

IEPI - 5/15/15 Update to CIO Listserv

Indicator Workgroup -

Concerns from the field when setting goals with the indicators:

- the fund balance indicator goal setting created challenges for some districts.
- messaging needs to be better to communicate that the partnership work is to build a community of practice amongst the colleges to increase effectiveness and not just another accountability requirement.

Year 2 indicators:

- will keep the same as first year to lessen confusion and help the system with acclimating to this work.
- Indicators for Year 2:
 - Will adjust the course success indicator to align with the course success measure with the ACCJC's - will also disaggregate of data for the metric.
 - Accreditation indicator sanction categories need to match updated ACCJC's new levels
 - Colleges will need to do one additional achievement indicator. Colleges will get to either "fill in your own" achievement indicator (so we can collect information about what colleges are using as an indicator outside of what is used on the IEPI reporting tool) or use one of the optional indicators on the tool.
 - Make FTES indicator goal setting required.
 - Identify pilot colleges to use Version 2.0 indicators that will be implemented in Year 3.

Year 3 indicators:

Will try to implement more robust metrics like:

- progress in which students are moving through their SEP's
- enrollment in math during first year
- change the indicators from compliance indicators to indicators that will help to drive the system towards data usage that will facilitate inquiry and

Skills builder data will be available next year.

Timeline:

Year 2 indicator will go to BOG by November 2015. No change in reporting timeline.
Year 3 Version 2.0 draft of indicators to go to Academic Senate Plenary and CIO/CSSO Spring meeting in April 2016 for usage in 16-17.

Request for input:

As CIO's are there indicators that you would like me to propose for Version 2.0 - Year 3, 16-17?

We plan to unveil the the Version 2.0 that will be used in 16-17 in April 2016, will this give you enough time to incorporate into your campus planning processes/discussions for 16-17?

We will present the draft indicators in April to Academic Senate, CIO/CSSO, who else needs to see the Version 2.0 in draft form?

Go to this link to provide input:

Professional Development Workgroup

- More funding for the dissemination of best practices was included in the May revise, so the group discussed setting up online resources, including:
 - Design -- the model discussed was based on the Judicial Branch of California website
 - Taxonomy -- a small group volunteered to work on this
 - Decision to Include -- setting up criteria for "high impact"
 - Standardization -- using a template for projects featured on website
 - Funding -- leveraging student equity funds, etc.
 - The group also reviewed recent statewide workshops and others that are planned, especially more "Student Success (Re)defined" workshops in the fall and enrollment management workshops. Members discussed the perspectives needed for enrollment management to complement the sponsorship of ACBO. Another possibility for a fall workshop was dual/concurrent enrollment, timed to come after AB 288 passes.
 - Other suggestions for workshops next year were using learning outcomes; fiscal management; integrated planning; and data fluency. As PRT groups gain information, that should inform workshop choices.
- 