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Executive Summary

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is a collaborative effort within 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 specialized training activities for community college faculty, staff, and administrators.

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

To support state leadership in guiding improvements to IEPI, this report provides an analysis of IEPI professional development activities, in order to identify their strengths and challenges. This report focuses on:

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

This report includes analyses from:

- professional development workshops held from Summer 2016 through Spring 2017; and
- the PLN since its launch in April 2016.

KEY FINDINGS

Professional Development Offerings Are Widely Used, Interest Remains High

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

Likewise, the online PLN has grown rapidly over the past year. It currently has 7,700 users from all 114 colleges and offers IEPI-developed Applied Solution Kits (ASKs) on data disaggregation and integrated planning. It also provides nearly 200 online resources submitted by PLN users.
that tend to target faculty and address career technical education (CTE) and economic development.

Interest in future use of IEPI professional development resources is high, according to surveys administered throughout the past year after each workshop, and levels of interest are largely consistent across job functions.

**Quality of Workshops Has Increased**

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

**Workshop Activities Primarily Support Student Outcomes Goal**

During the past year, workshop providers primarily promoted learning related to the statewide goal of boosting student performance and outcomes, followed by a focus on increasing programmatic compliance with state and federal requirements. They infrequently emphasized the goal of reducing accreditation sanctions and audit issues, and targeted improving fiscal viability the least.

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

**Workshop Respondents Anticipate More Effective Institutional Processes and Improved Student Outcomes**

Many survey respondents anticipated creating more effective institutional processes, including improved compliance with financial aid rules and requirements, more accurate and consistent transcript evaluation, stronger collaboration around the development of pathways and dual enrollment programs, enhanced institutional planning and decision-making for IEPI indicators, and better fiscal accountability through the integration of initiatives related to basic skills.

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

These expected impacts aligned well with IEPI goals related to boosting student outcomes, better compliance, improved fiscal viability, and reduced accreditation sanctions and audits.
Workshop Attendees Requested More Support for Campus Implementation

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

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to a comprehensive checklist of successful practices that EdInsights recommends be used consistently at all workshops, this report contains recommendations for how IEPI can build on its proven strengths to achieve even greater impact in the future. They include:

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

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

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

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

The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is a collaborative effort within 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 specialized training activities for community college faculty, staff, and administrators.

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

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

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

- How will the various activities and resources under development help IEPI achieve its desired outcomes?
- How will professional development resources be institutionalized in the long term?
- How will the professional development ecosystem have been transformed once the initiative is complete?
- What are the structures that will ensure the sustainability of coordinated, systemic change over time?

Having a well-defined and transparent theory of action will promote the fidelity of the IEPI initiative and support all IEPI stakeholders in collaborating effectively toward their shared vision of a successful future for the CCC.

This report includes analyses from:
- professional development workshops held from Summer 2016 through Spring 2017 and
- the PLN since its launch in April 2016.
The focus of this report is a set of key components of the EdInsights evaluation study that are likely to be of greatest interest to state leadership, including:

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

For detailed information on each of the workshops evaluated, please visit the IEPI website at http://iepi.cccco.edu to download evaluation reports. For detailed explanation of our evaluation methodology, please see Appendix A.
Interest, Use, and Usefulness of Professional Development Resources

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

The PLN has grown rapidly over the past year. As of June 2017, the PLN has 7,700 users from all 114 colleges. The PLN has nearly 200 resources submitted by PLN users based on their own experiences. The user-submitted resources tend to target faculty (73% of resources), with the category of “career technical education and economic development” having the most user-submitted resources submitted (comprising one-third of resources).

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT USE VARIED BY JOB CLASSIFICATION, FUNCTION, AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE LOCATION
During the past year, IEPI professional development users represented a variety of job classifications, job functions, came from all 114 community colleges, and typically attended workshops in teams from their individual colleges. We analyzed professional development usage by these factors and discuss in detail how professional development use differed based on user and college characteristics.

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

Figure 2.
Individuals in instruction made up the largest percentage of professional development users overall, but individuals in student services were the majority of workshop attendees.

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

Figure 3.
Most community colleges in California tend to acquire their professional development resources largely through the PLN.
Engagement in IEPI professional development activities varied by the urbanicity of the community in which the college is located. While employees in rural areas, towns, and small suburbs make up just 10 percent of all CCC employees, in the past year they comprised 14 percent of workshop attendees and 11 percent of PLN users, and thus were disproportionately making use of IEPI professional development resources (see Figure 4). In contrast, employees from larger urban and suburban colleges comprise over 90 percent of all employees, but they did not make use of IEPI resources in proportion to their numbers.

Figure 4.
Employees at rural and small colleges participated in IEPI professional development at higher rates than those at larger colleges, relative to the schools’ size.

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

Figure 5.
For most workshops, nearly all attendees came from their colleges as part of a team.

INTEREST IN IEPI PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES REMAINS HIGH
Workshop participants’ interest in future use of IEPI resources was high and largely consistent across job functions. The only statistically significant differences were that:
- administrators were more likely than faculty to be interested in tools on the PLN, which is different than actual usage, where faculty were more likely to use the PLN than administrators; and
- administrators also were more likely than faculty and staff to want to serve on a PRT at another college.
Interest was high in using IEPI resources in the future, particularly professional development workshops and PLN tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in future professional development workshops</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in using tools on the PLN</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in developing a plan on the PLN</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in serving on a PRT at my college</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in using an Applied Solution Kit (ASK)</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in serving on a PRT at another campus</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUALITY OF WORKSHOPS INCREASED OVER TIME**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop delivery overall*</th>
<th>Workshop presenters overall*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Ratings for IEPI workshops increased slightly in regard to other measures of the workshops’ usefulness and to attendees’ interest in using future IEPI resources. But these increases were not statistically significant when we controlled for competing effects (job function, job area, urbanicity, team attendance, and PLN usage).
IEPI Workshops: A Checklist of Successful Practices

Based on observation and analysis of participant surveys, we identified successful practices in delivering workshops that support participants’ learning. Many of these practices are used effectively by IEPI staff and workshop providers, but are not always being implemented consistently for all workshops. To promote the usefulness of future IEPI professional development workshops, EdInsights’ research team recommends the broad and consistent adoption of the practices listed below.

A CHECKLIST TO SUPPORT EFFECTIVE TEAM DEVELOPMENT

- Provide guidance to colleges on how to assemble effective cross-functional teams.
- Publicize workshops with sufficient lead time to support inclusive recruitment efforts.
- Offer options for workshop pre-work to support team development.
- Create structured team time for action planning to support post-workshop campus implementation efforts.
- Offer frequent, brief intervals for applying learning to action planning throughout the event, rather than only at the end.
- Provide different options when planning group activities or team time to allow for diverse needs, including those of solo participants and teams at different stages of implementation.
- Identify facilitators, coaches, or experienced peers to support structured team time.

A CHECKLIST TO PROMOTE MATCHING OF WORKSHOP CONTENT TO AUDIENCE NEEDS AND DESIRED OUTCOMES

- Ensure that workshop providers understand IEPI’s broad aims and, with those goals in mind, articulate learning outcomes for each event.
- Make certain that workshop presenters understand IEPI goals and communicate the connections between those goals and specific professional development content.
- Gather information in advance from the intended audience and/or registered participants to inform workshop content and design.
- Employ breakout sessions strategically to allow participants to customize content to their individual roles and institutional context.
- Offer popular breakout sessions more than once at larger events to facilitate widespread access to them.

A CHECKLIST TO ENGAGE ATTENDEES AND PROMOTE DEEPER LEARNING

- Provide structured and unstructured opportunities at workshops for networking and exchanges both within and across institutions.
- Use interactive exercises, hands-on learning, or directed small group discussions at frequent intervals to allow participants to integrate and apply learning from lecture presentations.
✓ Reduce the number of panelists and the amount of information presented in PowerPoint lectures to make time for interactive learning techniques.
✓ Expand thoughtful strategies for generating useful and inclusive Q & A sessions, including the exploration of relevant technology platforms.

A CHECKLIST TO SUPPORT CAMPUS IMPLEMENTATION
✓ Provide case studies of successful implementation efforts that include attention to process issues, such as how obstacles were overcome.
✓ Make available customizable templates from successful implementation efforts that can be shared with the permission of the model institutions.
✓ Offer context-specific support to campuses about leading and managing change efforts.
✓ Support colleges to consider how they will institutionalize changes to institutional processes to ensure sustainability of change.
✓ Make sure workshop content supports colleges in advancing to the next level of implementation.

A CHECKLIST TO INCREASE USEFULNESS OF WORKSHOP MATERIALS
✓ Ensure that participants have complete access to online and/or hard copy workshop materials in time for the workshop.
✓ Make available workshop materials in both printed and online format, where possible, to facilitate learning, dissemination, and future reference.
✓ Provide presenters with clear guidelines and tips for making presentation materials useful and accessible.

A CHECKLIST TO IMPROVE SEAMLESSNESS OF TECHNOLOGY
✓ Take extra steps to make certain that video conferencing and other technology always runs smoothly.
✓ Implement video recording of workshops sensitively, so as not to inhibit discussion.
Support for Statewide Goals

WORKSHOPS TARGETED STUDENT OUTCOMES MORE THAN FISCAL VIABILITY AND ACCREDITATION SANCTIONS

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

Our analysis discovered that attendees found the workshops’ learning content useful, mainly to help them improve student outcomes, and secondly to increase programmatic compliance. They said workshops were less useful in helping them reduce accreditation sanctions and audit findings and least useful in addressing fiscal viability—goals not explicitly targeted by workshop providers. To see how each workshop maps for each statewide goal for provider intent (target) and respondent usefulness, see Appendix D.
Figure 8.
Student outcomes and programmatic compliance were targeted more by workshop providers and perceived as more useful by respondents.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING NETWORK FOCUSED HEAVILY ON STUDENT OUTCOMES

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

Support for Action Planning

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

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

When asked, “What do workshop respondents note they plan to do after the workshop?” workshop attendees most commonly discussed these actions:

1. Implement or enhance a program (204 mentions)
2. Improve institutional processes or collaboration (194 mentions)
3. Engage stakeholders or disseminate information (91 mentions)
4. Follow up with resources or contacts (31 mentions)
5. Conduct a needs assessment or get additional information (29 mentions)
6. Make individual work improvements (15 mentions)

Respondents’ plans to take action as a result of the workshop most frequently involved launching new or enhancing existing programs in workshop topic areas such as inmate education, dual enrollment, and pathways. These plans for program implementation were collaborative and often included the formation or continuation of an implementation team or committee that included coworkers who had attended the workshop together. Almost as many respondents cited an intention to improve institutional processes or coordination across functions in areas such as improving programmatic compliance required for financial aid eligibility, ensuring the accuracy of transcript evaluation, and integrating planning for basic skills. The value of workshop content was also demonstrated by respondents’ intentions to disseminate workshop materials to other campus colleagues and to follow up about resources shared or with contacts made at the workshop. A smaller number of respondents indicated they needed more information in order to take action. Nevertheless, as a result of the workshop, these participants were empowered to conduct a needs assessment or to gather more information at their colleges to advance their efforts.
WORKSHOP RESPONDENTS EXPECTED THEIR ACTIONS TO RESULT IN MORE EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES AND IMPROVED STUDENT OUTCOMES

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

1. More effective institutional processes (178 mentions)
2. Improved student outcomes (171 mentions)
3. Better compliance (56 mentions)
4. Positive outcomes (unspecified) (53 mentions)
5. Improved community outcomes (13 mentions)
6. Improved fiscal viability (8 mentions)

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

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

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

1. Gaining support for change (184 mentions)
2. Time and funding resource constraints (162 mentions)
3. Implementation challenges (88 mentions)
4. Personnel constraints (39 mentions)
5. Various student issues (10 mentions)
6. Various policy issues (4 mentions)

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

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

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

1. Support for campus implementation (nuts and bolts) (104 mentions)
2. Follow-up training or information on specific topics (63 mentions)
3. Help managing change or supporting collaboration (42 mentions)
4. Additional workshops/summits/trainings (41 mentions)
5. Audience-specific support (27 mentions)
6. Improved institutional processes (business process analysis) (17 mentions)
7. Online learning (10 mentions)
8. Policy advocacy (3 mentions)

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

Building on our October 2016 report, the following section discusses the four key strengths that support IEPI’s effectiveness and success. We commend effective practices already in use and note corresponding opportunities to achieve even greater impact, based on our analyses of professional development usage, workshop participant survey data, and independent review and observation of professional development resources and activities.

INCREASING THE FOCUS ON OUTCOMES

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

Ensuring Professional Development Activities Support All IEPI Goals

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

Developing a Theory of Action for Long-Term Sustainable Change

Achieving improvements at the scale envisioned by the IEPI mandate requires a systemic approach that can be sustained over time. At this stage of development, IEPI leadership could benefit from making its overall theory of action more explicit in concert with its partners and stakeholders. How will the various activities and resources under development help IEPI achieve its desired outcomes? How will professional development resources be institutionalized in the long term, and how will the professional development ecosystem be transformed once the initiative is complete? What are the structures that will ensure the sustainability of coordinated, systemic change over time?

ENGAGING AND SERVING STAKEHOLDERS

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

**Strengthening Governance Structures**
IEPI leadership employs a broad range of advisory committees and working groups to set the broad vision and overall goals for the initiative and to implement specific initiative activities and components. One of the strengths of the initiative is the extent to which it relies on input from its many constituent groups and partner organizations and incorporates them into its leadership and planning. As with any initiative operating at the scale of IEPI, this results in a large and complex administrative committee structure. At this stage of the initiative, it would be useful to thoughtfully evaluate the effectiveness of the initiative’s governance model and administrative and meeting structure. What is the role and charge of IEPI’s various committees and work groups? What are the mechanisms by which the vision is established, decisions are made, and work gets executed? Are there changes that need to be made to the membership of various committees to ensure that the initiative is broadly inclusive? Are roles and responsibilities clear? Is the overall governance and administration of the initiative effective?

**Strengthening Communication**
IEPI leadership uses a broad range of communication mechanisms, including an initiative website, electronic newsletters, and regular presentations at key conferences, so that its stakeholders are kept informed. It has engaged an external communications consultant to provide expert advice to help gather input from stakeholders and make sure their needs are being met. Our analyses suggest that there are some differences in how stakeholders’ engagement with the initiative varies according to their job classifications and functions and the urbanicity of their institutions. Is the initiative fully reaching its intended audiences? Are there changes that should be made to broaden engagement with IEPI across less engaged groups and institutions? How can IEPI leadership continue to expand awareness of the initiative to all its diverse constituents?

**SUPPORTING CAMPUS IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS**
IEPI leadership places a special emphasis on supporting colleges to implement changes to programs or institutional processes based on professional learning. Team attendance is encouraged for all workshops, and action planning is a regular feature of workshop program design. Survey feedback demonstrates a strong interest among attendees in obtaining support to help their campuses implement change. This desired support from IEPI can take multiple forms, including disseminating to the colleges case studies and/or proven effective models that they can adopt and/or adapt; providing continuing online and in-person professional development activities, including those that establish professional networks or communities of practice; helping to streamline and/or integrate systems and processes to make them more sustainable; and assisting campuses in leading and managing change.
Disseminating Case Studies and Proven Effective Models
Survey data suggest that those who take part in professional development are interested in
detailed case studies on successful implementation efforts at other campuses that include
information about obstacles and how they were overcome. Participants are also interested in
templates for various programs and in examples from model institutions that can be shared with
permission and adopted for and/or adapted to their own institutions. Such content would be
useful to disseminate in person at workshops and online through the PLN.

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

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

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

**BUILDING AN INTEGRATED, COLLABORATIVE, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ECOSYSTEM**

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

**Linking and Integrating IEPI Professional Development Resources**

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

**Aligning IEPI Content with Other Professional Development Activities**

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

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

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

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

To meet IEPI’s evaluation needs, EdInsights will continue its developmental, formative, and summative evaluation to support the growth and improvement of the initiative. The evaluation will stay focused on understanding IEPI’s short-, medium-, and long-term impacts on the IEPI goals of improving fiscal viability, reducing accreditation sanctions and audit issues, boosting student performance and outcomes, and increasing programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines. Moreover, we will continue to provide feedback to IEPI leadership on the initiative’s internal processes.

Since initiating our evaluation work in Spring 2016, EdInsights evaluators have observed and participated in steering committee meetings, convenings, work groups, and other functions related to the development of IEPI professional development resources; administered participant and staff surveys; gathered usage data; conducted staff and provider interviews; and held stakeholder focus groups to understand the impact of IEPI activities on IEPI goals. We also have sought to evaluate integration across professional development resources to understand how impact is scaling up across the initiative.

Over this past year, however, two things became clear. First, IEPI leadership began to develop new resources to meet IEPI stakeholders’ changing needs for specialized training. Second, IEPI leadership recognized a need to understand how well the various components of IEPI are being integrated and how they are collectively impacting targeted goals for the colleges. As a result, the evaluation looking forward now aims to support and address three broad areas: (1) the evolving need to evaluate IEPI’s individual specialized training resources, (2) the integration and impact of IEPI resources with other IEPI resources and with non-IEPI resources at the institutional and systemwide levels, and (3) the need for developmental feedback on IEPI’s internal protocols and their effectiveness in supporting the achievement of IEPI goals.

To address these three broad areas, the evaluation will:

- assess each specialized training resource;
- explore the integration and impact of IEPI resources at the institutional and systemwide levels; and
- examine IEPI internal protocols.

EVALUATION OF SPECIALIZED TRAINING RESOURCES

For this component, the subject of evaluation will be individual professional development resources. The evaluation will assess and provide feedback on IEPI’s general processes and procedures for specialized training and perceptions about their effectiveness. In conducting the evaluation, we will seek to assess:

- the quality of each resource and its implementation;
- how participants rate the usefulness of that resource for achieving desired learning outcomes;
- how participants anticipate the resource will drive changes in processes and policies at their institutions;
• how participants anticipate the resource will drive changes in outcomes and behaviors at their institutions; and
• what barriers and supports participants anticipate in driving change at their institutions.

In addition, we will seek to understand perceptions about how specialized training increases connections between functional areas of the CCCs, such as through integrated planning and cross-functional team building, an informal goal of IEPI.

UNDERSTANDING THE INTEGRATION AND IMPACT OF IEPI RESOURCES

To understand the impact of IEPI on a campus, district, the entire CCC system, or the state, it is not feasible to target the impact of an individual resource in isolation from the suite of IEPI resources—doing so would make findings for any single resource artificially precise. Moreover, what is most paramount, and what the CCCCO has expressed more interest in, regarding IEPI’s impact, is how various IEPI resources interact to impact institutional effectiveness. As such, the focus for this component of the evaluation is the institution (college or district).

To meet these needs, we will conduct a two-step evaluation to assess IEPI’s wider impact on individual institutions, the CCC system, and the state. First, using existing data from IEPI (such as survey data from the regional workshops and indicator metrics from the campuses) and other sources, as relevant, we will analyze the impact of IEPI resources on IEPI indicators. Based on our findings, and with guidance from IEPI leadership on its needs, we then will analyze the impact of IEPI resources on institutional processes, policies, practices, and cultures.

DEVELOPMENTAL EVALUATION OF IEPI’S PROTOCOLS

For purposes of general evaluation and program improvement, we will developmentally evaluate IEPI’s protocols, particularly in regard to specialized training components. The subject of evaluation for this component is the implementation of IEPI.
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Appendix A. Data and Methodology Details

In this section, we detail the data and methods used in this report. First, we discuss the quantitative data and analysis, then the qualitative data and analysis.

QUANTITATIVE DATA AND ANALYSIS

The quantitative data for this study were from survey responses EdInsights received as part of our evaluation of IEPI’s previously-held workshops, college-level administrative data from the CCCC, and user data from the PLN. The data for this report are from the Dual Enrollment, Pathways, Basic Skills, Inmate Education, Noncredit Summit, BSI/SE/SSSP Integration, CTE Data Unlocked, Financial Aid, Evaluators, Financial Well-Being, Integrated Planning, and Indicators workshops.

The data from each of these workshops were aggregated and organized using SPSS Statistics software. Each workshop’s data were entered into SPSS individually and organized into columns. The columns represent evaluation questions we asked our respondents throughout each of the workshops. The rows in this dataset represent workshop respondents.

This report mainly contains identical questions asked at every workshop. Categories for these questions included: IEPI familiarity, IEPI goals’ usefulness, prior IEPI resource usage, interest in future IEPI resources, workshop presenter quality, workshop implementation quality, primary job classification, and primary job area. The evaluation questions included in the analysis, but not uniform throughout every workshop, were related to the Applied Solution Kits (ASKs) and to the community college where each respondent was primarily employed. The question related to the ASKs was not uniformly asked at all workshops, since it was included at the end of the academic year, when some workshops had already taken place. Responses to questions related to the ASKs were drawn from the Integrated Planning, Financial Well-Being, Noncredit Summit, and BSI/SE/SSSP Integration workshops. The question asked about community college employment was originally coded differently because of the numbers associated with responses like: “I don’t work at a community college” and differences between the names El Camino College and El Camino College Compton Center. As we later found out, El Camino College Compton Center, which had lost its accreditation, later regained it and was reinstituted as El Camino Compton College. We renumbered and recoded each of the two colleges to reflect their accurate accreditation status and so that their separate numeric codes would be uniform at each workshop.

As we gathered and organized information, it became apparent that many of our respondents chose not to include their job classifications and/or job functions. There were also several cases in which respondents chose “other” as their job classification and/or job function, and some of them wrote in their job classification or job function. To alleviate this problem and gain a more accurate picture of who was attending IEPI workshops, we researched each of these respondents (using the email address and college name they provided). Using Google and college websites, we were able to determine the missing job classifications and/or job functions.
for a large majority of these respondents. Job classification “others” now constitute only 2 percent of the respondents, while job function “others” constitute about 3 percent.

Another aggregate dataset was created to examine college size, geographic location, workshop attendees (as opposed to respondents), and PLN users. We measured the size of each college by its Fall 2016 employee count. This data was provided by the CCCCO’s datamart website. We also accounted for the size and geographic location of each college using the CCCCO’s urbanicity measurements provided to us by Todd Hoig in the Division of Technology, Research, and Information Systems. We received workshop attendance lists from Maureen Dowd and through access to IEPI’s Eventbrite registration list. We also used the PLN registration lists to gauge overall IEPI professional development resource usage. The PLN data we received originally included thousands of pieces of missing data. Users on the PLN are required to sign into their accounts with their email addresses, but are not required to include other key information. Again using email addresses to obtain further information, this time on workshop respondents, we researched the users who had missing data and supplemented each one’s primary job, primary area of work, and college of employment, if the information was available. These methods allowed us to decrease the number of missing cases and “others” to less than 1 percent for both job classification and job function.

Using this dataset containing college size, geographic location, workshop attendees, and PLN users, we were able to examine the total percentage of each college’s employees who used an IEPI professional development resource and the percentage of employees who had attended a workshop or registered for the PLN. We created a measurement to determine whether a college’s IEPI professional development resource usage skewed toward the PLN or toward workshop attendance. This measurement divided a college’s workshop attendance by its total IEPI participation (usually the sum of PLN plus workshop attendance, but some attendees attended multiple workshops). We then multiplied that decimal by 100 to give us a range from 0 to 100, where 0 equaled all PLN-driven participation and 100 equaled all workshop-driven participation. We then multiplied each value (each college) by two and subtracted by 100 to give us a range from -100 to 100. This gave us a scale to create the community college heat map (Figure 3), where -100 meant that all of a college’s participation came from the PLN (green dots), 0 meant there was an equal amount of participation from PLN users and workshop attendees (yellow), and 100 meant that all of a college’s participation came from workshop attendance (orange).

With this data, we illustrated how a college’s urbanicity can demonstrate differences in IEPI professional development resource usage (Figure 4). This figure was created by dividing the number of employees in an urbanicity location by the total number of CCC employees (grey bar), then dividing each urbanicity’s PLN usage and workshop attendance by the total number of PLN users and workshop attendees.

Figures 3 and 4 use the percentage of employees and their use of IEPI professional development at each college. This data, however, was not available for West Hills College-
Lemoore. Therefore data included on Figures 3 and 4 includes the West Hills Community College District, which includes their two campuses in Lemoore and Coalinga.

This dataset also proved helpful in accurately measuring the percentage of attendees who attended each workshop as a team (Figure 5). The attendance lists provided by Maureen Dowd were particularly helpful, since we could not ascertain who attended as part of a team from our workshop responses. We reviewed the attendance lists, and attendees were coded individually to reflect the college where each person worked and whether there were one or more representatives from each school at each workshop.

Figure 7 shows the findings of our analysis of how workshop presenters and workshop delivery have improved over time. In this linear regression analysis, the x-axis represents our “over time” variable. The variable begins with the first Inmate Education Workshop held in Bakersfield on June 8, 2016. That workshop was one of 32 individual workshops held during the 2016-2017 academic year. We have only 29 x-values because each point represents the date when an IEPI workshop was held, not an individual workshop. For example, the 29th data point in Figure 7 represents May 12, 2017, when two IEPI workshops were held.

Also in Figure 7, our ordinary least squares regression analysis includes controls to account for variations in our evaluations. These include: primary job classification, primary job area, urbanicity, team status, and PLN status. The analyses was conducted using Stata statistical software, and we used Stata’s margins command to quantify our estimates for each workshop plotted.

We asked workshop providers to determine learning outcomes for their workshops. The number of learning outcomes for each workshop was determined by the workshop providers, and the numbers ranged from a low of four (Integrated Planning Workshop) to as many as 14 (Basic Skills Workshop). Each of these learning outcomes was placed into our evaluation tool to determine how each outcome was related to one or more of the IEPI pillar goals: improving fiscal viability, reducing accreditation sanctions and audit issues, boosting student performance and outcomes, and increasing programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines. After we determined how each of these learning outcomes was related to a specific IEPI goal or goals, we submitted our findings to the workshop providers for their approval. This evaluation tool, approved by providers, is how we created measures to determine which IEPI goals were targeted by workshop providers (Figure 8). To access the usefulness of each IEPI goal, we created a composite score for each workshop and for each goal. Next, we calculate the average from the learning outcome responses that focused on each workshop. We then examined the question from our IEPI goals evaluation that asked, “How useful was this workshop in supporting your college’s ability to achieve its goals in the following area…(each goal is named)?” Each respondent’s average score was calculated for each of the four goals for each workshop. Finally, to create the composite score, we added the mean score from both the learning outcomes and the IEPI pillar goals and divided that number by two.
RESOURCES ON THE PLN

We also obtained Lynda.com user data collected from July 1, 2016 to May 31, 2017. Data is collected by the professional learning network (PLN) providers. The information is provided by the users during registration and web tracking information provided by the web server host. The information accessed on Lynda.com is not IEPI-developed material, rather it is a collection of courses, comprised of video tutorials, aimed to build professional skills, such as how to use Excel and Canvas. User information was was collected by the unique user identification (ID) created at the time of registration. In total, the data set included job classification information and website usage information from 4,693 unique users.

When registering to use Lynda.com, users created a unique user ID and provided their names and e-mail addresses. Prior to analysis, all personal identifying information, e.g., name and e-mail, was excluded. Users also provided job information, such as employment location, job function, and job classification. Initially, however, providing job information was an optional part of registration. Only later did it become required. Thus, not all users entered job information at Lynda.com. The employer listed by users was typically a community college, but some users identified their place of employment as a community college district or an affiliated non-governmental organization. A list of community colleges and districts was obtained from the Chancellor’s Office to verify official names of colleges and districts and to ensure consistency in nomenclature across the data set. Use of this list led to identifying an issue with Compton College. Some users listed “Compton College” as their employer, while others referred to it as “El Camino College Compton Center.” In such cases, the employer was changed to “Compton College.” Similar to what we did for workshop respondents and PLN users, we attempted to research and recover as much missing or incorrect information as we could for each user.

Lynda.com’s web server host provided data in three Excel spreadsheets related to (1) user usage, (2) tutorial video views, and (3) course views. Data related to user usage included the type of unique professional development online courses or video tutorials accessed or watched, total views, number of logins, hours viewed per login, and last login. Data related to videos views included the name of the video, the percentage of the video that was viewed, the numbers of hours the video was viewed, the last time the video was viewed, and job information on the video viewer. Finally, data related to course usage included course name, date of release, length of course, total views, unique users, hours viewed, number of users who completed the course, and course ID. The date a course was released and the course ID were excluded from analysis.

Prior to analysis, all personal identifying information, e.g., name and email address, was excluded. Data and statistical analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel (2016; Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA) and Python’s Pandas and Statsmodels statistical libraries. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the users’ job information and usage patterns and information on courses and videos viewed.
No information was collected on users’ intent or purpose in utilizing Lynda.com, nor was feedback requested on the materials they used. Thus, it was not possible to identify whether Lynda.com met users’ needs.

Grovo was another PLN resource we examined. It gave us user data collected from April 1, 2016 to May 31, 2017. Grovo’s web server host provided the name and time a workshop video was watched, along with the names and email addresses of the users who watched the video. The data also included the web address for the video and whether the video was classified as a training video. Prior to the analysis, the web address was excluded, as it did not provide any useful information. The data set included 16,334 videos. The training categorization was not applicable to over 10,000 of these videos, thus this category was excluded from analysis. Each user’s name was used to identify the number of unique viewers.

The Grovo data provided did not include information on the viewer’s employer, job function, or classification, as this information was not collected upon registration. Unlike Lynda.com, Grovo did not have information available as to whether a viewer finished watching a video or stopped the video before it ended.

Data and statistical analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel (2016; Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA) and Python’s Pandas and Statsmodels statistical libraries. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize videos viewed and the number of unique viewers per video.

RESOURCE MAPPING TO INDICATORS
We also examined data with information on 193 resources uploaded onto the PLN from August 2015 to May 2017. For each resource, the data included information on when the resource was uploaded and when it was last modified. Also included was information on the intended audience for the resource, category of the resource, and any associated tags. Three of the resources lacked any information except the title of the resource. Those resources were omitted from the analysis, leaving 190 in the data set.

The data did not include any information on who submitted the resource, their institutional affiliation, or when the resource was submitted. Further, the data did not include the number of times a resource had been viewed or who viewed the resource. Follow-up inquiries determined that this information was not available, but it may be in the future. This information is necessary to determine whether the resources are being utilized and by whom.

Data and statistical analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel (2016; Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA) and Python’s Pandas and Statsmodels statistical libraries. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize intended audience, category, and tag. The category variable was further explored, as discussed below.

PLN resource materials are organized by PLN staff into 31 categories. In order to study how or whether material submitted to the resource section of the PLN related to IEPI indicators, resource categories were examined to determine if they could be grouped together and
Assigned to an indicator. Mapping out or assigning resource categories to indicators elucidated whether there were any trends or themes in types of materials submitted to the PLN.

Categories were examined to determine their attributes and then assigned an indicator that shared similar attributes. Many categories were readily assignable, e.g., the accreditation category could be assigned to the accreditation status indicator. For categories that were not as clearly related to an indicator, materials assigned to each category were examined to determine if they addressed issues related to an indicator. For example, the enrollment management category contained resources that discussed both full-time equivalent students (FTES) and managing enrollment into college courses. FTES is a measure used to assess fiscal viability and ability for students to enroll in required courses related to student performance and outcomes. Thus, enrollment management was assigned to both indicators. Some categories were so broad, e.g., technology, that they could not be assigned to a specific indicator and thus were assigned to a “non-specific” category. The grouping of the categories into indicators was then vetted internally, and adjustments were made accordingly. The mapping of the resource categories were also shared with PLN staff in charge of the resource section and with the chancellor’s office for additional feedback. The number of materials assigned to each category was then totaled in order to arrive at the number of materials that were submitted.

QUALITATIVE DATA AND ANALYSIS

For the qualitative analysis of action planning related to workshop attendance, we aggregated previously coded data collected from eight workshop evaluation surveys conducted between June 2016 and May 2017. The topics of these workshops were inmate education, basic skills, financial aid and curriculum, IEPI indicators, pathways, transcript evaluation, dual enrollment, and student financial well-being. Qualitative data from each of these surveys was coded thematically, and the number of mentions by unique respondents was enumerated. While the coding categories were not standardized across the eight workshops, for this analysis we grouped similar codes together and aggregated the number of respondents from all eight workshops in order to provide a broad picture of intended actions, expected impacts, obstacles anticipated, and supports needed across the in-person professional development offerings. Each of the eight workshop evaluation reports also included final recommendations that were based on direct observation of the workshops and on analysis of survey responses. We grouped these recommendations into broad themes, which were used to generate the checklist of successful practices, as well as to inform the identification of opportunities to build on key strengths.
# Appendix B. IEPI Professional Development Workshops

Table B-1 (continues on next page).

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

Note: Attendance calculated based on attendance data provided by Windhausen Events. We then removed any duplicate registrants.
Appendix C. IEPI Professional Development Usage Across California

Figure C-1. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT USAGE BY COLLEGE

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

STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND OUTCOMES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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