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Executive Summary

The California Community Colleges (CCC) support California’s diverse educational needs by providing over 2 million students each year with preparation for collegiate degree programs; career technical education and workforce training; adult education, apprenticeships, and English as a Second Language courses; and lifelong learning opportunities.

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is a collaborative effort within the CCC to advance the colleges’ success by improving fiscal viability, reducing accreditation sanctions and audit issues, boosting student performance and outcomes, and increasing programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines. As part of this effort, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) and its partners offer specialized training activities for community college faculty, staff, and administrators.

To support state leadership in understanding the progress of IEPI, this report provides an analysis of IEPI professional development activities, focusing on:

- the interest, use, and usefulness of IEPI professional development activities;
- the extent to which professional development activities support legislatively-mandated statewide goals;
- how IEPI professional development supports colleges’ action planning;
- opportunities to build on IEPI strengths; and
- our evaluation plan looking forward.

This report includes analyses of:

- professional development workshops held from Summer 2016 through Summer 2017; and
- the Professional Learning Network (PLN) since its launch in April 2016.

KEY FINDINGS

Professional Development Offerings Are Widely Used, Interest Remains High

During the 2016-2017 fiscal year, IEPI held 32 workshops covering 12 topics with 2,955 people attending. Attendees came from all 114 of the state’s community colleges. IEPI workshops were in high demand; 41 percent of them experienced enrollment at 90 percent or more of capacity, and, on average, workshop enrollment reached 77 percent of capacity.

Likewise, the online PLN grew rapidly over the past year. For its 8,700 registered users from all 114 colleges, the PLN today includes access to online learning courses through Lynda.com, Grovo, and Skillsoft; over 200 online resources submitted by PLN users that tend to target faculty and address career technical education (CTE) and economic development; a systemwide calendar of events, trainings, and meetings; and IEPI-developed Applied Solution Kits (ASKs) on data disaggregation and integrated planning.
Surveys administered after each 2016-17 workshop showed that interest in future use of IEPI professional development resources is high, and this interest is largely consistent across job functions.

Quality of Workshops Has Increased
Attendees’ ratings for the quality of the presenters and the quality of the delivery of the workshops have risen since the first workshop evaluated by EdInsights, suggesting that IEPI leadership is effectively using evaluation data and other feedback to constantly improve workshop offerings. Ratings for these two aspects of the workshops have gone from “met expectations” to “better than expected.”

Professional Development Activities Primarily Support Student Outcomes Goal
During the past year, workshop providers primarily offered content targeted to the statewide goal of boosting student performance and outcomes followed by increasing programmatic compliance, and respondents indicated they found the content useful for supporting the targeted areas. Providers infrequently emphasized the goal of reducing accreditation sanctions and audit issues, and they targeted improving fiscal viability the least.

Likewise, on the PLN, user-submitted resources, such as a description of the California Guided Pathways Project and a guide for faculty and staff that discusses how Rio Honda College helps students in distress, often focused on student performance and outcomes and infrequently on the other three statewide IEPI goals.

Professional Development Expected to Yield Better Institutional Processes, Improved Student Outcomes
Many survey respondents anticipated creating more effective institutional processes, including improved compliance with financial aid rules and requirements, more accurate and consistent transcript evaluation, stronger collaboration around the development of pathways and dual enrollment programs, enhanced institutional planning and decision-making for IEPI indicators, and better fiscal accountability.

They also predicted direct improvements to student outcomes—higher enrollment, retention, and graduation rates—and better career and community outcomes as a result of the development of pathways, dual enrollment, basic skills, and financial well-being programs, among others.

These expected impacts aligned well with IEPI goals related to boosting student outcomes, better compliance, improved fiscal viability, and reduced accreditation sanctions and audits.

Colleges Seek Support for Campus Implementation
The most common challenge that survey respondents anticipated, and asked additional guidance about from IEPI, was gaining support at their colleges for change. They cited issues such as developing collaborative relationships, engaging various stakeholders, and overcoming
resistance to doing things differently. Funding constraints, expressed in terms of time, staffing, bandwidth, initiative fatigue, and other resource needs, also were among their top concerns.

**KEY RECOMMENDATIONS**

This report contains recommendations for how IEPI can build on its proven strengths to achieve even greater impact in the future. They include:

- **Designing and evaluating for outcomes** by ensuring that professional development activities support all IEPI goals and by developing a theory of action for long-term sustainable change.

- **Engaging and serving stakeholders** differently by strengthening IEPI’s governance and communications structures.

- **Supporting campus implementation efforts in targeted programmatic and functional areas** by disseminating case studies, providing continuing online and in-person professional development focused on advancing campus implementation efforts, helping campuses streamline systems and processes to create efficiencies, and helping campus leadership manage change, particularly resistance to change.

- **Building a cohesive, collaborative, professional development ecosystem** by linking professional development resources within the initiative and by ensuring that IEPI content is also integrated with non-IEPI professional development activities and resources as part of an interconnected and mutually supporting system.
Overview

The California Community Colleges (CCC) support California’s diverse educational needs by providing over 2 million students each year with preparation for collegiate degree programs; career technical education (CTE) and workforce training; adult education, apprenticeships, and English as a Second Language courses; and lifelong learning opportunities.

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is a collaborative effort within the CCC to advance the colleges’ success by improving fiscal viability, reducing accreditation sanctions and audit issues, boosting student performance and outcomes, and increasing programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines. As part of this effort, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) and its partners offer specialized training activities for community college faculty, staff, and administrators.

Through IEPI, the CCCCCO and its partners provide peer-based technical support through Partnership Resource Teams (PRTs), a menu of professional development workshops, and the Professional Learning Network (PLN), which offers online resources for CCC faculty, staff, and administrators. The Education Insights Center (EdInsights) is evaluating IEPI’s professional development workshops and the PLN. EdInsights, formerly the Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy (IHELP), is a research and policy center at California State University, Sacramento, that is devoted to student success, particularly for underserved populations, in K-12 and broad-access public postsecondary education.

IEPI leadership has effectively launched a broad array of both online and in-person professional development activities. It continues to expand its audience for these activities and to improve its approaches to delivering them based on feedback from users. Leaders also are engaged in an ongoing venture to integrate their endeavors both within IEPI and in partnership with other professional development efforts in the CCC system.

Yet, achieving improvements at the scale envisioned by the IEPI mandate requires a systemic approach at the college level that can be sustained over time. At this stage of development, IEPI leadership could benefit from more explicitly defining its overall theory of action and doing so in concert with its partners and stakeholders. These questions can guide such a vital step:

- How will the various activities and resources under development help IEPI achieve coordinated, system change at the college on its desired outcomes?
- How will professional development resources be institutionalized in the long term?
- How will the professional development ecosystem have been transformed once the initiative is complete?
- What are the structures that will ensure the sustainability of coordinated, systemic change over time?
Having a well-defined and transparent theory of action will promote the fidelity of the IEPI initiative and support all IEPI stakeholders in collaborating effectively toward their shared vision of a successful future for the CCC.

This report includes analyses of:
- professional development workshops held from Summer 2016 through Summer 2017; and
- the PLN since its launch in April 2016.

The focus of this report is a set of key components of the EdInsights evaluation study that are likely to be of greatest interest to state leadership, including:
- the interest, use, and usefulness of IEPI professional development activities;
- the extent to which professional development activities support legislatively mandated statewide goals;
- how IEPI professional development supports colleges’ action planning;
- opportunities to build on IEPI strengths; and
- our evaluation plan looking forward.

For detailed information on each of the workshops evaluated, please visit the IEPI website at http://iepi.cccco.edu to download evaluation reports. For a detailed explanation of evaluation methodologies used in this report, please contact EdInsights.

**LINKING TO THE VISION FOR SUCCESS**

Ensuring student success is at the core of the CCC’s Vision for Success. The Vision outlines ambitious, quantifiable systemwide goals to increase student transfer and completion rates, to improve equity between student groups and reduce achievement gaps between regions, and to improve student employment outcomes by 2022. It seeks to drive a shift in culture and practice in the CCC system, identifying how the CCC can better meet students’ needs through seven core commitments:

1. Focus relentlessly on students’ end goals.
2. Always design and decide with the student in mind.
3. Pair high expectations with high support.
4. Foster the use of data, inquiry, and evidence.
5. Take ownership of goals and performance.
6. Enable action and thoughtful innovation.
7. Lead the work of partnering across systems.

Although IEPI was launched prior to the publication of the Vision, a focus on how the initiative’s four broad aims (boosting student outcomes, increasing programmatic compliance, improving fiscal viability, and reducing accreditation sanctions) could support the goals and commitments outlined in the document would help the colleges understand how to integrate supports in meeting both sets of goals.

As this report demonstrates, the professional development content delivered through IEPI has focused primarily on the goal of improving student success, and the audience for this content has consistently validated its usefulness for their campus efforts. IEPI’s commitment to evidence-based inquiry and accountability for performance is integral to the design of the initiative, which requests that colleges set annual performance targets and provides resources and training to support those outcomes through onsite technical support teams, professional development activities, and online professional development resources. IEPI’s focus on peer learning, team building, and action planning fosters innovative leadership and partnership within and across higher education sectors.
Interest, Use, and Usefulness of Professional Development Resources

IEPI professional development resources were used by employees in all major job classifications and functions and from all 114 community colleges. From July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017, IEPI reached CCC employees through 32 workshops in 12 topics and through the Professional Learning Network (PLN) online resources.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFERINGS WIDELY USED

During the 2016-2017 fiscal year, IEPI held 32 workshops covering 12 topics with 2,955 people attending, plus presenters and panelists who also may have chosen to sit in on workshop presentations and discussions (see Appendix A for a list of workshops and topics). Workshop attendees came from all 114 of the state’s community colleges. IEPI workshops were in high demand; 41 percent of them experienced enrollment at 90 percent or more of capacity, and, on average, workshop enrollment reached 77 percent of capacity.

The PLN grew rapidly over the past year. As of August 2017, it had 8,700 registered users from all 114 colleges. The percentage of employees from each community college who registered for the PLN ranged from 2 percent to 27 percent.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT USE VARIED BY JOB CLASSIFICATION, FUNCTION, AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE LOCATION

During the past year, IEPI professional development users represented a variety of job classifications and job functions, came from all 114 community colleges, and typically attended workshops in teams from their individual colleges. We analyzed professional development usage by these factors and discuss in detail below how professional development use differed based on user and college characteristics.

IEPI Professional Development Usage Varied by Job Type

Administrators were more likely to attend IEPI workshops than faculty or classified staff, but they were significantly less likely to use the PLN. In contrast, faculty and classified staff were much more likely to utilize the PLN, but somewhat less likely to attend in-person workshops. Attendees reported that colleges had difficulty recruiting faculty to attend workshops held away from campus due to their teaching commitments. Employees’ difficulty leaving campus work obligations may explain differences in workshop attendance.
When looking at job function, employees from student services comprised the largest percentage of workshop participants, whereas individuals in instruction made up the largest percentage of PLN users. These findings are consistent with usage by job classification. Individuals in instruction, which includes but is not limited to faculty, were less likely to attend workshops and more likely to use the PLN.

### Figure 2.
The largest percentage of professional development users overall came from instruction, but the majority of workshop attendees were in student services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Function</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>PLN</th>
<th>Workshop &amp; PLN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or Admin Serv</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Planning</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Development Resources Used by Colleges Statewide
IEPI professional development resources were used at all 114 colleges across the state. Figure 3 shows employee attendance at an IEPI professional development workshop and registration on the PLN. The size of the circle in Figure 3 represents the proportion of employees at each college who have used IEPI professional development resources. The color of the circle represents whether employees at that college tend to use the PLN or IEPI workshops for their professional development needs.
professional development (see Appendix B for larger maps with college names). The figure suggests that most colleges’ professional development participation comes from PLN usage.

Figure 3.
Most community colleges in California tend to acquire their professional development resources largely through the PLN.
Engagement in IEPI professional development activities varied by the urbanicity of the community in which the college is located. While employees in rural areas, towns, and small suburbs make up just 10 percent of all CCC employees, in the past year they comprised 14 percent of workshop attendees and 11 percent of PLN users, and thus were disproportionately making use of IEPI professional development resources (see Figure 4).

Figure 4.
Employees at more remote colleges were overrepresented in their use of IEPI professional development resources.

Nearly all workshop attendees came in teams
Team attendance is an important component of the IEPI professional development approach, and workshop marketing materials consistently encourage colleges to identify cross-functional teams that should attend. Our analysis shows that, overall, the effort to recruit teams to attend is quite successful. Virtually all participants in both the Dual Enrollment and IEPI Pathways Training workshops attended in teams, and most other IEPI workshops also had very high levels of team attendance. Only the Indicators and Integrated Planning workshops had lower percentages of team attendance, at 29 percent and 53 percent, respectively.
INTEREST IN IEPI PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES REMAINS HIGH

Workshop participants’ interest in future use of IEPI resources was high and largely consistent across job functions. The only statistically significant differences were that:

- administrators were more likely than faculty to be interested in tools on the PLN, which is different from actual usage, whereas faculty were more likely to use the PLN than administrators; and
- administrators also were more likely than faculty and staff to want to serve on a PRT at another college.
Interest in future use of IEPI resources was high, particularly professional development workshops and PLN tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in future professional development workshops</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest in using tools on the PLN</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in developing a plan on the PLN</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in serving on a PRT at my college</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in using an Applied Solution Kit (ASK)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in serving on a PRT at another campus</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUALITY OF WORKSHOPS INCREASED OVER TIME

Attendees’ ratings for both the quality of workshop presenters and the workshops’ delivery rose since the first workshop EdInsights evaluated (see Figure 7), suggesting that IEPI leadership made effective use of evaluation data and other feedback to improve its offerings over time and is engaging in processes of continuous improvement. Ratings for these two aspects of the workshop improved from “met expectations” to “better than expected.” The findings are statistically significant, even after controlling for job function, job area, urbanicity, team attendance, and PLN usage.
Figure 7. The quality of both workshop presenters and workshop delivery significantly improved over time.

Note: Responses range from 1 (Unacceptable) to 5 (Outstanding);
*Statistically significant p <.05;
Controlling for job function, job area, urbanicity, PLN user status, and workshop team status
Support for Statewide Goals

WORKSHOPS TARGETED STUDENT OUTCOMES MORE THAN OTHER GOALS
To understand how well workshops supported colleges in achieving the four statewide IEPI goals—improving fiscal viability, reducing accreditation sanctions and audit issues, boosting student performance and outcomes, and increasing programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines—we analyzed the learning content that workshop providers targeted in relation to how useful participants said the workshops actually were for the various IEPI goals (see Figure 8).

Our analysis discovered that attendees found the workshops’ learning content useful, mainly to help them improve student outcomes, and secondly to increase programmatic compliance. They said workshops were less useful in helping them reduce accreditation sanctions and audit findings and least useful in addressing fiscal viability—goals not explicitly targeted by workshop providers. To see how each workshop maps for each statewide goal for provider intent (target) and respondent usefulness, see Appendix C.
Student outcomes and programmatic compliance were targeted more by workshop providers and perceived as more useful by respondents.

**Figure 8.**

**PROFESSIONAL LEARNING NETWORK FOCUSED HEAVILY ON STUDENT OUTCOMES**

Resources submitted by PLN users often focused on student performance and outcomes and infrequently on the other three statewide IEPI goals. Eighty-six percent of user-submitted resources were related to student performance and outcomes, such as a description of the California Guided Pathways Program and a guide for faculty and staff that discusses how Rio Honda College helps students in distress. Twenty-two percent of these resources supported the
goal of improving state and federal programmatic compliance, 7 percent supported improving fiscal viability, and 7 percent supported reduced accreditation sanctions and audit findings. The sum of these percentages is greater than 100 percent because some resources supported multiple goals.

Support for Action Planning

A key component of IEPI workshops is encouraging college teams to plan for action. We ask workshop participants about their action planning to understand their goals and how IEPI can further support a college’s success. While each workshop has distinct outcomes, we found themes across the workshops in respondents’ intentions and perceptions about change on their campuses. These findings were drawn from an analysis of surveys about IEPI workshops, but we encourage state leaders to consider how the findings might apply across the CCC system and the higher education landscape more broadly.

WORKSHOP RESPONDENTS INTENDED TO IMPLEMENT OR ENHANCE A PROGRAM AND TO IMPROVE INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES OR COLLABORATION

When asked what actions they plan to take after the workshop, workshop survey respondents most commonly discussed these actions:

1. Improve institutional processes or collaboration (312 mentions)
2. Implement or enhance a program (310 mentions)
3. Engage stakeholders or disseminate information (165 mentions)
4. Follow up with resources or contacts (47 mentions)
5. Conduct a needs assessment or get additional information (38 mentions)

Respondents’ plans to take action as a result of the workshop most frequently involved an intention to improve institutional processes or coordination across functions in areas such as improving programmatic compliance required for financial aid eligibility, ensuring the accuracy of transcript evaluation, and integrating planning for basic skills. Almost as many respondents stated they aimed to launch new or enhance existing programs in workshop topic areas such as inmate education, dual enrollment, and pathways. These plans for program implementation were collaborative and often included the formation or continuation of an implementation team or committee containing coworkers who had attended the workshop together. The value of workshop content was also demonstrated by respondents’ intentions to disseminate workshop materials to other campus colleagues and to follow up about resources shared or with contacts made at the workshop. A smaller number of respondents indicated they needed more information in order to take action.

“Our team plans on applying for the California Guided Pathways Project grant to help implement pathways and has agreed to implement it whether or not we are funded.”
Pathways workshop attendee
Nevertheless, as a result of the workshop, these participants were empowered to conduct a needs assessment or to gather more information at their colleges to advance their efforts.

**WORKSHOP RESPONDENTS EXPECTED THEIR ACTIONS TO RESULT IN MORE EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES AND IMPROVED STUDENT OUTCOMES**

When asked at the workshop, “What impact do you expect your action to have?” respondents most commonly listed and discussed the following:

1. More effective institutional processes (312 mentions)
2. Improved student outcomes (225 mentions)
3. Better compliance (56 mentions)
4. Improved fiscal viability (44 mentions)
5. Improved community outcomes (40 mentions)

Respondents sometimes struggled to express the impact of their actions in measurable terms, but those who did anticipated more effective institutional processes, including improved compliance with financial aid rules and requirements, more accurate and consistent transcript evaluation, stronger collaboration around the development of pathways and dual enrollment programs, enhanced institutional planning and decision-making for IEPI indicators, and better fiscal accountability through integration of initiatives related to basic skills. Respondents also anticipated direct improvements to student outcomes—including higher enrollment, retention, and graduation rates—and better career and community outcomes as a result of the development of pathways, dual enrollment, basic skills, and financial well-being programs, among others. These anticipated impacts aligned well with IEPI goals related to boosting student outcomes, better compliance, improved fiscal viability, and reduced accreditation sanctions and audits.

**WORKSHOP RESPONDENTS ANTICIPATED GAINING SUPPORT FOR CHANGE AND RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS AS TOP CHALLENGES**

When asked, “What challenges do you anticipate?” survey respondents most commonly discussed these barriers to success:

1. Gaining support for change (291 mentions)
2. Time and funding resource constraints (229 mentions)
3. Implementation challenges (126 mentions)
4. Personnel constraints (52 mentions)

“We anticipate that dual enrollment will increase the college-going and completion rates for populations in our district who typically would not go to college.”

Dual Enrollment workshop attendee
The most common challenge that respondents anticipated was gaining support for change, and they cited obstacles such as developing collaborative relationships, engaging various stakeholders, and overcoming resistance to doing things differently. Almost as many respondents mentioned funding constraints, which were expressed in terms of time, staffing, bandwidth, initiative fatigue, or other resource needs. Specific challenges related to implementation of programs such as inmate education, dual enrollment, or pathways were also listed and frequently tied to coordination or integration within and across institutions and systems. Personnel challenges not related to funding also surfaced, including recruiting faculty to teach in prisons and staffing dual enrollment courses with faculty who meet legislative requirements for minimum qualifications.

WORKSHOP RESPONDENTS REQUESTED MORE NUTS-AND-BOLTS SUPPORT FOR CAMPUS IMPLEMENTATION

When asked, “What IEPI supports would you like to have to overcome the obstacles you noted?” survey respondents most frequently identified:

1. Support for campus implementation (nuts and bolts) (161 mentions)
2. Additional workshops, summits, and trainings (85 mentions)
3. Follow-up training or information on specific topics (83 mentions)
4. Help managing change or supporting collaboration (45 mentions)
5. Audience-specific support (42 mentions)
6. Improved institutional processes (business process analysis) (23 mentions)
7. Policy advocacy (17 mentions)
8. Online learning (10 mentions)

Respondents provided a wide range of suggestions for supports that might help them address these obstacles. The largest number of ideas concerned ways to help with the nuts and bolts of campus implementation efforts such as disseminating successful models, sharing detailed case studies of successful programs, offering onsite technical support, supporting an analysis to streamline institutional processes, and providing additional training on how to effectively collaborate and manage change. Respondents requested additional and broader professional development, including follow-up summits, workshops, conferences, and online training and resources. Nearly as many respondents also requested follow-up support to drill down to particular topics or to target specific audience needs, such as how to teach in prison or how to craft dual enrollment partnership agreements.

“[We need] step-by-step good practices, samples, tools, etc. Practical tools for implementation to reduce the timeline.”
Pathways workshop attendee

“The only obstacle I anticipate is getting the entire campus on board and getting everyone to understand that this needs to be a campuswide effort and is not simply a financial aid [office] responsibility.”
Role of Financial Well-Being workshop attendee
Opportunities to Build on IEPI’s Strengths

Building on our October 2016 report, the following section discusses four broad opportunities for the state to build on the key strengths and momentum of IEPI through:

- increasing the focus on outcomes;
- engaging and serving stakeholders;
- supporting campus implementation efforts; and
- building an integrated, collaborative, professional development ecosystem.

IEPI’s demonstrated strengths support the continued development of these opportunities. We commend effective practices already in use by IEPI leadership and, based on our evaluation research, note opportunities to achieve even greater impact.

**INCREASING THE FOCUS ON OUTCOMES**

IEPI leadership has adopted the practice of requiring all workshop providers to reflect upon and identify precise learning outcomes for its workshops. To inform the evaluation, providers and IEPI staff are also asked to identify how workshop outcomes support the four broad IEPI goals: boosting student performance, increasing programmatic compliance, improving fiscal viability, and reducing accreditation sanctions. To create a tighter articulation between initiative activities and outcomes, we recommend that IEPI leadership and staff take additional steps to ensure that professional development activities directly support all IEPI goals and develop a clear theory of action to bring about long-term sustainable systemic change. Having an explicit and transparent theory of action will help guarantee the fidelity of the initiative and support all IEPI stakeholders in collaborating effectively toward a shared vision of the future.

**Ensuring Professional Development Activities Support All IEPI Goals**

Our analysis shows that IEPI’s professional development resources—workshops and online resources—are primarily targeting the IEPI goal of boosting student outcomes. The other three IEPI goals related to programmatic compliance, fiscal viability, and accreditation sanctions are less explicitly targeted by resource providers. IEPI leadership and staff should consider how professional development resources and activities are supporting each of the four IEPI goals and whether changes are needed, either through improved articulation of existing content or through the addition of new content, so that all the initiative outcomes receive sufficient attention.
Developing a Theory of Action for Long-Term Sustainable Change

Achieving improvements at the scale envisioned by the IEPI mandate requires a systemic approach that can be sustained over time. At this stage of development, IEPI leadership could benefit from making its overall theory of action more explicit in concert with its partners and stakeholders. Given the prominence of the Vision for Success and Guided Pathways, IEPI should consider how its activities support these priorities for the CCC. IEPI leadership, through its actions, serve as a role model for colleges and should be thoughtful about its theory of action and its approach to change. How will the various activities and resources under development help IEPI achieve its desired outcomes? How will professional development resources be institutionalized in the long term, and how will the professional development ecosystem be transformed once the initiative is complete? What are the structures that will ensure the sustainability of coordinated, systemic change over time?

ENGAGING AND SERVING STAKEHOLDERS

IEPI leadership and its staff and resource providers consistently and thoughtfully create structures and processes for soliciting input and feedback from their stakeholders and intended audiences though the use of advisory and planning committees, collaborations with partner organizations, and a variety of feedback and evaluation methods. An initiative website and regular electronic newsletters provide consistent mechanisms to keep stakeholders involved and informed. To amplify these strengths, IEPI leadership should continue to engage stakeholders broadly in further development and implementation of the initiative by being thoughtful about its strategies for both governance and communication.

One of the strengths of the initiative is the extent to which it relies on input from its many constituent groups and partner organizations and incorporates them into its leadership and planning.

Strengthening Governance Structures

IEPI leadership employs a broad range of advisory committees and working groups to set the vision and overall goals for the initiative and to implement specific initiative activities and components. One of the strengths of the initiative is the extent to which it relies on input from its many constituent groups and partner organizations and incorporates them into its leadership and planning. As with any initiative operating at the scale of IEPI, this results in a large and complex administrative committee structure. At this stage of the initiative, it would be useful to thoughtfully evaluate the effectiveness of the initiative’s governance model and administrative and meeting structure. What is the role and charge of IEPI’s various committees and work groups? What are the mechanisms by which the vision is established, decisions are made, and work gets executed? Are there changes that need to be made to the membership of various committees to ensure that the initiative is broadly inclusive? Are roles and responsibilities clear? Is the overall governance and administration of the initiative effective?
Strengthening Communication
IEPI leadership uses a broad range of communication mechanisms, including an initiative website, electronic newsletters, and regular presentations at key conferences, so that its stakeholders are kept informed. It has engaged an external communications consultant to provide expert advice to help gather input from stakeholders and make sure their needs are met. Our analyses suggest that there are some differences in how stakeholders’ engagement with the initiative varies according to their job classifications and functions and the urbanicity of their institutions. Is the initiative fully reaching its intended audiences? Are there changes that should be made to broaden engagement with IEPI across less engaged groups and institutions? How can IEPI leadership continue to expand awareness of the initiative to all its diverse constituents?

SUPPORTING CAMPUS IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS
IEPI leadership places special emphasis on supporting colleges to implement changes to programs or institutional processes based on professional learning. Team attendance is encouraged for all workshops, and action planning is a regular feature of workshop program design. Survey feedback demonstrates a strong interest among attendees in obtaining support to help their campuses implement change. This desired support from IEPI can take multiple forms, including disseminating to the colleges case studies and/or proven effective models that they can adopt and/or adapt; providing continuing online and in-person professional development activities, including those that establish professional networks or communities of practice; helping to streamline and/or integrate systems and processes to make them more sustainable; and assisting campuses in leading and managing change.

Disseminating Case Studies and Proven Effective Models
Survey data suggest that those who take part in professional development are interested in detailed case studies on successful implementation efforts at other campuses that include information about obstacles and how they were overcome. Participants are also interested in templates for various programs and in examples from model institutions that can be shared with permission and adopted for and/or adapted to their own institutions. Such content would be useful to disseminate in person at workshops and online through the PLN.

Providing Continuing Online and In-Person Professional Development Focused on Advancing Implementation
Requests for follow-up support frequently focus on advancing implementation efforts, as well as on creating networks or communities of practice that foster an ongoing exchange. Workshop participants cited an interest in learning from others about both challenges and solutions through attending in-person events and exploring online offerings. When offering follow-up workshops or other live events, IEPI leadership and workshop providers should carefully assess needs and ensure that content will advance colleges’ efforts to the next level, not repeat material already covered at prior professional learning events. Webinars and other online exchanges can be an effective way to provide targeted content that is specific to a current implementation issue or challenge or that offers up-to-date information in response to regulatory
or other changes. They also are a low-cost strategy to facilitate colleges’ access to information and to support the development of communities of practice working on similar goals. Such efforts can also help expand the audience for professional learning and facilitate the engagement of a broader cross section of college stakeholders.

Streamlining Systems and Processes
Survey respondents frequently mentioned workload, resource constraints, and initiative fatigue as significant obstacles. Efforts such as the integration of the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), Student Equity (SE), the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) compliance and accountability reporting currently underway at the Chancellor’s Office, and the development of the Integrated Planning Applied Solution Kit (ASK) are commendable and will help colleges streamline efforts. Feedback suggests that colleges, to reduce labor costs and initiative fatigue, would appreciate additional efforts at the systemwide level to accomplish this streamlining. In addition, the colleges are looking for technical support around business process analysis and systems implementation to help them automate and/or streamline time-consuming processes to operate more efficiently. Where systemwide solutions are not feasible, it would be helpful for IEPI leadership to disseminate local solutions that have the potential to be portable or scalable. When relevant to the topic, action-planning activities at future workshops could also help colleges find ways to improve existing institutional processes in order to provide sustainability of efforts.

Helping Campuses Lead and Manage Change
Survey respondents cited gaining support for change as the chief obstacle to implementing new programs, processes, and activities at their colleges. They sought assistance in engaging campus colleagues and other partners who are not yet willing and/or engaged. This feedback led IEPI leadership to sponsor the development of a new ASK on change management that will directly address this concern. In addition, content on change management already has been incorporated into some professional development workshops. IEPI leadership and staff should continue making sure that relevant content on managing change is consistently being incorporated into IEPI online and in-person professional development resources, including content modules that have already been developed and disseminated.
BUILDING AN INTEGRATED, COLLABORATIVE, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ECOSYSTEM

Usage and survey data show that IEPI professional development workshops and online resources are meeting important professional development needs at the CCC. However, the value of these events and materials could be enhanced further by linking and integrating IEPI professional development resources and activities and by leveraging and coordinating IEPI content with non-IEPI professional development forums. The benefit of such integration would be to create a professional development ecosystem in which discrete activities and resources would interact as part of an interconnected and mutually supportive system.

Linking and Integrating IEPI Professional Development Resources

IEPI leadership continues to integrate learning across the various professional development platforms being employed as part of the initiative. In particular, it has identified an important set of IEPI core competencies that cuts across workshop content areas and has funded the development of ASKs housed on the PLN. Current ASKs under development—including integrated planning, data disaggregation, strategic enrollment management, guided pathways, and leading and managing change—have tremendous potential to be incorporated into in-person professional development activities, as has been demonstrated at recent successful workshop offerings on integrated planning. Likewise, specific content from professional development workshop offerings in all areas can find a broader audience when integrated with ASKs or, more broadly, with the PLN. Efforts to integrate learning across the professional development workshops and the PLN are commendable and could be further strengthened, for example, by providing all workshop participants with a curated list of relevant PLN content. IEPI leadership should also continue to look for opportunities to create stronger links between Partnership Resource Teams (PRTs) and other IEPI professional development resources.

Aligning IEPI Content with Other Professional Development Activities

While IEPI supports significant new professional development activities across the CCC system, many other professional development activities are also being offered, frequently by IEPI partners not under IEPI sponsorship. The intended audiences for IEPI activities and resources inevitably overlap with those of other providers.

IEPI leadership and staff already look for opportunities to collaborate on these activities and make sure that IEPI content is

“More strategic alignment of all of the professional development available that covers some of the same material is needed. I attended the IEPI CTE Data Unlocked Workshop on a Friday, and the following Wednesday there was a California Workforce Board/Community College workshop on social mobility covering some similar information. Then there was an email about CCC Association for Occupational Education’s More and Better CTE, where teams come out to colleges to provide technical assistance.”

CTE Data Unlocked workshop attendee
offered at major professional development events, such as the RP Group’s Strengthening Student Success conference. This practice could be further enhanced to ensure that IEPI content is more fully leveraged by partners and potential partners. Such strategies could also broaden the reach of IEPI activities to faculty, administrators, and staff who may not have the bandwidth or funding to attend multiple activities. Events already targeting those audiences, such as the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Curriculum Institute or the CCC’s Chief Instructional Officers (CIO) Conference, can be important opportunities to integrate valuable content.

Development of new IEPI content should also coordinate closely with other systemwide professional development activities, to reduce the possibility of duplication or inconsistency of professional development content directed at the same target audiences. Workshop respondents have noted this overlap and expressed a desire for such alignment.

Broader integration of all systemwide professional development activities would help guarantee that resources are used responsibly and that effective practices are adopted broadly across the CCC professional development ecosystem. It might be useful at this juncture to engage partner organizations in discussions about how best to achieve greater integration of professional development content at future events.
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## Appendix A. IEPI Professional Development Workshops

Table A-1 (continues on next page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORKSHOP NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VENUE (CITY)</th>
<th>ATTENDEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Education Training</td>
<td>6/8-6/9/16</td>
<td>Bakersfield College - Delano campus (Delano)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/20-6/21/16</td>
<td>Chaffey College - Chino campus (Chino)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation Program Kick-Off Summit</td>
<td>8/2-8/3/16</td>
<td>Doubletree by Hilton Sacramento (Sacramento)</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Curriculum in Maintaining Institutional Financial Aid Eligibility</td>
<td>9/22/16</td>
<td>Hilton Irvine Orange County (Irvine)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/26/16</td>
<td>Sheraton Grand Sacramento (Sacramento)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>11/28/16</td>
<td>College of the Canyons (Valencia)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/13/17</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Junior College (Santa Rosa)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment</td>
<td>12/1/16</td>
<td>Woodland Community College (Woodland)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/8/16</td>
<td>Wyndham Garden Ventura Pierpont Inn (Ventura)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/12/17</td>
<td>Clovis Community College (Fresno)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/19/17</td>
<td>Chabot College (Hayward)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/2/17</td>
<td>Long Beach City College (Long Beach)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/23/17</td>
<td>Mt. San Antonio College (Walnut)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Training</td>
<td>12/7-12/8/16</td>
<td>Doubletree Hotel Sacramento (Sacramento)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/26-1/27/17</td>
<td>Hilton Orange County Costa Mesa (Costa Mesa)</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Training</td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td>Doubletree by Hilton Ontario Airport (Ontario)</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/10/17</td>
<td>Courtyard by Marriott Sacramento Cal Expo (Sacramento)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE Data Unlocked: Tools for Growing Enrollment and Strengthening CTE Pathways</td>
<td>2/24/17</td>
<td>Crowne Plaza Ventura Beach (Ventura)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/3/17</td>
<td>Sheraton Grand Sacramento (Sacramento)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/17/17</td>
<td>Hilton Oakland Airport Hotel (Oakland)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/24/17</td>
<td>Sheraton Cerritos Hotel (Cerritos)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/28/17</td>
<td>Courtyard San Diego Airport Liberty Station (San Diego)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKSHOP NAME</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>VENUE (CITY)</td>
<td>ATTENDEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Planning Tools and Resources</td>
<td>3/29/17</td>
<td>Golden West College (Huntington Beach)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/19/17</td>
<td>Hyatt Regency San Francisco (Burlingame)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSI/SE/SSSP Integrated Planning</td>
<td>4/7/17</td>
<td>Doubletree by Hilton Ontario Airport (Ontario)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/7/17</td>
<td>Hilton Oakland Airport Hotel (Oakland)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/28/17</td>
<td>Hilton Orange County Costa Mesa (Costa Mesa)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/17</td>
<td>Courtyard by Marriott Sacramento Cal Expo (Sacramento)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/17</td>
<td>Doubletree by Hilton Hotel Fresno Convention Center (Fresno)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Financial Well-being in Student Success</td>
<td>4/24/17</td>
<td>Hilton Irvine Orange County (Irvine)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/26/17</td>
<td>Walnut Creek Marriott (Walnut Creek)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Bridges and Programs: Developing &amp; Sustaining A Culture of Noncredit</td>
<td>5/4-5/5/17</td>
<td>Marriott Rancho Cordova (Sacramento)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Attendance calculated based on data provided by Windhausen, the company that coordinates event management. We then removed any duplicate registrants.
Appendix B. IEPI Professional Development Usage Across California

Figure B-1.
While all colleges used IEPI professional development resources, they used different mixes of resources.

Each circle is a CCC, with color representing the mix of IEPI professional development resources used (workshops and PLN) and size representing the percentage of employees participating in IEPI professional development.
Appendix C. How Individual Workshops Support Each of the Four Statewide Goals

STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND OUTCOMES
Nearly all workshops targeted improving student performance and outcomes. Regardless of whether the provider intended to improve student performance and outcomes, workshop survey respondents found them all useful for this goal.

Figure C-1.
Respondents found all workshops useful for improving student outcomes and performance.

Note: Targeted was measured by the workshop provider’s assessment of which statewide goal(s) was met by the workshop learning outcomes. Useful was measured by workshop survey respondents’ assessment of how useful the workshop was for the workshop learning outcome(s) related to that statewide goal.
STATE AND FEDERAL PROGRAMMATIC COMPLIANCE

Many workshops targeted the statewide goal of improved state and federal programmatic compliance, and survey respondents found them useful for it. However, some workshops—Inmate Education, Dual Enrollment, and Basic Skills—did not intend to target this goal, but respondents still found them useful for it. Two workshops, CTE Data Unlocked and Pathways, did not target this goal and were not found useful for it.

Figure C-2.
Respondents found nearly all workshops useful for improving state and federal programmatic compliance.
FISCAL VIABILITY

One workshop, Indicators, highly targeted the statewide goal of improving fiscal viability, but workshop survey respondents found it only moderately useful for this goal. Two workshops—Inmate Education and CTE Data Unlocked—did not intend to target this goal, but respondents still found them useful for improving fiscal viability. Many of the workshops did not target this goal, and respondents did not find them useful for it.

Figure C-3.
Few workshops targeted improving fiscal viability, hence, few respondents felt their workshop was useful for improving this IEPI goal.

Note: Targeted was measured by the workshop provider’s assessment of which statewide goal(s) was met by the workshop learning outcomes. Useful was measured by workshop survey respondents’ assessment of how useful the workshop was for the workshop learning outcome(s) related to that statewide goal.
ACCREDITATION SANCTIONS

Three workshops—Financial Well-being, Indicators, and Integrated Planning—targeted the statewide goal of reducing accreditation sanctions. Survey respondents for these workshops all found them at least moderately useful for this goal. Respondents found the Financial Aid workshop the most useful for this goal, but, like many of the workshops, that one did not intend to target this goal.

Figure C-4.
Respondents found workshops that targeted reducing accreditation sanctions to be useful.

Note: Targeted was measured by the workshop provider’s assessment of which statewide goal(s) was met by the workshop learning outcomes. Useful was measured by workshop survey respondents’ assessment of how useful the workshop was for the workshop learning outcome(s) related to that statewide goal.