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Introduction

Background

The Partnership Resource Team (PRT) component of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) provides technical assistance at no cost for those institutions identified as needing support. Prospective Client Institutions submit a letter of interest, explaining how the PRTs could help improve institutional effectiveness. Based in part on the letters of interest, the Project Director and Executive Committee determine a roster of institutions to serve in a series of cycles in the PRT process.

Under the IEPI model, the PRTs make three visits to the institution. During Visit 1, PRT Members gather information on the institution’s Areas of Focus, help the institution reflect on its situation, and facilitate internal conversations. The PRT then provides ideas for improvement and best practices in the form of a List of Primary Successes and Menu of Options. During Visit 2, the PRT helps the institution draft an Innovation and Effectiveness Plan (I&EP) to address its Areas of Focus. In the Follow-up Visit, the PRT facilitates conversations about progress on the I&EP and may make suggestions on how to improve implementation of the I&EP.

PRTs draw heavily on community college personnel with the requisite expertise and familiarity with the system to assist colleges, districts, centers, and the Chancellor’s Office. Using this broad array of competencies and skills, the PRTs provide technical assistance on a wide variety of topics to improve institutional effectiveness.

As part of the evaluation of the PRT process, surveys are administered to the Client Institutions and the PRT Members after each visit in the process. Relevant to this report, the existing external evaluator for the initiative stepped down from its role effective November 30, 2015. The current evaluator contract became effective on January 1, 2016. During the last month of the initial evaluator contract and during the transition period between evaluators, institutions were completing the Visit 1 component of the Cycle 2A process; however, feedback surveys for Visit 1 were not administered to the PRT Members or the Client Institutions. Those surveys were administered in February 2016, but no PRT Members and only two Client Institutions provided responses to those surveys, probably due to the time lapse and the holiday break.

In the winter and spring of 2016, institutions in Cycle 2A completed the Visit 2 component of the PRT process. Client Institutions and PRT Members were administered feedback surveys for Visit 2. Some Client Institution representatives and PRT Members contacted the current evaluator with questions and comments about the surveys. Some indicated that they had chosen not to complete the Visit 1 survey, and others stated that they had answered only the Visit 2 survey with both Visit 1 and Visit 2 in mind. Still other participants felt the time between the two survey administrations was too short to warrant answering both surveys, so they had not done so.
In the interests of providing meaningful information about the PRT process during Cycle 2A upon which the Project Director, Technical Assistance Workgroup and Advisory Committee could reasonably rely, and to protect the confidentiality of the limited number of Visit 1 respondents, the Project Director and evaluator decided to aggregate the findings from the survey responses from Visit 1 and Visit 2. In taking this approach, there is an attendant loss in the granularity of analysis of particular items, especially where areas of inquiry in the Visit 1 or Visit 2 surveys are unique. The survey instruments administered to the PRT Members and to the Client Institutions, respectively, across all visits (Visit 1, Visit 2 and the Follow-Up Visit) were quite similar, and thus it was agreed that the impact of data aggregation on the integrity of the findings would be minimal. Finally, given the satisfactory response rate for feedback surveys for Visit 2, specific findings for Visit 2 for both the Client Institutions and PRT Members are separately reported where relevant.

**Goals of the PRT Process**

The areas of inquiry for evaluation of the PRT technical assistance process were identified by the Project Director in cooperation with Technical Assistance Workgroup of the Advisory Committee and with the approval of the Executive Committee. The specific items created to measure the areas of inquiry were crafted by the Project Director in conjunction with the external evaluators.\(^1\)

The goals of the evaluation are to:

- Assess the impact of the PRT Process on the Client Institutions.
- Determine the value gained by participating in the PRT Process by both the Client Institutions and the PRT Members.
- Identify the technical assistance techniques, tools and concepts that positively impact PRT visits and best assist Client Institutions in addressing the identified areas of focus.

This report focuses on the general findings and trends in the data aligned with the three identified goals, to inform the decision making of the Project Director, Executive Committee and Advisory Committee. Specifically, the report covers feedback based on services to institutions that commenced in Fall 2015 (Cycle 2A). As of the date of this report, all institutions in this cycle of PRT assistance have completed Visit 1 and Visit 2. Institutions are in the process of completing or have completed the Follow Up Visit, with all institutions expected to complete the entire PRT process by summer 2017. This report focuses on the results of the surveys for Visit 1 and Visit 2; an additional report will be produced after a sufficient proportion of institutions have completed the entire PRT process.

---

\(^1\) The items for the Surveys for Visit 1 were created by the Project Director and the original external evaluator at the time of the initial instrument’s creation (Fall 2015). Edits were made to the surveys for Visit 1 by the current evaluator. The items for the surveys for Visit 2 and the Follow-Up Visit were created and edited by the Project Director in conjunction with the current external evaluator.
Areas of Inquiry

Areas of inquiry were identified and aligned with the goals of the evaluation. Constructs of interest were considered and identified under each area of inquiry. Closed-ended and open-ended items were aligned with the inquiry areas. Thus, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to illuminate the areas of inquiry.

The areas of inquiry in the surveys are divided into four aspects of the PRT experience:

- The Visit Process
- Training Concepts Used for the Visit
- Logistics Before, During and After the Visits
- Miscellaneous (Areas Otherwise Unaddressed in the Survey).

The Visit Process

The first area of inquiry concerned the Visit Process itself from both the Client Institution and PRT Member perspectives. Depending on the specific focus, items were generated and administered to:

- The Client Institution participants in the visit, individually
- Both the Client Institution participants and the PRT Members, and
- The PRT Members, Individually.

Table 1 displays the constructs measured with respect to the Visit Process for Visit 1 and Visit 2. For Visit 2, an item was added to the Client Institution survey about the degree to which Client Institution participants agreed that the PRTs provided effective guidance in the development of the Innovation and Effectiveness Plan (I&EP), a topic relevant for this visit.

In addition to the closed-ended questions about the Visit experience, the surveys also contained open-ended questions of both the Client Institutions and the PRT Members, asking respondents to:

- Give up to three examples of how the PRTs functioned well
- Give up to three examples of how the PRTs could have functioned better
- Identify any challenges experienced during the visit

Client Institutions were asked to identify up to three expectations they had for the visit and whether these expectations were met. PRT Members were asked for Visit 1 to evaluate the overall receptiveness of the institution to the PRT process.\(^2\)

\(^2\) Asked only after Visit 1, no findings reported on this item for Cycle 2A because not responses were provided.
Table 1. The Visit Process (Visits 1 and 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Items</th>
<th>Institutions and PRT Team Items</th>
<th>Team Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiarity</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRTs:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Receptiveness</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With the Areas of Focus (Letter of Interest)</td>
<td>• PRT’s preparedness</td>
<td><strong>Takeaways from the Visit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With the PRT Process</td>
<td>• Positive, constructive, solution-oriented approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence in PRT Process</strong></td>
<td>• Knowledge of sound practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficiency of the Information Provided on the PRT Process</strong></td>
<td>• Helpfulness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations for the Visit</strong></td>
<td>• Understanding of Areas of Focus in institutional context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open mindedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PRT Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on sustainable and sound practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognition of institutional personnel as problem-solving peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective guidance on the I&amp;EP (Visit 2 Only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRT Functioning**
- How the PRT functioned well
- How the PRT could have functioned better

**Challenges**

---

Training Concepts Used for the Visit

The second area of inquiry concerned the *Training Concepts Used for the Visit* by the PRT Members. To discover this information, in open-ended items PRT Members were asked to identify which training concepts, tools and techniques they found most useful on the visits. In addition, PRT Members were asked to recommend improvements and changes to the training based on their experiences on the visits. Table 2 displays the constructs considered in this area of inquiry.

---

<sup>3</sup> Asked only after Visit 1, no findings reported on this item for Cycle 2A because not responses were provided.
The third area of inquiry considered the Logistics before, during, and after the visits. Closed-ended and open-ended items were generated to discover this information. Client Institutions were asked about scheduling of visit dates and meetings as well as the communication with the PRT Lead and Project Director before and after the visits. PRT Members were asked about the clarity of roles, agreement as to outcomes for the visit and communication among team PRT Members. In addition, PRT Members were asked about the time spent preparing for each visit, completing follow-up activities, and preparing for the next visit. PRT Members were also asked about other issues such as scheduling, effectiveness of team meetings, and coordination and leadership of PRT Leads. **Table 3** displays the constructs measured for the Logistics Area of Inquiry for both Visit 1 and Visit 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 2: Training Concepts Used for the Visit (Visits 1 and 2)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of the PRT Training Most Useful for the Visit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Changes and Improvements to the Training Based on the Visit Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRT Training That Was Especially Helpful</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Logistics**

The third area of inquiry considered the Logistics before, during, and after the visits. Closed-ended and open-ended items were generated to discover this information. Client Institutions were asked about scheduling of visit dates and meetings as well as the communication with the PRT Lead and Project Director before and after the visits. PRT Members were asked about the clarity of roles, agreement as to outcomes for the visit and communication among team PRT Members. In addition, PRT Members were asked about the time spent preparing for each visit, completing follow-up activities, and preparing for the next visit. PRT Members were also asked about other issues such as scheduling, effectiveness of team meetings, and coordination and leadership of PRT Leads. **Table 3** displays the constructs measured for the Logistics Area of Inquiry for both Visit 1 and Visit 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 3: Logistics (Visits 1 and 2)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheduling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Camaraderie and Operations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Availability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination and Leadership of PRT Lead</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Miscellaneous**

The final area of inquiry elicited open-ended responses from Client Institutions and the PRT Members on topics not previously covered in the survey instrument. This question was used to allow PRT Members and Client Institutions to share information on topics not otherwise contemplated in the survey.

**Components of the Report**

The Partnership Resource Team (PRT) Technical Assistance Feedback Summary Report consists of the following components:

- Key Findings for *Visit 1* and *Visit 2*
- Analysis and Findings

The Key Findings for *Visit 1* and *Visit 2* convey the results from the Client Institution and PRT Member surveys in greater detail but using color-coded tables for easy review. The Analysis and Findings section provides a narrative of the findings using tables and charts as illustrations. The individual components of the report are designed to provide access to the findings for policymakers, the Executive Committee, Advisory Committee, researchers and the field at the appropriate level of analysis.
## Key Findings

### PRT Technical Assistance Scorecard | Cycle 2A

#### Specific Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Interest</th>
<th>Institution Feedback</th>
<th>Partnership Resource Teams Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiarity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the Areas of Focus</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the PRT Process</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the PRT Process</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations for the Visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Interest</td>
<td>Progress on Areas of Focus (11)</td>
<td>Met (4) Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRT Preparedness</td>
<td>Met (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Met (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRT Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiency of Information Provided</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTs Preparedness</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderately Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive, Constructive Solution-Oriented Approach</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Sound Practices</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderately Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Area of Focus is Institutional Context</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Solutions</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT Expertise</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Sustainable and Sound Practices</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance on the I&amp;EP</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Institutional Personnel as Problem-Solving Peers</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderately Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Project Director/PRT Lead Before the Visit</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Project Director/PRT Lead After the Visit</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling: Meetings</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: PRT Lead</td>
<td>Moderately Strong</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of info: Next Steps</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Phone Meeting</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Face to Face</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Availability</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Moderately Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT Lead Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# KEY FINDINGS
## PRT Technical Assistance Scorecard | Cycle 2A

### SPECIFIC FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA OF INTEREST</th>
<th>INSTITUTION FEEDBACK</th>
<th>PARTNERSHIP RESOURCE TEAMS FEEDBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRT PROCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How the PRT Functioned Well</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with the Team (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRT Lead (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Best Practices (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings Before and After Visit (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Guidance with Areas of Focus (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Candid Discussions Among Members (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How the PRT Could have Functioned Better</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with the Team (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Debriefing Time (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Small Group Meetings (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier, More Effective Contact with Institution (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time With Team Between Meetings (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Better Scheduling (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHALLENGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Preparedness (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Buy-In (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Dedicate (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient Time (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Buy-In (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constituency Absence at Meetings (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEAM OPERATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Roles</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Outcomes for Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication: Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication: Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Availability: Institutional Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Availability: Team Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Face-to-Face Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination &amp; Leadership of PRT Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING CONCEPTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied at the Visit</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Facilitative Approach (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Listening (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS TO TRAINING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and Facilitation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogies, Methods and Curriculum</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Review of Templates (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEAM TAKEAWAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Application at Home Sites/ Other Venues</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Better Listening at Meetings at Home Institution (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Home Institution Practices More Clearly (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analysis and Findings

The Visit Process

Familiarity with Areas of Focus and the PRT Process

Client Institutions were asked to report their degree of familiarity with respect to two aspects of the PRT process using closed-ended items:

- the Areas of Focus for the institution
- the Three-visit PRT Process, with the overall purpose of each visit

Data on the degree of familiarity were collected through instruments administered after both Visit 1 and Visit 2. The items addressing familiarity were identical for the Visit 1 and Visit 2 feedback surveys administered.\(^4\)

All but one of the Client-Institution respondents reported that they were either very familiar or somewhat familiar with respect to both the Areas of Focus and the Three-visit PRT Process. Table 4 reports the response counts for Visit 1 and Visit 2 as to the level of familiarity with the Areas of Focus; Table 5 reports the response counts for Visit 1 and Visit 2 as to the level of familiarity with the Three-visit PRT Process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Client Institution Degree of Familiarity with Areas of Focus, Visits 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Table 5. Client Institution Degree of Familiarity with PRT Process, Visits 1 &amp; 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat familiar</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total answered: 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relatively small percentage of Client-Institution respondents who reported that they were not familiar with one or the other of the two aspects of the PRT process (5%, n=1) provides evidence that both the information disseminated and the training provided to the institutions are adequately apprising them on the Areas of Focus and the Three-visit PRT Process.

\(^4\) Due to the low number of responses for the Visit 1 feedback survey, the sums for the responses have been aggregated across the visits.
**Confidence in the PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness**

Client Institutions and PRT Members were asked to report their level of confidence that the PRT process would assist the Client Institutions to improve their institutional effectiveness in their identified *Areas of Focus* through closed-ended items.\(^5\)

**Client Institutions**

All but one of the Client-Institution respondents reported that they were either very confident or somewhat confident the PRT approach would improve institutional effectiveness in the identified *Areas of Focus*. The relatively small percentage of Client-Institution respondents who reported that they were not confident in the PRT approach (5%, n=1) provides evidence as to the perceived efficacy of the PRT approach in helping Client Institutions improve their effectiveness. *Table 6* reports the response counts on the level of confidence of Client Institutions in the PRT approach at the time of *Visit 1* and *Visit 2*.

| Table 6. Client Institution Level of Confidence in the PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness Visits 1 and 2 |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Answer Options**                             | **Response Count** |
| Very confident                                 | 13 |
| Somewhat confident                             | 5 |
| Not at all confident                           | 1 |
| **Total answered:**                            | **19** |

**PRT Members**

All but one of the PRT Members responding to the feedback survey reported that they were either very confident or somewhat confident that the PRT approach would improve institutional effectiveness in the identified *Areas of Focus*. As with the responses from the Client Institutions, the relatively small percentage of respondents who reported that they were not confident in the PRT process (5%, n=1) provides evidence that the PRT Members were confident that the PRT process would help the institution improve effectiveness.

Importantly, however, the average level of confidence reported by PRT Members was lower than for Client-Institution respondents. This difference between the Client Institutions and the PRT Members may reveal a more guarded opinion of the effects of the PRT approach by the PRT Members or higher optimism on the part of the Client Institutions that the approach will work.

---

\(^5\) Due to the low number of response for the Visit 1 feedback survey, the sums for the responses for this item have been aggregated across both visits. Responses for Client Institutions and PRT Members are separately reported.
Table 7 reports the response counts on the level of confidence of PRT Members in the PRT process at the time of Visit 1 and Visit 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very confident</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total answered: 20

Expectations for the Visits

The expectations that institutions had for Visit 1 and Visit 2 were measured by an open-ended item asking institutions to list up to three expectations for the visit. This question was followed up by a second open-ended item asking institutions whether the expectations were met. Progress on the Areas of Focus was the most common expectation identified by the Client-Institution respondents at Visit 1 and Visit 2, with PRT preparedness and team open-mindedness as additional common responses. For each of the most common expectations cited, all Client-Institution respondents reported that the expectations were met. Table 8 reports the coded expectations of the institution with counts for each category of expectation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress in Areas of Focus (4)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT’s Preparedness (4)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PRT Approach

Client Institutions and PRT Members were asked, through closed-ended items, to report their level of agreement about the PRT Members’ adherence to the PRT approach, including team preparedness, open-mindedness of the PRT Members, and so on.

Client Institutions

For the Client Institution feedback, eleven of the survey items were identical in the feedback survey for Visit 1 and Visit 2; however, Visit 2 asked an additional question about whether the PRT provided effective guidance to the institution in improving the implementation of the
Innovation and Effectiveness Plan. The responses from the surveys after both Visit 1 and Visit 2 have been aggregated into one table. All but one of the Client-Institution respondents reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that the team adhered to the PRT approach in each of the listed aspects. All Client Institutions reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that they were provided the information needed to work effectively with the PRT. The relatively small percentage of institutional respondents who disagreed as to the other items about adherence to the PRT approach (5%, n=1) provides evidence that the PRT Members are adhering to that approach. Table 9 reports the Client Institution response counts on the items regarding the PRT process for Visit 1 and Visit 2.

Table 9. Client Institution Responses on the Adherence to PRT Approach, Visits 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>NA/Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. We had the information we needed to work effectively with the PRT.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The PRT was well prepared for the visit.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The PRT took a positive, constructive, and solution-oriented approach to the work.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The PRT was knowledgeable about sound practices related to our Areas of Focus.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The PRT conveyed a helpful attitude in interactions with members of the institutional community.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The PRT understood the Areas of Focus in the context of the specific needs, culture and practices of our institution.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The PRT Members kept an open mind about issues and possible solutions.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The expertise of the PRT Members was a good fit for the institution’s Areas of Focus.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The PRT focused on sustainable and sound practices.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The PRT focused on solutions rather than problems or where to place blame.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. The PRT recognized institutional personnel as problem-solving peers.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. The PRT provided effective guidance to the institution in improving the implementation of our Innovation and Effectiveness Plan.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 This item was asked in the feedback survey for Visit 2.
PRT Members

PRT Members were asked, through closed-ended questions, to self-evaluate their adherence to the PRT approach, again including such areas as preparedness of the team, open-mindedness of the PRT Members, and so on. All the feedback survey items were identical for Visit 1 and Visit 2 and the responses for the visits are aggregated.

Of the PRT Members who responded to the items, almost all strongly agreed or agreed that they adhered to the PRT approach. All PRT Members reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that they conveyed a helpful attitude and understood the Areas of Focus in terms of specific needs, culture and practices of the institution. The relatively small percentage of PRT Members who disagreed as to the team adherence to any aspect of the PRT approach (5%, n=1) provides evidence that the PRT Members are adhering to that approach. Table 10 reports the PRT Member response counts on the items regarding adherence to the PRT process for Visits 1 and 2.

**Table 10. PRT Member Responses on the Adherence to PRT Approach, Visits 1 and 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>NA/Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Was well prepared for the visit.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Took a positive, constructive, and solution-oriented approach to the work.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Was knowledgeable about sound practices related to the institution's Areas of Focus?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conveyed a helpful attitude in interactions with members of the institutional community.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Recognized institutional personnel as problem-solving peers.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Focused on sustainable and sound practices.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Focused on solutions rather than problems or where to place blame.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Understood the Areas of Focus in the context of the specific needs, culture, and practices of the institution.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Kept an open mind about issues and possible solutions.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The expertise of the PRT Members was a good fit for the institution’s Areas of Focus.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PRT Functioning**

Both the Client Institutions and the PRT Members were asked, through open-ended questions, to identify up to three examples of how the PRT functioned well. Responses by Client Institutions identified time spent with the team, the providing of best practices and assistance in the Areas of Focus. Responses by PRT Members identified the effectiveness of the PRT Lead, the meetings before and between visits and the openness of the dialogue among PRT Members. Table 11 reports the most common Client Institution and PRT Member coded areas where the PRT functioned well on Visit 1 and Visit 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11. Examples of PRT Functioning Well, Visits 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Institutions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time spent with the Team (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing best practices (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Direct guidance in Areas of Focus (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Areas of Improvement**

Both the Client Institutions and the PRT Members were asked, through an open-ended item, to identify up to three examples of how the PRTs could have functioned better after Visit 1 and Visit 2. Responses by Client Institutions identified having more quality time with the PRT Members, more meetings, and between-visit communications. Responses by PRT Members identified increased time for team debriefing meetings, more effective contact with the Client Institution, and more coordinated scheduling. Table 12 reports the most common Client Institution and PRT Member coded areas where the PRT could have functioned better for Visit 1 and Visit 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12. Examples of How PRTs Could Function Better, Visits 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Institutions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time with the team (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More small group meetings with the team (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time to talk with PRT members between meetings. (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Responses were coded and reported when the same or similar answer was provided multiple times. Singular counts are not reported.
8 Responses were coded and reported when the same or similar answer was provided multiple times. Singular counts are not reported.
**Challenges**

Both the Client Institutions and PRT Members were asked, through an open-ended item, to identify challenges either preparing for or during the visit. Responses by Client Institutions identified their own preparedness for the visit, buy-in from constituency groups, and time to dedicate to the PRT process. Responses by PRT Members identified college buy-in, time constraints, the absence of key constituents from the meetings during the visit, and existing institutional practices. *Table 13* reports the most common Client Institution and PRT Member coded areas on the challenges faced during the PRT process for *Visit 1* and *Visit 2*.

| **Table 13. Challenges Preparing for or During the Visit (Visits 1 and 2)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Institutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRT Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution preparedness (3)</td>
<td>Institutional buy in (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to dedicate (3)</td>
<td>Insufficient time (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College buy-in (3)</td>
<td>Constituency absence at meetings (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing institutional practices (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training Concepts Used During the Visit**

**Training Concepts**

PRT Members were asked to identify the training concepts, pedagogies and methods used by the PRT Members at the visits. Responses by PRT Members identified taking a facilitative approach when working with the team and active listening not instructing colleges what to do to resolve their problems. *Table 14* reports the most common training concepts used by PRT Members on Visits 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 14. Training Concepts Utilized on Visits 1 and 2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRT Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative approach (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active listening (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Practice**

PRT Members were asked to identify a particular practice or action that they found most helpful in ensuring a successful and effective visit. Responses by PRT Members identified communication and facilitation skills when working with the team and use of the templates provided as part of

---

9 Responses were coded and reported when the same or similar answer was provided multiple times. Singular counts are not reported.

10 Responses were coded and reported when the same or similar answer was provided multiple times. Singular counts are not reported.
the PRT process. Table 15 reports the most common practices or actions reported as most helpful to PRT Members on Visit 1 and Visit 2.

Table 15. Most Helpful Practice or Action on Visits 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRT Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communication and facilitation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of the templates (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Suggestions

PRT Members were asked, based on their experience on the visits, to make suggestions for training improvements. Responses from the PRT Members focused on additional training in listening, and added coverage of PRT templates. Table 16 reports the most common training suggestions after Visits 1 and 2.

Table 16. Suggested Improvements to Training after Visits 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRT Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Greater focus on active listening (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More coverage of PRT templates (Including I&amp;EP) (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Takeaways

PRT Members were also asked to identify takeaways from Visit 1 and Visit 2 to measure the value gained by PRT Members as part of the process. Responses from PRT Members identified an increased appreciation for listening skills at their home institutions and a better view of their own practices after participating in the PRT visits. Table 17 reports the most common takeaways identified from Visit 1 and Visit 2.

Table 17. PRT Member Takeaways from the PRT Process after Visits 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRT Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Greater listening at meetings at home institution (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• See home institution practices more clearly (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Responses were coded and reported when the same or similar answer was provided multiple times. Singular counts are not reported.

12 Responses were coded and reported when the same or similar answer was provided multiple times. Singular counts are not reported.

13 Responses were coded and reported when the same or similar answer was provided multiple times. Singular counts are not reported.
Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training

PRT Members were finally asked to rate the overall usefulness and effectiveness of the training considering their experiences after Visit 1 and Visit 2. All PRT Members responded that the training was either excellent or good for Visit 1 and Visit 2. Table 18 reports the response counts from PRT Members for overall usefulness and effectiveness of the PRT training after Visit 1 and Visit 2.

Table 18. Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training (Visits 1 and 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Excellent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Don't Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total answered:</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logistics

The third area of inquiry of the surveys addressed the Logistics before, during, and after the visits. Closed-ended and open-ended items were generated to discover this information.

Client Institutions

All Client-Institution respondents reported at least Fair ratings as to all logistical aspects of the visits including visit dates, meeting timing, and communication with the PRT Leads and Project Director before, during and after the visits. No Client-Institution respondents reported the logistics as poor. Table 19 reports the aggregate responses for logistics for Client Institutions for Visit 1 and Visit 2.
### Table 19. Client Institutions Responses on Logistics for Visits 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>NA/Don’t Know</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Scheduling of the date of the visit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Scheduling of meetings to be held during the visit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Communication with the IEPI Project Director and/or PRT Lead before visit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Communication with the PRT Lead and/or PRT Members after visit, to date</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Effectiveness of the PRT Lead in coordinating with the institution regarding the visit.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Provision of information about the institution’s next steps following the visit.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRT Members

All PRT Members reported at least Fair ratings as to all logistical aspects of the visits including visit dates, meeting timing, and the coordination and leadership by the PRT Leads. Table 20 reports the aggregate responses for logistics for Client Institutions for Visit 1 and Visit 2.

Table 20. PRT Member Responses on Logistics (Scheduling, Meetings, Information) Visits 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Scheduling of the date of the visit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Scheduling of meetings to be held during the visit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Information about travel arrangements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Access to information related to the institution’s areas of focus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Effectiveness of team phone conference(s) before the visit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Usefulness of face-to-face team meeting just before the visit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Time available for meetings with members of the institutional community during the visit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Time available for team meetings during the visit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Coordination and leadership by the PRT Lead</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRT Members were also asked to report their clarity in their roles, the outcomes for the visits and the communication during the process. Most PRT Members reported satisfactory ratings as to all aspects of clarity, outcomes and communication during and after the visits. Table 21 reports the aggregate responses for these areas of inquiry for the PRT Members for Visit 1 and Visit 2.
In addition, PRT Members were asked about the number of hours spent preparing for the visit, completing follow-up activities, and preparing for the next visit. The average time spent reported by PRT Members for the visits were calculated for Visit 1 and Visit 2 as an aggregate. Table 22 displays the average time reported by PRT Members on Visit 1 and Visit 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Were clear about the roles and responsibilities of the team.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Were on the same page about anticipated outcomes of the PRT process.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Communicated clearly with each other.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Communicated in a timely fashion with each other.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, PRT Members were asked about the number of hours spent preparing for the visit, completing follow-up activities, and preparing for the next visit. The average time spent reported by PRT Members for the visits were calculated for Visit 1 and Visit 2 as an aggregate. Table 22 displays the average time reported by PRT Members on Visit 1 and Visit 2.

**Table 22. Total Hours Spent on PRT Process for Visits 1 and 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. preparing for this visit?</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. completing any follow-up activities related to this PRT visit to date?</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. preparing for the next PRT visit (if any) to date?</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miscellaneous**

The final area of inquiry elicited open-ended responses from participants to share any thoughts or comments on the PRT process for Visit 1 and Visit 2. Nine (9) of the 39 respondents provided feedback on this item, yielding a response rate of 23%. Responses were general in nature and overall very positive about the PRT process, but provided no new data beyond what was already garnered from responses to the earlier questions in the survey.