

Committee Reporting Form
CCCCIO Representatives on Statewide Committees

Committee: Metrics Simplification Working Group	CCCCIO Rep: Jerry Buckley, Kim Hoffmans, and Brian Sanders
Meeting Date: February 12, 2018	Meeting Location: Sacramento

Committee Charge:

The Committee charge is identify metrics that will replace the data points in existing public dashboards such as the Student Success Scorecard and the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Indicators Portal to aligned metrics with system goals.

Link to materials for meeting:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Tsn2-gr7yzNiRgPmuWBG9Qscp74x8cMD>

I. Meeting Agenda Topics:

- 1) Welcome and Introductions
- 2) Metrics Simplification Background & Overview
 - i) Restructure metrics from the students' perspective...
 - (1) Utilize new patterns
 - ii) White paper – page three – Target is to roll out new metrics by fall 2018
 - (1) Simplify the existing metrics and replace them with a reduced data set
 - (2) Incentive accountability
 - (3) Not connected to performance-based funding
 - (4) Focus is on student success
 - iii) Question regarding other systems of accountability in higher education?
 - (1) CSU dashboard
 - (2) CCCs are looking at more a process improvement and proactive approach
 - iv) Review of categories – Vision for Success
 - (1) Student progress
 - (2) Incentivize behavior – not just meeting a minimum
 - (3) System goals
 - (4) Limit the number of metrics?
 - (5) Data should originate from statewide systems – standardized access to information
- 3) Understanding Types of Metrics
 - a) Types of metrics
 - i) Input – High school vs returning students – Reflective of California's diversity
 - ii) Process – Student experience, college operations and institutional health
 - iii) Output – Progress and completion, skill attainment, licensure
 - b) Relationship and mapping to Guided Pathways concepts...
 - i) Metrics may evolve as focus shifts to address various equity gaps

- c) What metrics drive change within the student culture
 - i) Categorical funding – Use Nova to integrate and visualize investments and outcomes
- d) How have colleges reported various types of metrics?
 - i) Standard methods
 - ii) Internal discussion of specific practices
 - iii) IE reports defined by local metrics
 - iv) Noncredit success metric – “measurable skill gain”
 - v) “Consentivize” - Concern over a new business model in CCCs
 - vi) Accountability to ourselves and students, not necessarily the state
 - vii) Launchboard has been the first instrument that provides relevance to faculty – simplified data set will also be able to be disaggregated
- e) How have they supported local change?
 - i) What room exists to challenge existing assumptions in the metrics?
 - i) Too close to the work?
 - ii) Consensus on not stopping conversations in April – conversations must be iterative due to existing assumptions and underlying biases
- 1) Mapping Student Journeys
 - a) Who are our students? – Page 7
 - i) Noted race and other variables that impact outcomes across institutions
 - ii) Impact of childcare, transportation, and books – cost and equity issue
 - iii) Overall – a college’s preparedness for students?
 - b) Noncredit metrics –
 - c) a. Recent high school graduate
 - d) Returning student
 - e) Skills builder
 - f) Work group will propose metrics that can apply to this pathway, and others (b. and c. above)...
- 2) Recap and Next Steps

II. Topics for CCCCO consideration/discussion:

- The conversation from this group is to be proactive in determining accountability metrics before they are imposed.
- Metrics will be based on data points that come from statewide data systems, such as MIS, rather than being reported by colleges using supplemental systems. The goal is to increase the relevance of the current reporting system and decrease onerous additional reporting instruments. The concern for CIOs is that MIS data has flaws as well.
- These new metrics will *replace* not supplement the existing metrics for many initiatives. Many of these are legislatively mandated, so CCCCO reps will need to work with the legislature to establish permission for us to monitor our activities using the new, better, standardized metrics rather than the ones prescribed in existing legislation.
- One set of metrics comes from ACCJC. The goal at the meeting is to *work with* ACCJC as we develop new CCCCO metrics but not to try to impose the new metrics on ACCJC.
- One key idea: Student Equity would move from being a separate set of specific metrics to a standard practice across all metrics. Each metric developed will be drillable by

demographics to support equity-minded gap analysis.

III. Top Three Takeaway Items:

1. Three statewide webinars for other CIOs who are interested to attend. These will recap the discussions at the face-to-face sessions we attend in between.
 - a. February 26 at 10:00 am
 - b. March 26 at 10:00 am
 - c. April 30 at 10:00 am
2. We are buried in far too many metrics now. The charts on pages 5-17 of the attachment, “National and California Community College Metrics,” does a nice job of laying out the plethora of metrics we currently use. Objectively, it’s unworkable and having so many means we can’t really identify key issues to work to improve.
3. The workgroup was convened to gather input on metrics. However, the time was spent telling the story of the flaws in our existing system, from recruitment and registration to tracking students after graduation. It became clear that the Chancellor’s Office and WestEd have already developed the bulk of the proposed changes and will, hopefully, present those at the next face-to-face meeting of the Metrics Workgroup.