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Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is a collaborative effort of the California Community Colleges (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. Through IEPI, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) and its partners offer professional development workshops and online resources for CCC faculty, staff, and administrators.

More than three-quarters of CCC students need basic skills coursework in mathematics and English. Yet, basic skills courses typically have high attrition and low success rates, and students placed into the lowest levels of basic skills sequences face a lengthy time to degree and are much less likely to graduate. To address these concerns, in 2015-16 the state provided the CCC system with $90 million for campus grants to support the adoption or expansion of evidence-based practices that boost student success in basic skills education. These grants, called the Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation (BSSOT) grants, were awarded to colleges that articulated a compelling plan for adopting or expanding two or more high-impact strategies that transform basic skills outcomes. In all, 64 colleges received grants of up to $1.5 million to execute programs during a three-year period, from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019.

The BSSOT Grant Program Kick-off Summit was held in Sacramento on August 2 and 3, 2016. Sponsored by IEPI, in collaboration with the Chancellor’s Office Academic Affairs Division, the statewide Academic Senate, and California Community Colleges’ Success Network, the summit’s overarching purpose was to help position community colleges that had received transformation grants to be successful in achieving their objectives as they embarked on the first year of the grant. At the event, 62 of the 64 funded colleges were represented.

EdInsights designed a summit participant survey to collect information in the following areas:

- usefulness of the summit in helping participants achieve the summit’s learning outcomes;
- participants’ plans and need for support to take action based on the summit;
- effectiveness of the summit in helping colleges achieve institutional goals required by IEPI;
- participants’ experiences with and interest in other IEPI activities and resources;
- quality of the presenters and of IEPI’s delivery of the summit; and
- demographic information, such as a participant’s college, role, and function.
KEY FINDINGS

Respondents Reported the Summit Positioned Colleges to be Successful with Their Grants

Two-thirds of respondents rated the summit as quite useful or extremely useful in the overarching goal of the summit: positioning colleges to be successful with the objectives of their transformation grants. Three-quarters of respondents found the summit quite useful or extremely useful for college team building. Roughly one-half to two-thirds of respondents found the summit quite useful or extremely useful for learning about specific best practices in basic skills, which were the focus of their grants. Respondents felt the summit was least useful for deepening understanding of integrated planning (45%), reporting requirements (39%), and relevant state rules and regulations (35%).

Respondents Reported the Summit Supported the IEPI Goal of Improving Student Performance and Outcomes

Respondents found the summit most useful in supporting the statewide IEPI goal of improving student performance and outcomes. Sixty percent of respondents thought the summit was quite useful or extremely useful for improving student performance and outcomes, and another 25% found it moderately useful. Respondents found the summit less useful for other IEPI goals, which was not surprising, given the summit’s primary focus on student outcomes, as well as the attendees’ primary focus on instruction, in terms of their role and function. Lower ratings for the IEPI goals concerning fiscal viability and compliance were consistent with lower ratings related to summit learning outcomes on understanding state rules and regulations and on using integrated planning to leverage funding and increase sustainability.

Respondents Reported Summit Quality Met Expectations

Respondents reported satisfaction with the summit quality, with almost all respondents stating that it met or exceeded expectations. Sixty percent of respondents rated the overall quality of presenters as better than expected or outstanding, and another 35% said presenters met expectations. Fifty-six percent rated the overall quality of the summit implementation as better than expected or outstanding, and another 35% said it met expectations. Respondents especially appreciated networking and learning across colleges, as well as having repeated breakout sessions and time built into the agenda to meet with their own college teams.

Respondents Would Like More Learning About Effective Implementation Strategies

Many respondents requested future professional learning events and other assistance focused on the practicalities of how to successfully implement grant strategies. These could include presentations on how best practice models were implemented at other colleges, ongoing structured opportunities for college off-site teamwork and exchange with peers at other colleges, tools for integrated planning, and project management training and resources. Those surveyed said they also would like help with change management, especially strategies for gaining faculty buy-in and overcoming resistance to change, which they reported as the most significant obstacle to success. Respondents noted that material in the summit had already been covered at the grant application stage, and that colleges already have funded plans for action. As such,
they sought information about and support for how to successfully implement their plans, rather than being sold on the importance of basic skills reform and learning about best practice models.

**Respondents Need More Clarity About Reporting and Accounting Requirements**

Respondents also expected to receive more information about the practicalities of grant accounting and reporting; they were disappointed that this information was relegated to a short session at the very end of the summit. Some respondents said they left the event without clarity on accounting and reporting expectations, restrictions, and guidelines, and were lacking information about how to integrate planning across funding programs and initiatives. They requested additional resources to support this aspect of their planning.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFINING THE SUMMIT EXPERIENCE**

To enhance the continued success of BSSOT grantees, EdInsights recommends:

- including a focus on grant implementation and project management strategies in future programming;
- providing more clarity about rules, reporting, and accounting requirements; and
- publishing a calendar of events to support grantees’ ability to plan for future events.

To enhance the integrated use of IEPI resources, EdInsights recommends:

- reminding professional learning resource providers to focus on the “how” of implementation, as relevant;
- integrating workshops with the PLN (Professional Learning Network) as a resource for project management, including change management;
- continuing to develop strategies to embed support for integrated planning into IEPI professional learning activities; and
- coaching resource developers on opportunities to integrate learning across IEPI goals.
Overview

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is a collaborative effort of the California Community Colleges (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 professional development workshops and online resources for community college faculty, staff, and administrators.

Since 2006, the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) has had a goal of improving student access and success for CCC students with basic skills needs. As open access institutions, community colleges address the needs of learners with very varied levels of preparation. More than three-quarters of students need basic skills coursework in mathematics and English; additional remediation is required in areas such as reading and English as a Second Language, which are not traditionally defined as basic skills courses. As a result of the BSI, colleges have learned that basic skills courses typically have high attrition and low success rates, and that students placed into the lowest levels of basic skills sequences face a lengthy time to degree and are much less likely to graduate.

To address these concerns, the state provided the CCC system with $90 million for campus grants to support the adoption or expansion of evidence-based practices that boost student success in basic skills education. These grants, called the Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation (BSSOT) grants, were awarded to colleges that articulated a compelling plan for adopting or expanding two or more high-impact strategies that transform basic skills outcomes. Grants were awarded in two rounds; the original sum of $60 million allocated in 2015-16 was supplemented by a $30 million allocation from the 2016-17 budget. In all, 64 colleges received grants of up to $1.5 million to execute programs during a three-year period, from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019. In the first round of funding, 43 colleges received grants; in the second round, 21 colleges received grants. Both cohorts were funded to execute programs during the same period; however, the cohort notified in the first round had three additional months to plan prior to the summit.

IEPI hosted the BSSOT Program Kick-off Summit in Sacramento on August 2 and 3, 2016. In collaboration with the Chancellor’s Office Academic Affairs Division, the statewide Academic Senate, and California Community Colleges’ Success Network, IEPI’s overarching purpose for the summit was to help position transformation grant recipients to be successful in achieving their objectives as they embarked on the first year of the grant. At the event, 62 of the 64 funded colleges were represented. The summit took place over one and a half days and featured four breakout sessions, guided activities for college teams, a community connection activity to introduce participants to colleagues at other colleges who shared common objectives, and a concluding plenary session on budget and sustainability issues. Breakout sessions were repeated to allow participants to attend more of their preferred choices, and a team meeting space was provided so colleges could meet together during the summit.
To help the CCCC0 understand how well the program met its identified goals and outcomes as well as its participants’ needs, EdInsights designed a summit participant survey to collect information in the following areas:

- usefulness of the workshops in helping participants achieve the summit’s learning outcomes;
- participants’ plans and need for support to take action based on the summit;
- effectiveness of the summit in helping colleges achieve institutional goals required by IEPI;
- participants’ experiences with and interest in other IEPI activities and resources;
- quality of the presenters and of IEPI’s delivery of the summit; and
- demographic information, such as a participant’s college, role, and function.

A detailed discussion of the survey methodology is included in Appendix A, and Appendix B lists the survey questions.
**Understanding Summit Attendance**

*Half of respondents reported that they were faculty. Two-thirds of the respondents reported that their primary function was instruction.*

Respondents were asked to identify their primary role (see Figure 1). Half of respondents were faculty, and almost all of them had full-time status. Thirty-six percent were administrators, including executives (2%), deans (17%), and directors/coordinators (17%). The remainder were classified staff (8%) or identified themselves as “other” (5%).

**Figure 1. What is your primary role?**

Respondents also provided their primary area of work (see Figure 2). Two-thirds of respondents worked in instruction. The remaining third were in student services (15%), research and planning (9%), business or administrative services (1%), or listed their work as “other” (7%).

**Figure 2. What is your primary area of work?**

---

1 Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.
How Useful Was the Summit in Meeting Learning Objectives?

Attendees rated how useful the summit was in helping them accomplish the learning outcomes identified by conference providers and CCCCO staff. Two-thirds of respondents rated the summit as quite useful or extremely useful in the overarching goal of the summit: positioning colleges to be successful with the objectives of their transformation grants. Roughly one-half to two-thirds of respondents found the summit quite useful or extremely useful for learning about specific best practices in basic skills, which were the focus of their grants. In terms of other learning goals, respondents said the summit was most useful for college team building (75%) and connecting with experts (65%). They felt the summit was least useful for deepening understanding of integrated planning (45%), reporting requirements (39%), and relevant state rules and regulations (35%).

HOW USEFUL WAS THE SUMMIT IN INCREASING KNOWLEDGE OF BASIC SKILLS BEST PRACTICES?

Roughly one-half to two-thirds of respondents found the summit quite useful or extremely useful for learning about specific best practices in basic skills.

Respondents were asked about the usefulness of the summit in increasing knowledge of specific best practices relevant to the BSSOT grants’ objectives (see Figure 3). We limited respondents for each outcome to those who indicated that their funded grant focused on that specific intervention. Respondents found the summit quite useful or extremely useful for learning about these topical areas: multiple measures (65%), learning assistance (65%), acceleration (60%), professional development (56%), contextualizing basic skills (56%), and co-requisites (48%).

---

2 Respondents rated the usefulness using a five-point Likert scale: not at all useful, slightly useful, moderately useful, quite useful, and extremely useful.
HOW USEFUL WAS THE SUMMIT IN SUPPORTING COLLEGES’ ABILITY TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN ACHIEVING GRANT OBJECTIVES?

Two-thirds of respondents rated the summit quite useful or extremely useful in the overarching goal of positioning their college to be successful with its transformation grant objectives.

Providers also identified additional learning outcomes intended to support their college’s ability to be successful in achieving its grant objectives (see Figure 4). Nearly two-thirds of respondents rated the summit quite useful or extremely useful in the overarching goal of positioning their college to be successful with its transformation grant objectives. In terms of other outcomes, more than half of respondents found the summit quite useful or extremely useful in the following areas: “building relationships with colleagues from my own college with shared responsibility for our grant’s success” (75%), “connecting with experts in the field who deepened my understanding of potential successful models that my college can implement” (65%), “supporting my college’s implementation team to determine concrete next steps for implementing our proposals” (60%), and “building relationships with colleagues from other campuses with shared transformation grant objectives” (51%). Fewer than half of respondents said the summit was quite or extremely useful in the following areas: “deepening understanding of how my college can integrate planning for related initiatives to leverage funding sources and sustain innovations” (45%), “deepening my understanding of transformation grant reporting requirements” (39%), and “deepening my understanding of state rules and regulations that could impact the success of my college’s grant” (35%).
Of note, respondents who were notified of being awarded funding from the Chancellor’s Office in the first round were much more likely to state that the summit was extremely useful for positioning their college to be successful with its grant (see Figure 5). This suggests that the extra three months of planning enabled by the early notification was significant in terms of team formation and related activities, most likely including those colleges’ ability to identify and recruit the right individuals to send to the summit. The late notification was unavoidable due to the timing of additional funding from the state. However, now that the full cohort of colleges with grants is in place, recognizing the importance of adequate lead time for maximizing success could be helpful in informing the planning of future support activities.

---

3 Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.
How Well Did the Summit Support Implementation Planning for Community College Basic Skills Transformation Grants?

Respondents indicated that they will make use of what they learned at the summit to redesign programs; to integrate planning across programs, funding streams, and governance structures; and to engage campus stakeholders to ensure success. Respondents who articulated clear impacts anticipated process improvements, including better collaboration and communication across their campuses, as well as improved student outcomes. The primary obstacles respondents identified were overcoming resistance to change and gaining the buy-in of their colleagues. Respondents were interested in additional professional development activities, especially those focused on strategies for effective grant implementation.

WHAT WERE RESPONDENTS' INTENDED ACTIONS AS A RESULT OF THE SUMMIT?

Respondents indicated that they intend to move forward with redesigning programs, integrating planning, and engaging campus stakeholders to ensure success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Action</th>
<th>Number of Mentions by Unique Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and Execute Programs</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Planning (Across Programs, Funding Streams, Governance Structures)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage Stakeholders/Share Information With Colleagues</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form/Participate in Implementation Teams/Committees</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a Tool/Follow-up With Contacts From Summit</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer Professional Learning/Training/Development</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Data/Evaluation Tools/Infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-two respondents indicated that they intend to move forward with the redesign of their basic skills programs and take actions related to implementation. Sample comments included:

“[We intend to] implement a co-requisite model. We were able to strategize how it can be done within our unique system.”

“We had a post-conference debriefing the day after the conference to put together a specific plan of next steps, including the hiring and appointment of personnel to leadership positions on the grant, and the scheduling of additional courses related to the grant in the current academic year.”

“[We plan to] refocus efforts to incorporate multiple measures (GPA, etc.) into our placement system [and] strengthen ties between instruction and student services to provide a support structure in the classroom.”

Nineteen respondents stated an intention to integrate planning across programs, funding streams, and governance structures:

“We will begin by engaging in a crosswalk of all other initiatives and grants on campus.”

“Our team is moving forward with a unified vision for our different initiatives -- accelerated, professional development, and SI (Supplemental Instruction). We have identified the stakeholders and are positioned to bring collaboration between Instruction and Student Services in ways we were not successful before. The specific requirements of the grant will keep us on track for our comprehensive goal of implementing SI in Basic Skills and Gateway courses – which, at our college, requires breaking down separate services and bridging support to our students across disciplines and ‘houses.’”

“Our college came in on the second round, and we are just getting started with implementation plans. We plan to meet and determine what our priorities will be, based on the plan that was submitted, and discuss how each program – BSI, SSSP (Student Success and Support Program), and SEP (Student Educational Plan) – can work to integrate services and to efficiently support students while achieving our objectives.”

Seventeen respondents intend to engage stakeholders and share information learned at the summit with colleagues:

“We left the summit with an action plan to present at our annual SSSP, SEP, and BSI joint retreat next week. We also came up with three specific strategies for building support for the MMAP (Multiple Measures Assessment Project) portion of the grant.”
“I plan to use the information and research learned to help my colleagues understand why we need to transform, especially related to utilizing Multiple Measures. The team of three who attended decided to start encouraging colleagues to join our team (to increase our numbers) by using information from this summit. I also plan to review and learn the info provided to us in the sessions so I will be able to pass it on to my colleagues.”

Fourteen respondents stated an intention to form or participate on an implementation team:

“We have a clear plan to develop two teams (one centered on co-requisites and the other on acceleration), both of which will undergo similar training and meet together frequently.”

“We formed a BSSOT team to work with our shared governance Basic Skills Committee to oversee implementation of the grant. We have been assigned tasks/strategies/objectives to help shepherd the grant along.”

Fourteen respondents said they will implement a tool they learned about at the summit or will follow up with contacts they made there:

“I plan to use the tools I learned in Craig Hayward’s workshop to create more compelling graphs to build more buy-in for acceleration at my college.”

“I am recommending that our college adopt the MMAP model presented at the summit. We will also use the information we gained at the summit to apply to our currently planned activities.”

“[I will] probably talk or even visit one or two colleges that presented at the meetings.”

Nine respondents will offer professional learning opportunities on their home campuses:

“[We will] plan and carry out a Flex Cal (in-service training) session to communicate the goals of our project(s) and demonstrate one of the practices that we learned at a different conference earlier in the summer. [We will] plan further professional development sessions later in the semester or next.”

“We have implemented Multiple Measures for direct placement into transfer on math and are working toward English. We have successful acceleration programs, so we are looking into providing professional development to sustain those programs.”

Four respondents indicated they will be developing data evaluation tools and structures:

“I plan to assist with the development of evaluation tools to effectively evaluate the progress of the transformation program.”
WHAT SPECIFIC IMPACTS FROM THESE ACTIONS DID RESPONDENTS ANTICIPATE?

*Respondents who articulated clear impacts that were likely to result from actions inspired by the summit said they anticipated process improvements, especially improved collaboration, and improved student outcomes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Impact</th>
<th>Number of Mentions by Unique Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact (unspecified)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Collaboration/More Effective Processes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Student Outcomes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Alignment of Initiatives/Utilization of Funding</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large number of respondents did not articulate specific impacts beyond a general positive statement such as, “A great impact!” Many respondents expressed the general hope that the actions would lead to successful outcomes without specifying what those outcomes would be. This could be a symptom of survey fatigue, an indication that respondents felt they had already successfully identified impacts of the grant, and/or a sign that respondents did not feel confident about identifying and describing impacts effectively.

Twenty-one respondents anticipated improved process outcomes, such as better collaboration and more effective communication:

> “There will be greater understanding of the purposes and objectives of all grants and initiatives and a more cohesive and collaborative approach to closing achievement and equity gaps.”

> “[The impact will be] high – consistent experience across departments for students, increased collegiality within and across departments.”

Sixteen respondents anticipated specific student success outcomes:

> “I am hoping that these transformation techniques will bring our success rate in developmental mathematics to about 70% or higher.”
“It will greatly increase the number of students completing transfer level math within two years.”

A few respondents pointed to better alignment of initiatives, which would result in improved utilization of funding:

“Before the summit, we had already discussed the need for a common vision among the SSSP, SEP, and BSI committees on campus. We now know even more how important this coordination will be and are geared up to make it happen. In particular, we have set a goal for our retreat to align our evaluations of activities in all three areas in order to eliminate duplication (as much as possible).”

“We have so many funding streams and teams working on similar objectives. We simply need to be more clearly aligned.”

WHAT SPECIFIC OBSTACLES DID RESPONDENTS ANTICIPATE IN IMPLEMENTING INTENDED ACTIONS?

The primary obstacle respondents identified was the challenge of gaining faculty buy-in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles Anticipated</th>
<th>Number of Mentions by Unique Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Buy-in/Overcoming Resistance</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time/Ability to Achieve Timely Results</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Across Silos</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Support/Resources/Personnel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Space Constraints</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges in Revamping Curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Clarity re: Grant Guidelines/Expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resistance to change was the primary obstacle identified by respondents (35):

“Our writing program still holds onto the idea that some students benefit from deceleration. This belief is impervious to statistical evidence, which is also frustrating.”
“[Obstacles are] tension within faculty with regard to speed of change [and] curriculum committee resistance to [the] co-requisite model. Even if we fund [professional development], their participation is voluntary.”

“The biggest obstacle is faculty buy-in. There are so many categorical programs around at the moment and in the past that our faculty may have categorical program burn-out/fatigue.”

“Our college is very slow to change, in general, and currently has many obstacles in place that prevent effective long term professional development activities for adjunct faculty in basic skills areas. Unless we find ways of incentivizing these activities for adjunct faculty, we are concerned about scaling up our successful programs.”

Concerns about finding bandwidth for executing the grant and being able to achieve timely change were also identified as key obstacles by respondents (20):

“The short time frame [is an obstacle]. Three years is a short period to drastically change policies and procedures on assessment and placement that have been around for many years.”

“Human Resources takes multiple months to help us fill support staff positions. Unspent grant funds due to the delay in staffing start dates might need to be moved to another object code to use funds effectively and in a timely manner due to expenditure deadlines.”

“I am worried that the faculty and administration who are tasked with doing this work are already overextended and suffering from initiative fatigue.”

Some respondents mentioned the challenges associated with integrating planning across silos (10):

“Varied objectives and reporting requirements tied to each grant/fund force the teams tied to those categories to separate somewhat. Instead of just focusing on students, so much of the time is spent jumping through hoops to meet various unaligned requirements or deadlines.”

“[Obstacles include] coordinating the various grant activities into a coherent initiative, working across different offices and areas of the college, different levels of interest and commitment between the math and English departments, and the ongoing tensions related to the ambiguous status of reading as a BSI subject in the CCCs.”

“Too many chefs with too much overlap over outcomes and definition of success.”
Additional obstacles identified included a lack of support and resources, including human resources (6); challenges related to sustainability of the initiative, both in terms of avoiding burn-out and institutionalizing changes after the grant funding ends (4); scarcity of physical space, including classrooms and labs (3); and a lack of clarity regarding grant guidelines and expectations (2).

**HOW COULD IEPI HELP RESPONDENTS OVERCOME THESE OBSTACLES?**

*Respondents are interested in additional professional development activities, especially those focused on implementation issues.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Support Needed</th>
<th>Number of Mentions by Unique Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Summits or Similar Events</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Focused on Implementation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance With Change Management</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Reporting and Accounting Requirements</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Topics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons From the Field/Site Visits/Technical Support</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLearning (Webinars, Professional Learning Network)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Development Content**

In terms of the content, respondents (12) requested a focus on the nuts and bolts of successful implementation strategies at future events, including time for college off-site teamwork, tools for integrated planning, and project management tools and resources, e.g., for change management, data collection, group facilitation, and meeting scheduling:

“[We need additional support for] team work, integrated planning, dealing with resistance (passive and active), collaboration across groups (aka "silos"), institutional change/reform, setting and implementing a vision. The summit focused on student-oriented topics (assessment, curriculum, instruction, tutoring/SI), and these topics are all VERY important. Still, many of the challenges happen behind the scenes between college employees. How do people with different experiences and interests work together to change the way a college serves its students? (For example, I know all about the results of Long Beach City College’s Multiple
Measures initiative, but very little about how the college came to agree on making these changes."

"I would suggest implementation models be developed (e.g., the acceleration model; the non-credit to credit basic skills model; models that begin two levels below transfer level coursework, or three levels [below]; and a model that shows how transformation activity impacts other programs and the campus operations). These models could serve as basic architecture for colleges to consider/use as they build transformation activities/programs."

"I wish there were more time at such events for the team to work as a team. Doing that off campus is so beneficial because the dynamics shift; territoriality diminishes."

"There was limited discussion at the event about aligning transformation efforts with SEP/SSSP/BSI and others. More of this needs to happen. Not just using the funds, but planning."

"[We could use] some resources for project management. I would love for the state to provide a form-making program, like Cognito Forms, to help us to collect/organize/preserve information. (I think something like this might be in the works?) Also, maybe some helpful hints about facilitation and meeting schedules and such."

Several respondents (8) were looking for specific, concrete strategies for how to manage change with colleagues:

"[I would like to] learn from other colleges how they developed consensus from faculty who may not have wanted to change or participate."

"It might be helpful to have state curriculum specialists write a document providing guidance for faculty and campus curriculum committees in terms of implementing acceleration and co-requisites. Perhaps curriculum chairs could receive training on the interventions listed in the grant so they are less resistant to curriculum that integrates [these interventions]."

Other respondents (8) requested more support related to specific topics, including co-requisites, summer bridge programs, payment of adjuncts in view of ACA (Affordable Care Act) regulations, contextualizing the curriculum, connecting transformation to enrollment management, building communities of practice, and common assessment tools.
Several respondents (7) requested more training, information, and clarity on grant reporting and accounting requirements, e.g., grant reporting, spending parameters, and budget roll-over rules:

“I know the state is learning on the fly, but I halfway expected a binder showing what was expected as far as progression and reports.”

The suggestions for professional development content, especially the focus on implementation and grant management issues, are consistent with respondents’ suggestions for improvements to the summit that are discussed later in this report.

**Professional Development Formats**

In terms of delivery format, respondents (12) requested additional summits or similar opportunities to meet with colleagues across the state.

“It might be worthwhile convening a similar activity next year and the following year to keep programs on track, provide opportunities to share best practices, and discuss challenges.”

“[I suggest you] have a Southern California conference...as we get deeper into our grant tasks.”

Other respondents (7) were interested in lessons from the field, site visits, and technical support. Some respondents (6) also suggested online learning and electronic resources, including monthly webinars, timely FAQs, and utilization of the Professional Learning Network for sharing summit resources.
How Useful Was the Summit in Meeting IEPI Institutional Goals?

Respondents found the summit most useful for supporting the IEPI goal of improving student performance and outcomes, which is consistent with the primary focus of the event and the roles and functions of attendees.

Participants varied in their familiarity with IEPI goals (see Figure 6). A little less than half the respondents described themselves as quite familiar or extremely familiar, just under a quarter of them were moderately familiar, and a little over a quarter were only slightly or not at all familiar.

Figure 6. IEPI requires colleges to set goals related to the IEPI Framework of Indicators. How familiar are you with your college’s IEPI goals?

While variability existed in knowledge of IEPI goals, respondents found the summit most useful in supporting the statewide IEPI goal of improving student performance and outcomes, which is consistent with the summit’s primary focus (see Figure 7). Sixty percent of respondents thought the summit was quite or extremely useful for bettering student performance and outcomes, and another 25% felt it was moderately useful.

In terms of improving programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines, 26% of respondents found the summit quite useful or extremely useful, and an additional 28% said it was moderately useful. In terms of improving fiscal viability, 20% rated it as quite useful or extremely useful, and another 22% felt it was moderately useful. In terms of reducing audit issues and accreditation sanctions, 13% found it quite useful or extremely useful, and another 26% felt it as moderately useful.

These findings are unsurprising, given the summit’s primary focus on student outcomes, as well as the attendees’ primary focus on instruction, in terms of their role and function. However, lower ratings on IEPI goals related to fiscal viability and compliance are also consistent with lower ratings for summit learning outcomes related to integrating planning to leverage funding.

---

4 Attendees rated the usefulness of the workshops in supporting IEPI’s desired outcomes on a five-point scale: not at all familiar, slightly familiar, moderately familiar, quite familiar, and extremely familiar.
sources and sustain successful interventions and to deepening understanding of state rules and regulations that could impact the success of grants. This suggests there may be some productive opportunities to improve the overall outcomes of the IEPI initiative by integrating learning across IEPI goals in future professional learning activities supporting BSSOT grantees.

**Figure 7.** How useful was this workshop in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following IEPI goals? (Responses of quite useful and extremely useful)
To What Extent Are Respondents Making Use of IEPI Resources?

While the percentage of respondents who had utilized other IEPI resources prior to the summit was low, a majority expressed interest in attending another IEPI workshop and in accessing professional learning resources online.

Forty-four percent of respondents had previously attended an IEPI workshop (see Figure 8). For other IEPI resources, 25% had utilized the Professional Learning Network (PLN), 20% had a Partnership Resource Team (PRT) visit their college, 7% had created a professional development plan on the PLN website, and 3% had served on a PRT at another college. The PLN website was rolled out in April 2016, providing context for the percentage of participants who had accessed it by early August 2016, when the summit was held.

![Figure 8. Use of IEPI resources in the past? (Respondents affirming use of IEPI resources)](image)

Based on their experiences at the summit, respondents were asked about their interest in using IEPI resources in the future (see Figure 9). A majority of respondents expressed interest in using the PLN (64%), attending another IEPI workshop (63%), and creating a professional development plan on the PLN (54%).

In terms of technical support, 43% percent said they would like a PRT at their college, and 27% were interested in serving on a PRT at another college. Respondents who were notified in the first round of awards were statistically significantly (p<0.55) more likely to say they would like a PRT at their college (50% of first-round awardees, compared to 28% of second-round awardees).

Of the remaining respondents, the majority selected "not sure," rather than "no." Further outreach and publicity about the benefits of IEPI professional learning and technical support may be helpful to sway those who are undecided.
Figure 9. Based on your experience at this summit, are you interested in using any of the following resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serve on a PRT at another college</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT at my college</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Plan on the PLN</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPI Professional Development workshop(s)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLN</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Did Respondents Rate the Quality of the Summit?

Respondents were satisfied with the summit quality, with almost all respondents stating that it met or exceeded expectations. Sixty-one percent of respondents rated the overall quality of presenters as better than expected or outstanding, and another 35% said presenters met expectations. Fifty-six percent rated the overall quality of the summit implementation as better than expected or outstanding, and another 35% said it met expectations. Respondents especially appreciated networking and learning across colleges, having repeated breakout sessions, and having time built into the agenda to meet within college teams. However, a large number of respondents cited a need for greater focus on issues of both grant implementation and management, which were largely missing from the summit content.

HOW HIGHLY DID RESPONDENTS RATE THE QUALITY OF SUMMIT PRESENTERS AND SUMMIT DELIVERY?

Respondents were satisfied with the summit’s quality, with almost all respondents stating that the summit met or exceeded their expectations. Sixty-one percent of respondents rated the overall quality of the presenters as better than expected or outstanding, while another 35% indicated that presenters met their expectations (see Figure 10).5

Respondents also rated the presenters as better than expected or outstanding in the following areas: responsiveness to questions (58%), knowledge (55%), preparation (48%), and communication (46%). For these same categories, almost all of the remaining respondents said

---

5 Participants were asked to rate presenters and workshop implementation on a five-point Likert scale: unacceptable, below expectations, met expectations, better than expected, and outstanding.
presenters met their expectations.

Participants were also asked to rate IEPI’s delivery of the summit (see Figure 11). Overall, 56% of respondents rated the summit as better than expected or outstanding, and another 35% stated that it met expectations.

Despite their overall satisfaction with the summit, respondents rated specific components of the summit implementation slightly lower than the overall rating. About half rated the organization (53%) and pacing (49%) as better than expected or outstanding. Less than half listed the accommodations (44%), the room set-up (41%), refreshments (36%), and the materials (34%) as better than expected or outstanding. Although the vast majority of remaining respondents said these items met their expectations, a small percentage was dissatisfied. Overall, the percentage of respondents who found specific aspects of the implementation of the summit below expectations or unacceptable was consistent with the less than 10% of respondents who were dissatisfied with the implementation of the summit overall; however, more respondents were dissatisfied with refreshments than with other items (20%). (See Appendix for full survey results).

Figure 11. How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following? (Responses of better than expected and outstanding)

![Bar chart showing respondents' satisfaction with summit implementation](attachment:image.png)

Participants were also asked specifically about the summit length. Seventy-seven percent of respondents said the length was just right, while 16% indicated it was too short and 7% felt it was too long.

**WHAT WERE RESPONDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT WORKED BEST ABOUT THE SUMMIT?**

*Highlights cited by respondents were networking/learning across colleges, the format of repeated breakout sessions, as well as time built into the agenda to meet with their college team.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Worked Best</th>
<th>Number of Mentions by Unique Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking/Learning Across Colleges</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated Break-out Sessions</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Meet Within College Teams</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Appreciation/Praise</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content/Topics/Information</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break-out Sessions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Speakers/Presentations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Logistics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Session on Implementation/Reporting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration/Motivation to Get Started</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents appreciated the opportunity to make connections with like-minded colleagues at other institutions pursuing similar goals:

“I learned a lot from hearing what other schools have implemented. I also learned many things from speaking to various faculty from other schools.”

Respondents were enthusiastic that breakout sessions were repeated, giving them multiple opportunities to attend their preferred sessions:

“I loved that the sessions were repeated! That was brilliant!”

The value of time set aside for college teams to meet and plan as a group was noted by multiple respondents:

“[What worked best was] team time built in so that we had valuable time to meet with our college’s own team and strategize.”

Respondents also praised “topics aligned with the strategies of the grant,” “great speakers with great presentations,” and “speakers who came prepared with handouts we could review and use on the spot.”
A number of respondents expressed appreciation for the summit as a whole:

“Thank you for a valuable professional experience. I know that we will be able to translate our work into student success.”

“This summit came at a perfect time to help with the initiative.”

“We now know how to proceed with our Multiple Measure conversation, and we have specific research to share with our peers. I know that our plan can change some (as long as the activity is research-based), and our whole team has a better understanding of the magnitude and scope of this transformation in the whole state!”

WHAT WERE RESPONDENTS’ SUGGESTIONS FOR SUMMIT IMPROVEMENTS?

A large number of respondents cited a need for greater focus on the issues of grant implementation and grant management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions for Improvement</th>
<th>Number of Mentions by Unique Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Focus on Grant Implementation/Management Issues</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing/Schedule</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue/Location</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Team Activities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicize Agenda in Advance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-college Interaction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints About Speakers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Support for Speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More Focus on Grant Implementation and Management

Many respondents (33) wished that the summit had focused more on how to implement and manage their grants. These findings were consistent with the lower quantitative ratings related to the summit learning goals of deepening attendees’ understanding of integrated planning, reporting requirements, and relevant state rules and regulations pertaining to their grants.
Respondents noted that material in the summit had already been covered at the grant application stage, and that colleges already have funded plans for action. Rather than being sold on the importance of basic skills reform and learning about best practice models, they were looking for information on how to successfully implement their plans. Respondents also expected to receive more information about the nuts and bolts of grant accounting and reporting; they were disappointed that this information was relegated to a short session at the very end of the summit. Some respondents said they left without clarity on accounting and reporting expectations, restrictions and guidelines, and on how to integrate planning between funding programs and initiatives.

Representative comments included:

“It seemed as though the majority of the sessions were best practices, which are interesting, to some extent, but since the grant was written with specific projects, it was not that helpful to see more ideas when the grant money is already spent/accounted for. Going to the summit, my college already had a good plan in place for the projects.”

“As grant director, I need resources to learn how to work with my team and organize goals. Our college isn't too hot at strategic planning, so I'd like to learn how to do that in whatever way I can (maybe just teaming up with other funding sources). I'm contacting friends who work in project management in the private sector, so I can get ideas from them. Right now, support in [project management] is what I need most.”

“I was sorely disappointed that we went to breakout sessions that often told us how great certain things were when we already know the things we are planning on doing and just have little idea how to implement them! That was not really talked about at all. Although I liked the talk by John Hetts, I am already on board with Multiple Measures and would have liked to know more about how to implement it on campus. Reporting is also so important, and that was quickly discussed at the end. That type of thing stresses people out, yet we heard more about what people are doing at other colleges than working on what WE needed to be doing at our college. There was very little team time, which we really need, and once school starts, the whirlwind begins. I would have liked more supported planning sessions during the summit. As it is, I am not sure exactly what I even got out of it and am glad I didn't have to fly from far away to attend.”

“Laws [were] mentioned with little explanation and no documents provided or clear state contacts for support. We were excited about the opportunity to learn about implementation and reporting on the last day, but that fell flat, and there was just a cursory and brief monologue. Very disappointing. We are still clueless on whom to contact and how to report, when the grant period begins, where the money is...Everything!”
“Attendees are the choir. They don’t need to be convinced of the value of grant goals. They need practical tools and strategies for getting the work done and for creating the infrastructure for data collection. Does each college have to figure out how to collect data on this project? Could that not be somehow organized at the state level? We need to resolve the coding issue of [what courses qualify as] basic skills. Many accelerated courses are coded as degree applicable and do not currently ‘count’ as basic skills, although they are serving the exact same students. This needs to be fixed. Can’t we consider any course in English, math, or ESL that is not transferable as basic skills?”

“I had truly hoped this summit would be more about planning how to implement and even measure outcomes. It felt like we were hit rapid fire at the end with fine print on the requirements, when in reality, I would have liked to have been discussing those the entire time while planning how to tackle them. Instead, most of the presentations were good, but did not address our planning needs.”

“The summit would have been better if it were more forward-looking. Back in February, I attended an Application Workshop. The summit seemed to serve a similar purpose of advocating for BSI reform and offering ideas for activities. Now that our activities have been funded, what can we do to be successful? If the program (with workshop descriptions) had come out before the summit, I might not have attended. I wound up mostly going to presentations I’d seen/heard/read about before (many times, for some), but they were the ones appropriate to my role on our team. There were some important moments and ideas that came from attending, though.”

Improved Conference Logistics

Respondents noted some challenges presented by the large number of attendees. There were not enough rooms reserved at the hotel, and breakout sessions were crowded:

“Be better prepared on the front end for response to the event. The hotel sold out early, as did the event, including the registration for presenters.”

“Perhaps suggest a limit on attendees from the colleges. My college was not able to bring more than three people because there was no more room. Is there a way to reserve five seats for each college up to a given date?”

“The breakout rooms were very crowded, too – more room was needed for the number of attendees.”

Several respondents asked that the agenda for the summit be published further in advance to enable effective travel planning and recruitment of team members:
“It would be incredibly helpful to have the schedule for the conference posted at least a week in advance so people can make informed travel arrangements.”

“Having more notice would have allowed recruitment of more faculty to attend. Many faculty members had already planned their summer vacations and were unavailable to attend during the first week of August.”

“[I recommend] better communication about what will actually happen at the summit. We brought our Account Tech because we were led to believe that there would be a session on reporting, compliance, etc. However, there were no breakout sessions on this topic, and Wednesday morning’s session was not very detailed.”

Other logistical suggestions included: having better breakfast options on both days, providing a list of local restaurants for dinner, letting participants know about hotel shuttle service to the airport, and including a map of the venue in the conference program. One presenter requested more advance notification, more communications about expectations, and a way to have expenses covered up front.

A number of recommendations were related to the pacing of the event and the time allotted for various activities, with no clear consensus emerging. This is consistent with the quantitative findings about the length of the summit, with respondents who were dissatisfied disagreeing about whether the summit was too short (16%) or too long (7%).
Recommendations for Future Professional Learning

Based on an analysis of the survey data, EdInsights offers recommendations for continued professional learning support for BSSOT grantees and for IEPI professional learning activities as a whole.

SUPPORTING BSSOT GRANTEES

To ensure the continued success of BSSOT grantees, EdInsights recommends that any future professional development programs provide greater support for grant implementation and management strategies and more clarity about rules, reporting, and accounting requirements. Moreover, we recommend publishing a predictable calendar of events to support grantees’ ability to plan for these events.

Include a focus on grant implementation and project management strategies in future programming

Respondents expressed a desire for ongoing professional learning opportunities, like the summit, and they valued time allocated for individual college team building and for exchanges with experts and colleagues across the state. However, they also noted that material in the summit had already been covered at the grant application stage, and that the summit did not adequately address their learning needs at the implementation stage of the grant. For future professional learning activities supporting BSSOT grantees, program planners should consider a stronger focus on content requested by respondents, such as: case studies of successful strategies for implementing large-scale change; techniques for managing resistance to change; approaches for integrating planning across initiatives, funding streams, and governance structures; and information on the practicalities of grant management.

Provide more clarity about rules, reporting, and accounting requirements

More than a third of respondents said the summit was slightly useful or not at all useful in deepening their understanding of transformation reporting requirements (40%) and state rules and regulations impacting grant success (35%), and many respondents reported that they left the summit without clarity about requirements and expectations. To help allay these concerns, organizers should consider providing an electronic follow-up in the near term with relevant guidelines, reporting templates, FAQs, and contacts who can answer questions. A few respondents also suggested having regular webinars or electronic communications to keep grantees abreast of critical deadlines and requirements throughout the grant cycle; implementing these or similar measures would provide efficient and low-cost strategies for establishing clarity and alleviating anxiety.

Publish a predictable calendar of events to support transformation grantees

Many respondents reported that the structured off-site team-building activities were tremendously valuable, especially because schedules can be difficult to coordinate in the hectic...
pace of campus life. However, respondents also noted that they would have liked more time prior to the summit to make logistical plans and to engage with their own colleagues.

To the extent feasible, planners should consider publishing a predictable calendar of events supporting BSSOT grantees. Advance notice of events would facilitate the ability of colleges to coordinate the schedules of all relevant team members, so they can set aside joint time for team learning and planning. Having more advance notice for professional development events would also support staff charged with implementing activities and should be more feasible now that the funding is established. This would mitigate some of the logistical challenges noted by respondents, such as not having access to the agenda in advance and the shortage of hotel rooms and space at the venue. One respondent’s suggestion that a set number of seats be reserved for each college merits further consideration; after a certain date, these seats could be released and made available to anyone wishing to attend.

ENHANCING INTEGRATED USE OF IEPI RESOURCES

Responses on this survey highlighted some ways that IEPI can improve the integration of its resources. IEPI staff should look for opportunities to integrate resources across its many efforts by (1) focusing professional learning on the “how” of implementation, (2) leveraging the PLN to provide support for project management, (3) providing more support for integrated planning, and (4) integrating learning across IEPI goals.

Remind professional learning resource providers to focus on the “how”

Respondents’ feedback about the need for more implementation support is useful for thinking about IEPI professional learning more broadly. As relevant for future IEPI workshops, planners should consider suggesting that resource providers coach speakers to unpack how they were able to implement successful strategies. Insights into how successful models managed resistance to change would be especially valuable, given the frequency with which this resistance was mentioned by respondents as an obstacle. Based on feedback from the summit survey, IEPI workshop attendees would appreciate, in general, more interactive, structured opportunities for individuals and teams to present real-world challenges and to get expert coaching on strategies for addressing them. Challenges could also be solicited in advance and redacted into scenarios for discussion to preserve a campus’s confidentiality. Such interactive workshops, or “clinics,” could also benefit colleagues with similar challenges.

Integrate workshops with PLN as a resource for project management

For IEPI workshops that focus on projects, programs, and initiatives, integration with PLN could provide attendees with more generic project management resources, including resources for change management. One survey respondent noted that she planned to turn to colleagues in the private sector for project management resources. Respondents’ requests for support around meeting facilitation, data collection, calendaring, information archiving, and change management might be met by pointing these individuals to common resources and platforms offered either through the CCCCO or by other providers.
Continue to develop strategies to embed support for integrated planning into IEPI professional learning activities

In their open-ended responses, survey respondents recognized that integrating planning across funding streams, initiatives, and governance structures with common objectives was critical to success and sustainability. Yet, close to a third of respondents rated the summit as slightly useful or not at all useful for increasing their understanding of how to do this planning. IEPI staff should continue to consider how the integrated planning resources under development by the RP Group can be effectively leveraged through various IEPI professional learning activities to support colleges in this important area.

Look for opportunities to support IEPI outcomes by integrating learning across IEPI goals

Resource providers should be encouraged to support IEPI outcomes by looking for opportunities to integrate learning across IEPI goals. Some learning activities obviously lend themselves to one goal more than to another, as in the case of the BSSOT summit and student outcomes; however, there are also important linkages with other goals, such as fiscal viability and compliance issues, that could be emphasized. With its broad view of IEPI goals, IEPI leadership is in an excellent position to coach resource providers on how best to achieve a more integrated approach.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the time and expertise of the many who contributed to this report. Foremost, the summit attendees thoughtfully completed the evaluation survey. The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, particularly Stacy Fisher, facilitated all aspects of the evaluation and responded promptly to our inquiries. Fredy Campos provided research and administrative assistance. Finally, Gretchen Kell’s editing expertise and the Foundation for California Community College’s design and layout skills pulled this report together.
Appendix A: Methodology

Surveys were administered to all summit attendees online using Qualtrics survey software. Participants at each location received a total of four email reminders to complete the survey before it was closed on August 15, 2016.

The summit was attended by 263 attendees (representing 62 colleges) and 24 speakers. At the request of the CCCCDO, both attendees and speakers received the survey. There were 137 survey respondents, almost all of whom were attendees. The overall response rate was 48%, as noted in Table 1.

Table 1: Survey Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
<th>Number of Speakers</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey data consisted of both closed- and open-ended questions. For closed-ended responses, data were analyzed using SPSS Statistics and examined in aggregate. The data also were disaggregated by demographic information that EdInsights and the CCCCDO deemed of potential interest.

Respondents who selected the category “other” for either their primary role or function were reassigned to an existing category when their written-in specifications indicated they were, in fact, of a role or function that was a survey option. Data was disaggregated and examined by the primary role of respondents and in the following groupings: faculty (part-time and full-time), administrators (executives, deans, directors, and coordinators), and classified staff. By role, no statistically significant differences in responses were noted.

We also disaggregated data in terms of whether respondents were notified of their award in April 2016 or in June 2016. We noted a few significant differences, as highlighted in the report, where late notification was associated with less satisfaction with the summit.

For open-ended responses, data was coded thematically, and the number of mentions by unique respondents was enumerated. When appropriate, comments were reassigned and included when relevant to a specific question topic, even if they were made in response to a different question. Open-ended responses of “none,” “unknown,” “not sure,” “not applicable,” and the like were excluded from analysis. A few statements that were not responsive to any question were also excluded.
Appendix B: Survey Given to Attendees

Attendees were given this survey using the online survey software Qualtrics. The visualization of the survey is different than what is presented here, but this provides the exact questions, choices, and order of the survey.

Basic Skills Summit Evaluation Survey

Thank you for your willingness to have your voice be heard. Your feedback is very important to the continual improvement of resources provided by the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI).

IEPI’s independent evaluator, Education Insights Center (EdInsights) at Sacramento State, is surveying all summit attendees to understand your experience in the summit.

The survey will take about 10-15 minutes to complete.

Your responses will be kept completely confidential. Your name and identifying information will never be used in the reporting of our findings. EdInsights will only use this information for analytical purposes.

If you have any questions about this survey or the evaluation, please contact EdInsights’ Faculty Fellow Su Jin Jez at jez@csus.edu or 916-278-5955.

Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary. By completing this survey, you are agreeing to participate in the evaluation research. EdInsights may also follow-up with you at a future date to better understand your experience after you returned to your home institution.

Thank you for your participation.

Q1 How many days did you attend the Basic Skills Summit?
- Both days (August 2 and 3) (1)
- First day only (August 2) (2)
- Second day only (August 3) (5)
Q2 Which of the following interventions are the focus for your college’s transformation grant? Please check all that apply.
- Multiple measures & assessment (4)
- Learning assistance (e.g. embedded tutoring, supplemental instruction) (5)
- Contextualizing basic skills (6)
- Acceleration (7)
- Co-requisites (8)
- Professional development (9)
- Other, please describe: (3) __________________

Q3 How useful was this summit in helping you learn the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Not at all useful (1)</th>
<th>Slightly useful (2)</th>
<th>Moderately useful (3)</th>
<th>Quite useful (4)</th>
<th>Extremely useful (5)</th>
<th>Not applicable (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple measures and assessment (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning assistance (e.g. embedded tutoring, supplemental instruction) (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing basic skills (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-requisites (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4 How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following areas?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build relationships with colleagues from other colleges with shared transformation grant objectives (1)</th>
<th>Not at all useful (1)</th>
<th>Slightly useful (2)</th>
<th>Moderately useful (3)</th>
<th>Quite useful (4)</th>
<th>Extremely useful (5)</th>
<th>Not applicable (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build relationships with colleagues from my own college with shared responsibility for our grant’s success (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with experts who deepened my understanding of potential successful models that my college can implement (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepen my understanding of transformation grant reporting requirements (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepen my understanding of state rules, regulations, and related information that could impact the success of my college’s grant (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepen my understanding of how my college can integrate planning for related initiatives (BSI, SSSP, and Student Equity) to leverage funding sources and sustain successful interventions (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support my college’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 As a result of this summit, what specific actions do you plan to take, individually or as part of a team, to advance the success of your college’s transformation grant?

Q6 What impact, if any, do you anticipate these specific actions having on your college’s ability to achieve its transformation grant objectives?

Q7 What obstacles, if any, do you anticipate affecting your college’s ability to achieve its transformation grant objectives?

Q8 Do you have suggestions for additional professional development support that would help you or your college address the specific obstacles you described above?

Q9 IEPI requires colleges to set goals related to the IEPI Framework of Indicators. How familiar are you with your college’s goals?

- Not at all familiar (1)
- Slightly familiar (2)
- Moderately familiar (3)
- Quite familiar (4)
- Extremely familiar (5)
Q10 How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following areas from the IEPI Framework of Indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Not at all useful (1)</th>
<th>Slightly useful (2)</th>
<th>Moderately useful (3)</th>
<th>Quite useful (4)</th>
<th>Extremely useful (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving fiscal viability (1)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing audit issues/accreditation sanctions (2)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving student performance and outcomes (3)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines (4)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 IEPI offers a variety of professional development tools and resources for community colleges in addition to this summit. Prior to this summit, what other IEPI resources had you used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEPI Professional Development workshop(s).</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information or tools on the Professional Learning Network (PLN) website.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Plan on the PLN website.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Resource Team (PRT) at my college.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve(d) on a PRT at another college.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12 Based on your experience at this summit, are you interested in using any of the following resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Yes (1)</th>
<th>No (2)</th>
<th>Not sure (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEPI Professional Development workshop(s)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information or tools on the Professional Learning Network (PLN) website.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Plan on the PLN website.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Resource Team (PRT) at my college.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve on a PRT at another college.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13 How well did the quality of the summit presenters meet your expectations in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Unacceptable (1)</th>
<th>Below expectations (2)</th>
<th>Met expectations (3)</th>
<th>Better than expected (4)</th>
<th>Outstanding (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of summit topic (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of summit information (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to questions (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of presenters (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Unacceptable (1)</th>
<th>Below expectations (2)</th>
<th>Met expectations (3)</th>
<th>Better than expected (4)</th>
<th>Outstanding (5)</th>
<th>Not applicable (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room set-up (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight accommodations (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall implementation of the summit (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15 How was the summit length?
- ☐ Too short (1)
- ☐ About right (2)
- ☐ Too long (3)

Q16 What worked best about the summit?

Q17 What changes would you recommend to improve the summit?

Q18 Is there anything else that's important for us to understand that we haven't covered?

Q19 At what community college do you primarily work?
- ☐ I do not work at a community college. (1)
- ☐ [List of all community colleges is here, but it is cut for brevity]

Q19a You selected "I do not work at a community college". Can you please explain why you attended the summit?
Q20 What is your primary role?
- Executive administrator (1)
- Dean (2)
- Full-time faculty (3)
- Part-time faculty (4)
- Director/coordinator (5)
- Classified staff (7)
- Other (6) ______________________

Q21 What is your primary area of work?
- Instruction (1)
- Research and Planning (2)
- Student Services (3)
- Business or Administrative Services (4)
- Information Technology (5)
- Other (6) ______________________

Q22 What is your name? We will use this to follow up with you in the future to understand how this summit impacted your work. Providing your name is optional.
**Appendix C: Analysis of All Respondents Together**

### How many days did you attend the Basic Skills Summit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Both days (August 2 and 3)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First day only (August 2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Which of the following interventions are the focus for your college’s transformation grant? Multiple measures & assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Which of the following interventions are the focus for your college’s transformation grant? Learning assistance (e.g., embedded tutoring, supplemental instruction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Which of the following interventions are the focus for your college’s transformation grant? Contextualizing basic skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of the following interventions are the focus for your college's transformation grant? Acceleration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following interventions are the focus for your college's transformation grant? Co-requisites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following interventions are the focus for your college's transformation grant? Professional development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following interventions are the focus for your college's transformation grant? Other, please describe:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How useful was this summit in helping you learn the following? Multiple measures & assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: This analysis includes all participants. Analysis reported in report text is for only those for whom this was a focus of their grant.**

How useful was this summit in helping you learn the following? Learning assistance (e.g., embedded tutoring, supplemental instruction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: This analysis includes all participants. Analysis reported in report text is for only those for whom this was a focus of their grant.**
How useful was this summit in helping you learn the following? Contextualizing basic skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: This analysis includes all participants. Analysis reported in report text is for only those for whom this was a focus of their grant.**

How useful was this summit in helping you learn the following? Acceleration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: This analysis includes all participants. Analysis reported in report text is for only those for whom this was a focus of their grant.**
### How useful was this summit in helping you learn the following? Co-requisites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: This analysis includes all participants. Analysis reported in report text is for only those for whom this was a focus of their grant.**

### How useful was this summit in helping you learn the following? Professional development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: This analysis includes all participants. Analysis reported in report text is for only those for whom this was a focus of their grant.**
How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Build relationships with colleagues from other colleges with shared transformation grant objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Build relationships with colleagues from my own college with shared responsibility for our grant’s success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Connect with experts who deepened my understanding of potential successful models that my college can implement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Deepen my understanding of transformation grant reporting requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How useful was this summit in supporting your college's ability to achieve its goals in the following? Deepen my understanding of state rules, regulations, and related information that could impact the success of my college's grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How useful was this summit in supporting your college's ability to achieve its goals in the following? Deepen my understanding of how my college can integrate planning for related initiatives (BSI, SSSP, and Student Equity) to leverage funding sources and sustain successful interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Support my college’s implementation team to determine concrete next steps for implementing our proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Position my college to be successful with our transformation grant objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEPI requires colleges to set goals related to the IEPI Framework of Indicators. How familiar are you with your college’s goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly familiar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately familiar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite familiar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely familiar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Improving fiscal viability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Reducing audit issues/accreditation sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Improving student performance and outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How useful was this summit in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following? Improving programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IEPI offers a variety of professional development tools and resources for community colleges in addition to this summit. Prior to this summit, what other IEPI resources had you used? IEPI Professional Development workshop(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEPI offers a variety of professional development tools and resources for community colleges in addition to this summit. Prior to this summit, what other IEPI resources had you used? Information or tools on the Professional Learning Network (PLN) website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IEPI offers a variety of professional development tools and resources for community colleges in addition to this summit. Prior to this summit, what other IEPI resources had you used? Professional Development Plan on the PLN website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IEPI offers a variety of professional development tools and resources for community colleges in addition to this summit. Prior to this summit, what other IEPI resources had you used? Partnership Resource Team (PRT) at my college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEPI offers a variety of professional development tools and resources for community colleges in addition to this summit. Prior to this summit, what other IEPI resources had you used? Serve(d) on a PRT at another college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on your experience at this summit, are you interested in using any of the following resources? IEPI Professional Development workshop(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on your experience at this summit, are you interested in using any of the following resources? Information or tools on the Professional Learning Network (PLN) website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on your experience at this summit, are you interested in using any of the following resources? Professional Development Plan on the PLN website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on your experience at this summit, are you interested in using any of the following resources? Partnership Resource Team (PRT) at my college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on your experience at this summit, are you interested in using any of the following resources? Serve on a PRT at another college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How well did the quality of the summit presenters meet your expectations in each of the following? Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well did the quality of the summit presenters meet your expectations in each of the following? Knowledge of summit topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How well did the quality of the summit presenters meet your expectations in each of the following? Communication of summit information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well did the quality of the summit presenters meet your expectations in each of the following? Responsiveness to questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How well did the quality of the summit presenters meet your expectations in each of the following? Overall quality of presenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following? Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following? Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following? Pacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following? Room set-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following? Refreshments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following? Overnight accommodations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well did the quality of the summit implementation meet your expectations in each of the following? Overall implementation of the summit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below expectations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met expectations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than expected</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System                     | 11        | 16.4    |               |                    |
Total                               | 67        | 100.0   |               |                    |
### How was the summit length?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too short</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too long</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What is your primary role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/coordinator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## What is your primary area of work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Instruction</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or Administrative Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>