

Committee Reporting Form
CCCCIO Representatives on Statewide Committees

Committee: Metrics Simplification Working Group	CCCCIO Rep: Jerry Buckley, Kim Hoffmans, and Brian Sanders
Meeting Date: March 23, 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/open?id=17dDn9y7LSE6Qsa0AL2Q5yq2QnLNhopGM>

I. Meeting Agenda Topics:

- 1) **Review of committee charge**
- 2) **Process Recap**
- 3) **Operating Principals**
 - a) Simplified metrics to replace scorecard, and IEPI
 - b) Focuses on a few key indicators; too many data points can be overwhelming
 - c) Simplification does not destroy current data sources or MIS processes which will provide additional sets of data for continuous quality improvement, research and evaluation.
 - d) Focused on student journey mapping from application to completion
 - e) Covering an array of student credit, noncredit, etc...
 - f) Intended to drive reporting for SEP, SSSP, BSI, SWP, AEBG,...
 - g) Does not replace, but tried to align with federal reports and accreditation requirements
 - h) Support the transformation of colleges and the and the system in a guided pathways framework
- 4) **Student Journey Metrics Mapping** (Three identified pathways)
 - 1) Award (degrees/certificates) and Transfer students- CCCO approved (70% of students)
 - 2) Adult Ed Basic, Secondary & ESL students (9% of students)
 - 3) Skills-Building and Short-term CTE students (credit and noncredit) (15% of students)
- 5) **Display of metrics**
 - a) Snap shot view , time bound
 - b) Cohort tract same students through a period of time
- 6) **Establish further clarity on Identified nine metrics** and small groups “deep dive” in to only a few per group, and large group report out to follow. Noncredit was omitted or difficult to capture in some of these metrics.
- 7) **Nine Identified Metrics:**
 - i) Student body reflected equitable access

- ii) Enrolled in college after application
- iii) Retained from fall to spring
- iv) Completed Foundational Coursework
- v) Momentum toward goal
- vi) Completed and/or transferred
- vii) Employed/Job related to field of study
- viii) Earning/Living wage
- ix) Earnings gained

II. Topics for CCCCIO consideration/discussion:

- Support nesting of certificates to show student progress through the journey. Avoid creating small certificates of no value.
- What type of metrics makes sense (snap shot or cohort view)? This is difficult to determine without knowing the specific data points and institutional goal being addressed.
- Once metrics are established, the CIOs need to be involved in conversations regarding the display dashboard.
- How would this be adopted across the initiatives (IEPI, SSSP, etc...)?

III. Top Three Takeaway Items:

1. Initial metric data suggested to be displayed at a high level with the ability to drill down as desired for institutional planning.
2. Concern with the development of certificates that are not valuable to students just to gain additional points related to funding.
3. The committee discussions have been captured but the ultimate decision is going to be made by the Chancellor.
4. Once the metrics have been set, the committee would like to be brought together again to better understand the rationale for the final metrics.