused on: student performance and outcomes, accreditation status, fiscal viability, and programmatic compliance with state and Federal guidelines. The IEPI Advisory Committee has made recommendations for specific measures for each of these areas. Colleges or districts also are required to adopt goals for 2015-16 for indicators in each of the areas listed above. The framework of indicators and college or district goals must be completed and posted by the Chancellor's Office by June 30, 2015. Colleges or districts may set longer-term goals for the same indicators if they wish.

Given timing constraints and the need to use a collegial consultation process, additional details on the requirements were developed with consultation from the Advisory Committee. The details were made available through the six regional workshops held in March in several parts of the state.

What is the purpose of the new framework of indicators structure?

While the indicators are useful in helping to determine the scheduling of Partnership Resource Team technical assistance visits, even more importantly, we hope that the college/district finds the information useful in gauging their progress for internal planning purposes. We expect that the evaluation of the indicators will increase their utility for both purposes.

Does the new indicator system just add another layer on top of several existing indicator systems?

The framework of indicators relies heavily on existing indicators for the first iteration in the first year, to help ensure consistency across systems and minimize the impact on colleges/districts. The IEPI Executive Committee has also asked the Advisory Committee Workgroup to continue to work on recommendations for refining the existing indicators and develop new indicators, especially leading indicators that can help advance colleges' and districts' efforts to improve institutional effectiveness in coordination with other efforts such as the Scorecard. Operational definitions for all the indicators in year one of the goals framework are on the Indicators Portal.

How does IEPI help colleges/districts respond to the new indicator system?

As noted above, the indicators rely on existing data, and the Chancellor's Office has provided access to the baseline data for each college and district. IEPI offered regional workshops in March 2015 to share with colleges/districts the indicators and answer questions. One of these regional workshops is also available online at www.canyons.edu/iepi.

How does IEPI ensure that leading indicators are used?

The initial indicator system draws on current indicators that are responsive to change in a relatively short amount of time, in addition to indicators that reflect longer-term outcomes. For future versions, the IEPI Advisory Committee will work with other groups to develop additional leading indicators for the indicator system.

What is the timeline for developing the indicators and goals?

Per statute, each college is required to adopt a framework of indicators and colleges/districts must set goals for indicators in four specific areas, which we do not expect the Legislature to change:

- student performance and outcomes (student achievement),
- accreditation status,
- fiscal viability, and
- programmatic compliance with state and Federal guidelines

College/district goals must be posted on the Chancellor's Office web site by June 30, 2015. In response to these requirements, the Advisory Committee developed a set of indicators in February, which were reviewed by Consultation Council in February and approved by the Board of Governors on March 16, 2015. The Chancellor's Office posted baseline data on an online Indicators Portal in March, and provided login access for goal setting to the districts in mid-April. Details on the requirements for colleges/districts were presented at the regional workshops in March. One of the workshops also is available online at www.canyons.edu/iepi.

The Indicators Portal is located at <https://misweb.cccco.edu/ie>. This portal contains baseline data, and colleges will use it to certify their adoption of the goals framework and to set their goals. Access to the goal-setting portion of the portal is limited to those who have passcode permission to enter information; the baseline information is available to the public.

Where can I obtain my college/district's username and password?

Your college/district's login information was initially sent from the CCCCCO to each district's Chief Information Systems Officer. Per your locally developed goal-setting process, the login information was shared with those responsible for adopting the goals framework and college goals, and for completing the Indicators Portal certification page.

We have specific questions about the goal-setting process; where can we find answers?

The Institutional Effectiveness Division's Indicators Portal website has four tabs at the top of each web page, and each of these tabs offers selected definitions to help clarify goal-setting for all four indicator areas.

Do goals for the indicators have to be "aspirational" or can a college set a minimum baseline?

Generally, goals should be aspirational, or higher than baseline data. Statute specifically states that goals be "challenging" and "quantifiable." However, there could be instances in which the college already exceeds a desired standard, such as exceeding a desired fund reserve level. In this instance, it would be reasonable to set targets that are not higher than current levels. In addition to the goals being challenging or aspirational, they also should be realistic, measurable and attainable.

What happens if a college/district does not achieve their goal? Will sanctions be imposed?

Sanctions will not be imposed if the college/district does not achieve their goal, provided that the college/district has tried to implement changes and measured their effectiveness. We want to encourage colleges/districts to try new things and recognize that not every effort will have the desired results. In fact, the most important changes arguably are the ones with the greatest risk and will require the colleges/district to stretch the most.

What process do colleges have to use to set their goals? Do they have to be board-approved or may they be submitted as information items? Does the college or district have to involve constituent groups, such as the local academic senate?

The goals must be adopted by the college/district. The process the college/district uses to adopt the goals should be locally determined. This includes whether or not the goals are approved by the district's board of trustees. However, each college/district should ensure that constituent groups (e.g., local academic senates, classified staff, and students) are engaged in the process consistent with the local collegial consultation processes. Ideally, setting goals on the indicators should be integrated with the college's existing planning processes.

Should the goals for fiscal stability indicators and state and Federal programmatic compliance be set by the district or by the college?

Since many of the indicators of fiscal stability and state and Federal programmatic compliance reflect district-level information, colleges in some multi-college districts might decide to have their districts set the goals for these measures, which each college would then enter into the Indicators Portal. However, we recognize that each of the 72

community college districts is unique, and will need to use the specific goal-setting processes that make sense to the district and its college(s).

How does the framework of indicators interact with the state postsecondary education goals and California Community Colleges System Goals?

California statute (ECS 84754.6) requires system- and college-set goals aligned to the state higher education goals passed in 2013, which include, among other things, improved access and success, greater completion rates by all students, and improved outcomes for graduates. In addition, in July 2014, the Board of Governors approved a set of System Goals aligned with student success, equity, student services, efficiency, and access. The framework of indicators within which colleges set goals is required to include some measures different from those set by the Board of Governors, but there are important overlaps between the two sets in the area of completion rates. The entire system could be viewed as a pyramid, with college programs and operational activities as the foundation, the framework of indicators at the next level, and the Board of Governors System Goals – measured in part via the Scorecard – at the top of the pyramid. For the college indicators and goals to inform and even drive the system goals, there will need to be further development of system goals to increase the alignment at the various levels.



**Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative
Partnership Resource Teams
Summary of Initial Observations**
Date:



Name of Institution:
Partnership Resource Team Members:

| Area of Focus | Institution's Point Person or Group | Institutional Activities Underway | Ideas Discussed with the Institution during the Visit | Other IEPI Resources Needed? |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| A. | | 1. 2. | a. b. | • • |
| B. | | 1. 2. | a. b. | • • |
| C. | | 1. 2. | a. b. | • • |
| D. | | 1. 2. | a. b. | • • |
| E. | | 1. 2. | a. b. | • • |



Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Typical Process for Partnership Resource Team (PRT) Visits

(For distribution to client-institution participants in the initial PRT visit; revised December 11, 2015)

General Notes

- Training is provided for all PRT members before they commence service.
- The Project Director and IEPI Program Specialist do the initial work with the institutional CEO, point person, and PRT members on scheduling each visit and on other logistics. However, after these contacts in the early part of the process, in most cases the PRT Lead assumes primary responsibility for working with the point person and CEO to finalize the meeting schedule and other arrangements.
- The main responsibilities of the PRT Lead include communicating as needed with the CEO.
- The PRT Lead has at least one substantial phone conversation or meeting with the CEO before each visit, in part to ensure mutual understanding of the purposes of and expectations for the visit. For example, it's important to clarify with the CEO that visit 1 is designed to gather information and to determine the scope of PRT assistance needed, not to provide immediate conclusions or recommendations for action.
- After each visit, both PRT members and the institutional participants are asked to evaluate the visit.

Preparation for Visit 1

- In their initial conversation, the CEO and the PRT Lead discuss the importance of informing the institutional community, and especially the participants in visit meetings, about the nature and purposes of the PRT visit, and about the information that participants will be asked to provide in those meetings. They also discuss ensuring sufficient functional and constituency representation in the meetings.
- The IEPI Project Director requests from the institution a somewhat more detailed (but still concise) treatment of the Areas of Focus, which the CEO will prepare in consultation with applicable institutional leadership.
- The PRT reviews the following documentation, in addition to the Letter of Interest and the Areas of Focus treatment:
 - IEPI and accreditation status documentation
 - Any additional documentation regarded by the institution as crucial to understanding the Areas of Focus
 - Other documentation available on the institutional website, or provided by the institution at the team's request, that is directly related to the Areas of Focus
- The PRT reviews the list of individuals and groups the institution has suggested for interviews/meetings; identifies any additional interviews or meetings that are needed to gain a fuller understanding of the institution's needs, and decides who on the PRT should meet with whom. Some interviews/meetings might work best with one PRT member; others might require two or more members, or even the whole team.
- The initial visit day typically starts at 8:00 or 8:30, and includes short breaks between meetings (to the extent that any formal committee meetings have such flexibility), a 45-to-60-minute lunch break, an afternoon wrap-up meeting for the team, and time for an oral summary of initial observations to the CEO (and others at the CEO's discretion), all by the target finish time of 4:30 or 5:00. The PRT Lead works with the institutional point person to finalize the schedule for the day.

Visit 1: Gathering Information and Establishing Scope

- The PRT holds interviews and meetings with the individuals and groups applicable to the Areas of Focus, and asks questions the team has identified for each interview or meeting, with follow-up questions as appropriate.
- The PRT analyzes the information gathered in the interviews and meetings.
- The PRT meets as a team to share preliminary observations about the institution's Areas of Focus, what the institution has already done or plans to do about them, and what additional IEPI resources, if any, would help the institution make progress.
- Based on the team's discussion, the PRT prepares and presents a brief oral summary of initial observations.

Follow-Up to Visit 1

- If the CEO has requested a written Summary of Initial Observations, the PRT prepares and submits it within two weeks of the visit, if at all possible. The Summary is primarily a list of ideas discussed with institutional personnel during the visit, along with a list of activities that the institution has already undertaken to address its Areas of Focus, if any. It ordinarily does not contain findings, conclusions, suggestions, recommendations, or prescriptions.
- The PRT Lead forwards the request for any additional documentation to the institutional point person.

Preparation for Visit 2

- Very soon after the initial visit, the PRT Lead works with the CEO and point person to identify the date for the second visit. The second visit should take place as soon after the first visit as schedules permit, consistent with development and timely delivery of the List of Primary Successes and Menu of Options as described below.

- The CEO designates a specific group to draft the Innovation and Effectiveness Plan (the I&EP Group) with the guidance of the PRT during the second visit. The group may be ad hoc or existing, and if necessary, the CEO may designate two or even three groups, each of which is to draft one section of the Plan.
- Based on the documentation review, interviews, meetings, and further discussions, the PRT creates a List of Primary Successes and Menu of Options for institutional consideration in developing its Innovation and Effectiveness Plan. The Menu consists of ideas for improvement and/or best practices in each Area of Focus. At least a week before the second visit, the PRT Lead sends this document to the CEO.

Visit 2: Helping the Institution Develop Its Innovation and Effectiveness Plan

- The PRT meets with the CEO (and others that he or she might wish to include) to gather information on any progress that has occurred since the first visit.
- The PRT meets with the I&EP Group, discusses the List of Primary Successes and Menu of Options, introduces the Innovation and Effectiveness Plan template as a useful model for structuring the Plan, and assists the I&EP Group as they draft the Innovation and Effectiveness Plan over the course of the visit, providing constructive, colleague-to-colleague advice, commentary, and feedback as needed.
 - The components of the Plan should at some point be integrated into the institution's existing planning processes and products, but the template is an important transitional repository for objectives, associated planning elements, and, assuming the institution wishes to request a seed-money grant to expedite implementation of the Plan, the Request for IEPI Resources, which is required to obtain that grant (see below).
 - If the I&EP Group does not finish an approved draft Plan during the visit (which is likely), the PRT Lead makes arrangements for its chair or the CEO to email the draft in Word to the PRT Lead and Project Director for feedback as soon as it is complete.

Follow-Up to Visit 2

- The PRT and Project Director provide constructive and timely written feedback on the draft of the Innovation and Effectiveness Plan. The Project Director forwards the final version of the feedback to the CEO. The CEO then incorporates the feedback as he or she sees fit, and emails the final Plan to the Project Director, with a copy to the Lead for distribution to the PRT.
- Upon receipt of the final Plan, assuming that it includes a request for IEPI resources to expedite implementation of the Plan, the Project Director forwards to the CEO the application and agreement forms for a seed-money grant of up to \$150,000. Ordinarily, processing the application and agreement and issuing the check will take about 30 days.

Preparation for Visit 3 and Any Subsequent Visits

- Immediately after completion of the final Innovation and Effectiveness Plan, the PRT Lead works with the CEO and point person to identify the date for the third visit, which should take place no more than three months later, if schedules permit.
- The Project Director asks the institutional point person to provide a status report on implementation of the Innovation and Effectiveness Plan at least two weeks before the visit, and distributes it to the PRT.
- The PRT reads the final version of the institution's Innovation and Effectiveness Plan, along with the latest status report, and assesses overall progress on the Plan.

Visit 3 and Any Subsequent Visits: Following Up

- The PRT meets with the CEO (and others that he or she might wish to include) to discuss her or his perspective on progress to date, and then shares any positive comments or questions that the initial discussion has not already covered.
- The PRT meets with the I&EP Group or its successor(s) to discuss their perspective on progress to date; shares any positive comments or questions that the initial discussion has not already covered; provides constructive advice, commentary, and feedback, including ideas or suggestions to improve implementation of the Plan, as needed; and discusses whether an additional visit would be helpful to the institution.
- Upon request, the PRT meets once more with the CEO to answer any questions and, if requested, provide an oral summary of ideas or suggestions to improve implementation of the Plan. The CEO may also request a written version of that summary.

Wrap-Up and Evaluation

- If the CEO has requested a written summary of ideas or suggestions to improve implementation of the Plan, the PRT drafts it based on the team's final discussions, and the PRT Lead forwards the final version of the summary to the CEO.
- The Project Director asks the CEO to provide a description of any PRT-related improvements in institutional structures or processes that have proven especially successful, for possible posting in the Professional Learning Network (<http://prolearningnetwork.cccco.edu/>) or sharing in other venues.

IEPI Contacts

Matthew C. Lee, Ph.D., IEPI Project Director: matthew@mcleeconsulting.com

Catherine Johnson, IEPI Program Specialist II: catherine.johnson@canyons.edu

From: Matthew C. Lee [<mailto:matthew@mcleeconsulting.com>]

Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 10:03 AM

To: Susan Sperling; Deborah Ikeda; Cynthia Azari; Victor Jaime; Baron, Bruce; Melinda Nish; Robert Sprague

Subject: Your Spring 2016 IEPI PRT Initial Visit: First Steps

Importance: High

Dear Susan, Deborah, Cynthia, Victor, Bruce, Melinda, and Bob,

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Executive Committee has approved each of your institutions for visits by a Partnership Resource Team (PRT) beginning in Spring. I'm delighted to know that you will be joining in this statewide effort to improve our effectiveness!

With that approval, it's time to begin preparations for the initial visit. So I would like to schedule a 45-minute phone conversation with each of you to kick off those preparations. Here are the topics I would like to cover in that conversation:

- Please identify three or more date options for your initial visit. Prime time for the initial and second visits is expected to run from February 29 through May 10, 2016 (excluding the week of March 7-11, during which ACCJC accreditation visits will occur), depending on the institutions' preferences and the PRT members' availability. A couple of you might wish to coordinate these date options with other colleges in your district that will be receiving PRT visits during the same term.
- If you have identified any additional Areas of Focus since submitting your LOI, what are they?
- I am now matching the Areas of Focus you identified in your Letter of Interest (LOI) with the areas of expertise of a number of Partnership Resource Team volunteers. I will share my preliminary list with you during our phone call, and check to see whether you have any concerns about any of the proposed team members. (We will likely have to modify this list, depending on other approvals and scheduling, but I will certainly give you the opportunity to raise any concerns about additional members as soon as we have those names.)
- Please designate one logistical point person, who will help with scheduling meetings, providing documents, supplying parking permits and local travel suggestions, and so on; and one substantive point person, who will help get the word out about the visit, field questions about the PRT process, and so on.
- I will also ask you to begin thinking about a few other matters:
 - The list of people and groups with whom the PRT should meet during the visit. We suggest at least the following:
 - You and your executive leadership. We suggest that the PRT's first meeting of the day and last meeting of the day should be with you.
 - The Academic Senate President, and other constituency leadership as appropriate
 - Additional managers, faculty, staff, and/or committees specifically related to your Areas of Focus, as needed to provide functional and constituency representation sufficient for a successful visit
 - Your preferences regarding the PRT's summary of its initial observations: An oral summary at the end of the day, a written summary delivered about two weeks later, or both. Most CEOs so far have chosen to receive both.
 - In a separate email, I will be requesting a treatment of your Areas of Focus that is somewhat more detailed than the LOI, but still concise (up to about two pages). This treatment might include, for example, the following elements for each Area of Focus:

- A more precise definition of the institution's needs with respect to the Area of Focus
- Status of any recent efforts to address the Area of Focus
- Specific questions that you want the PRT to consider as it helps the institution address the Area of Focus
- The URLs of any documentation that you regard as especially crucial to the PRT's understanding of the Area of Focus
- If the Areas of Focus include issues that fall within the purview of the 10+1 Faculty Academic and Professional Matters, I will ask you to work with your local Academic Senate President in developing this treatment, and obtain her or his signature or endorsement on it before submission. We encourage you to involve other members of your college community, too, in the development of the treatment as appropriate, and to share the original LOI and final treatment document with those with whom the PRT will be meeting during the initial visit.
- Informing the college community (at the very least, the folks who will be participating in meetings with the PRT—see below) ahead of time about the PRT's purposes and the nature of the initial visit is crucial to a successful experience. For example, the initial visit is designed for gathering information (to add to the documentation the PRT will already have reviewed) and determining the scope of the PRT services the college needs, through discussions with college personnel; the PRT will not arrive at firm conclusions or come up with immediate recommendations after only one day. We suggest that you consider involving your local PIO and other key communicators to help convey accurate information about the whole process.
- Finally, I will ask whether you have any questions, or need any other information.

I have attached three documents to help set our conversation in context; please review them before our phone meeting:

- The latest IEPI FAQs document
- The template that most teams use for the written Summary of Initial Observations that you may request
- A brief outline of the typical PRT process, including all three visits

Please ask your assistant to send me an email with two or three 45-minute time slots that would work for you within the next two weeks (not counting the holidays, of course!).

Thank you for sitting through this long email! I look forward to talking with you soon! And I wish you a wonderful, restful, joyous holiday!

Matthew

Matthew C. Lee, Ph.D.
 Special Projects Consultant for Higher Education
 Project Director, Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative
 V: 626-797-3372
 F: 626-794-6344
www.mcleconsulting.com



Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative
Partnership Resource Teams
Summary of Initial Visit
 Date of Visit: March 31, 2016



Name of Institution: San Bernardino Community College District

Partnership Resource Team Members: Hope EII, Carol Farrar, Diane Fiero, Stacy Fisher, Lori Gaskin, Susan Keith, Anu Khanna

| Area of Focus | Institution's Point Person or Group | Institutional Activities Underway | Ideas Discussed with the Institution during the Visit | Other IEPI Resources Needed? |
|--------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| A. Human Resources | Vice Chancellor, Human Resources; Human Resources staff | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since ACCJC visit they have hired a permanent Vice Chancellor of HR. 2. Reorganization/restructuring plan of Human Resources staff was developed within 1 month of Vice Chancellor arrival. Went from a staff of 5 to 11 employees. 3. Filled restructured vacant HR positions and additional positions listed in program review for a total of \$88,000. 4. Hired HR Director 5. Addition of a training specialist to the District office to address professional development needs; robust offerings cited. 6. Addition of a recruitment/diversity position to the District office 7. Hired an employee relations officer (Title IX, investigations, union issues) 8. Created a Human Resources Staffing Plan 9. Created personnel requisition process 10. Hold lunch and learns with HR staff 11. HR staff holds "HR huddles" every Monday morning 12. Established more field presence by having one HR generalist at Crafton and two at Valley | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. PD Director created a catalog of available trainings. Previously no PD for classified or Management. b. Recruitment/diversity position has created items to show the community what the District entails (two colleges, EDCT, KVCR TV station) c. Recruitment/diversity position attending more community events, including Chamber of Commerce, doing more outreach to secure better applicant pools. d. Created an EEO committee to work on EEO plan e. Search committees to participate in training before sitting on a search committee f. Working towards a better onboarding process and negotiating an online evaluation notification system g. Academic Senate expressed hope with the advances being made by HR. | |

| Area of Focus | Institution's Point Person or Group | Institutional Activities Underway | Ideas Discussed with the Institution during the Visit | Other IEPI Resources Needed? |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| B. Integrated Planning and Budgeting | Vice Chancellor of Business Services & Fiscal Services | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expanded membership on the District Budget Committee in order to get more representation and communication from constituents in the budgeting process 2. Use of data has improved at the colleges and at the district for an emerging culture of evidence 3. Established an Enrollment Management Committee which helps to feed information to the District Budget Committee and helps to better facilitate communication about and development of the resource allocation model that the district uses. 4. Each college has well defined program review and budgeting/planning processes. The colleges are trying to liaison with the District to understand District processes and where the colleges fit in. 5. Chancellor and Vice Chancellor creating and building more avenues to communicate budgeting process and allocations to constituents (e.g., Chancellor's Chat and quarterly newsletters and Chancellor's Extended Cabinet). | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Information not being shared; lack of clear communication b. Developing a vision for the district and the colleges and defining clearly the relationship of the colleges to the district and to other district entities (Economic Development and KVCR) c. Refining and broadly communicating District Program Review process – how is the District PR integrated with the college PR processes? d. Need to clearly articulate the purpose/mission of district governance bodies and their interrelationship with each other and with the college governance e. Aligning district RAM timeline with college planning needs f. Need for processes to be developed and adhered to when implemented (and clearly expressed to constituents). g. Need for transparency with decisions especially as they relate to budget and resource allocations. h. Decisions being implemented top-down without input from the constituent groups who are affected (e.g., international student program and Non-credit Basic Skills changes). i. Effort needed in relationship-building across divisions and across colleges and with the district. j. Concern expressed or intimated with regard to lack of leadership at the top level. | |

| Area of Focus | Institution's Point Person or Group | Institutional Activities Underway | Ideas Discussed with the Institution during the Visit | Other IEPI Resources Needed? |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|
| C. Board Roles | Chancellor Board of Trustees | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of process to review and revise Board policies and administrative procedures 2. New Board member orientation 3. Greater focus on communication across the district, transparency, and open and genuine dialog by District leadership and within committees and bodies. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification as to Board roles and responsibilities regarding policy function as opposed to oversight and input into operational matters. b. District processes which recognize and honor collegial consultation and participatory governance, particularly as it relates to the decision-making at the colleges and role of the Academic Senates. c. Strengthening the Board's appreciation for and commitment to the role of collegial consultation and participatory governance. d. Strengthening district processes so that (1) all entities of the district are held to the same standards; (2) such processes are well understood; and (3) such processes are aligned with and supportive of the colleges' institutionalized processes. e. Strengthening the role and voice of the colleges' CEOs in the leadership of the district. f. Ensuring a timely and mutually-agreeable process for the Board to evaluate the role of the District's Chief Executive Officer with respect to attaining institutional goals. g. Allotting time for the Board to dialog on and monitor institutional progress from a broad-based policy perspective while respecting operational decision-making. | |