California Community Colleges
Institutional Effectiveness

Partnership Resource Team (PRT)
Technical Assistance
Feedback Summary Report
Cycle 11A
Visit 1 and Visit 2
PRT Services Commenced in Spring 2024

June 15, 2025

Robert Pacheco, Ed.D.
External Evaluator

Table of Contents

Introduction

Background

The *Partnership Resource Team (PRT)* component of the *Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI)* provides technical assistance at no cost to colleges, districts, and the California College System Office with a goal of improving institutional effectiveness. The PRT process follows a positive "colleagues-helping-colleagues" model that delivers customized support based on individualized needs. Prospective Client Institutions initiate the process by submitting a Letter of Interest that outlines how a PRT can assist their key *Areas of Focus* (*AOFs*). Based on the letters of interest, the Project Director and the IEPI coordinating group assemble teams aligning their expertise with the institutions' needs for each semiannual cycle.

Under the full-PRT model, each PRT typically conducts three visits to the institution.

Visit 1 focuses on gathering information about the institution's *AOFs*, facilitating institution-wide discussions, and supporting institutional reflection. Following the visit, the PRT provides the institution with two documents:
- *Summary of Initial Visit* and,
- *List of Primary Successes and a Menu of Options*

Outlining what the team heard during the visit and suggestions for improvements and effective practices.

Visit 2 centers to help the institution with drafting an *Innovation* and *Effectiveness Plan (I&EP)* to address its *AOFs*. Upon submission of the I&EP, Institutions may be eligible for a Seed Grant of up to $200,000 to support the implementation of the Plan.

The *Follow-up Visit* assesses early progress on the *I&EP* and enables the PRT to offer suggestions to strengthen implementation and promote long-term sustainability.

PRT Members are current or former community college personnel whose expertise aligns with the client institutions' *AOFs*. Drawing on their diverse skills and experiences, PRTs provide targeted, peer-based technical assistance to improve institutional effectiveness. (In this report, "PRT Members" includes both Members and Leads unless otherwise specified.)

Goals of the Visit 1 and Visit 2 Report

This report aims to:

- Assess the impact of the PRT Process on Client Institutions during Visits 1 and 2.
- Evaluate the value of participation for both the Client Institutions and PRT Members.
- Identify technical assistance strategies, tools, and concepts that positively influenced the visits and supported institutions in addressing their *Areas of Focus*.

The report summarizes findings from services provided to Client Institutions during Cycle 11A, which began in Fall 2024. The Cycle 11A cohort included 11 institutions. For Visit 1, survey responses were received from ten institutions: four single-college districts, three colleges within multi-college districts, and four district offices. Similarly, 10 institutions responded to the Visit 2 survey; however, the respondents were not entirely the same as those for Visit 1. To protect anonymity and allow for aggregate analysis, results are reported collectively rather than by individual institutions.

Areas of Inquiry

The evaluation explored key aspects of the PRT experience through both quantitative and qualitative data collection. The surveys were designed around four primary *Areas of Inquiry*.
- The Visit Process
- Training Concepts Used during the Visit
- Logistics Before, During, and After the Visits
- Miscellaneous (Aspects Not Captured Elsewhere)

The Visit Process

The first set of Areas of Inquiry focused on the Visit Process from the perspectives of both Client Institutions and PRT Members. **Table 1** presents the specific constructs measured for Visits 1 and 2 related to this aspect of the evaluation.

Table 1. The Visit Process		
Client Institution Only Items	**Client Institutions and PRT Items**	**PRT Only Items**
Familiarity • With the *AOFs* • With the PRT Process ***Adherence to the PRT Approach*** • *Sufficiency of the Information to work with PRT* • *Effective Guidance on the I&EP* [1] • Positive, constructive approach • *Usefulness of MOO* [2] • *PRT Lead Facilitation* [3] ***Expectations for the Visit*** • Expectations Met? • If Not Met, why? **Overall Satisfaction** ***Additional Information Needed*** ***Next Steps as Result of Visit*** [4]	***Confidence That* PRT Process *Will Help Institution Improve Effectiveness*** ***Adherence to the PRT Approach*** • PRT's preparedness • PRT helpful attitude • Consideration of institutional context (needs, culture, and practices) • Open-mindedness • Focus on Sustainable and Sound Practices [5] • Focus on solutions [6] • Knowledge of Sound Practices [7] • PRT expertise fit • Recognition of institutional personnel as problem-solving peers ***PRT Functioning*** • How the PRT functioned well • How the PRT could have functioned better ***Challenges in Process***	***Institution's Receptiveness*** [8] ***Adherence to the PRT Approach*** • Application of Appreciative Inquiry [9] • Refrained from Judgmental or Prescriptive comments [10] • Positive, constructive, solutions approach ***Takeaways from the Visit*** ***Overall Effectiveness of PRT Training***

---

[1] *Visit 2* Only.
[2] *Visit 2* Only.
[3] *Visit 2* Only.
[4] *Visit 2* Only.
[5] *Visit 2* Only
[6] *Visit 2* Only
[7] *For Client Institutions, Visit 2 only*
[8] *Visit 1* Only.
[9] *Visit 1* Only.
[10] *Visit 1* Only.

In addition to the closed-ended questions about the Visit experience, the surveys included open-ended questions asking respondents to:

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

Respondents were also asked to list up to three expectations they had for the visits and indicate whether those expectations were met. For Visit 1, PRT Members were additionally asked to briefly assess the institution's overall receptiveness to the PRT Process.

Training Concepts Used for the Visit

The second set of Areas of Inquiry focused on the training concepts used by PRT Members during their visits. To gather this information, PRT Members responded to a closed-ended question rating the overall effectiveness of the training and to open-ended questions identifying the training concepts, tools, and techniques they found most valuable.

Table 2.   Training Concepts Used for the Visits
PRT Items
- Most Useful Aspects of PRT Training   - Recommended Changes or Improvements to the Training   - PRT Practice That Was Especially Helpful

PRT Members made recommended improvements or changes to the training based on their experiences during the visits. They also identified specific PRT practices or actions that were especially helpful in supporting the process. *Table 2* summarizes the constructs considered within these *Areas of Inquiry*.

Logistics

The third set of *Areas of Inquiry* focused on the *Logistics* before, during, and after the visits. Client Institutions were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of key logistical elements throughout the cycle, including scheduling visit dates and meetings, as well as communicating with the PRT Lead and Project Director.

PRT Members reflected on their understanding of roles, agreement on visit outcomes, and communication among team members. They also reported on time spent preparing for each visit, completing follow-up activities, and preparing for the next visit. Additional topics included scheduling, the effectiveness of team meetings, and the coordination and leadership provided

by PRT Leads. **Table 3** displays the constructs measured for the *Logistics Areas of Inquiry* for Visits 1 and 2.

Table 3. Logistics		
Client Institution **Only Items**	Client Institution **and PRT Items**	**PRT Only Items**

Communication
 	
• *With Project Director/PRT Lead <u>Before</u> the Visit*
• *With Project Director/PRT Lead <u>After</u> the Visit*
• *Dissemination of Information*
  • *Next Steps*
  • *Seed Grants[11]*
	Scheduling
	
	• *Visit*
	• *Meetings during Visit*
	
	Effectiveness
	• *PRT Lead Coordination and Effectiveness*
		Team Camaraderie and Operations
		
		• *Clarity of Roles*
		• *Shared Outcomes for Visits*
		• *Communication*
		  • *Clarity*
		  • *Timeliness*
		• *Hours Spent on* PRT Process
		• *Availability of Information, including Travel, Reimbursements, etc.*
		• *Access to Institutional Information*
		• *Useful of Face-to-Face PRT Meeting before Visit*
		• *Effectiveness of PRT Phone Conferences before the Visit*
		• *Time Availability for Meetings During Visit*

Miscellaneous

The final *Area of Inquiry* elicited open-ended responses from Client Institutions and PRT Members on topics not previously covered in the survey.

---

[11] Visit 2 only.

Components of the Report

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

- Introduction
- Key Findings for Visit 1
- Key Findings for Visit 2
- Analysis and Findings
  - Visit 1
  - Visit 2
- Appendix

The *Key Findings* section summarizes survey results from both the Client Institutions and PRT Members for each visit in a concise, accessible format. The *Analysis and Findings* section offers a detailed narrative interpretation of the results, accompanied by tables to illustrate trends and insights. The *Appendix* provides more detailed data related to specific *Areas of Inquiry*.

Together, these components provide policymakers, IEPI staff, researchers, and institutional stakeholders with accessible and appropriately detailed findings to inform future practice and decision-making.

Summary of Findings
Visit 1

KEY FINDINGS			VISIT ONE
PRT Technical Assistance Scorecard | Cycle 11A			
AREA OF INTEREST	CLIENT INSTITUTION FEEDBACK		PRT FEEDBACK
FAMILIARITY			
With Areas of Focus	Very Strong		
With the PRT Process	Very Strong		
CONFIDENCE IN PRT PROCESS	Very Strong		Very Strong
INSTITUTIONAL RECPTIVENESS	Not Applicable		Very Strong
EXPECTATIONS FOR THE VISIT			
Areas of Interest	Listen and Facilitate Conversations on the Areas of Focus (3)	Met	
	Frame the Issues with the College Representatives (2)	Met	
PRT APPROACH			
Sufficiency of Information Provided	Very Strong		
PRT's Preparedness	Very Strong		Very Strong
Positive, Constructive and Solution-Oriented Approach	Very Strong		
PRT Helpful Attitude	Very Strong		Very Strong
PRT Consideration of Specific Needs, Culture and Practices	Very Strong		Very Strong
Open-mindedness	Very Strong		Very Strong
PRT Institutional Fit	Very Strong		Very Strong
Recognition of Institutional Personnel as Problem-Solving Peers	Very Strong		Very Strong
Focused on Solutions Rather than Problems or Place Blame	Not Applicable		Very Strong
Applied Appreciative Inquiry Techniques	Not Applicable		Very Strong
PRT Refrained from Judgmental or Prescriptive Comments	Not Applicable		Very Strong
Knowledge of Sound Practices Related to Areas of Focus	Not Applicable		Very Strong
LOGISTICS			
Communication with IEPI Project Director/PRT Lead Before the Visit	Very Strong		
Communication with IEPI Project Director/PRT Lead After the Visit	Very Strong		
Scheduling Visit Date	Very Strong		Very Strong
Scheduling Meetings During Visit	Very Strong		Very Strong
Effectiveness: PRT Lead	Very Strong		
Dissemination of Info: Next Steps	Very Strong		
Access to Information: Travel	Not Applicable		Very Strong
PRT PROCESS			
How the PRT Functioned Well	PRT Readiness for the Work (4)		Active Listening (8)
How the PRT Could Have Functioned Better	None (6)		

Summary of Findings
Visit 1

KEY FINDINGS (Continued)		VISIT ONE
PRT Technical Assistance Scorecard | Cycle 11A		
AREA OF INTEREST	**CLIENT INSTITUTION FEEDBACK**	**PRT FEEDBACK**
CHALLENGES		
General Areas	Insufficient Time During the Visit (6)	Insufficient time for the Discussions Needed at the Meetings (10)
ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED	None (2)	Not Applicable
TEAM OPERATION		
Clarity of Roles	Not Applicable	Very Strong
Shared Outcomes for Visits		Very Strong
Communication: Clarity		Very Strong
Communication: Timeliness		Very Strong
Access to Information: Areas of Focus		Very Strong
Access to Information: Logistics		Very Strong
Time Availability: Institutional Meetings		Very Strong
Time Availability: Team Meetings		Very Strong
Effectiveness of PRT Phone or Zoom Conferences(s) before the Visit		Very Strong
Usefulness of Face-to-Face or Zoom PRT Meeting Immediately before Visit		Very Strong
Coordination and Leadership of PRT Lead		Very Strong
Average Preparation Time for Visit (hours)		5.1
Average Time Completing Follow-up Activities (hours)		1.1
Average Time Preparing for Next Visit (hours)		1.0
TRAINING		
Concepts Applied to the Visit	Not Applicable	Active Listening (6)
		Appreciative Inquiry (2)
Particular Helpful Practice	Not Applicable	Active Listening (3)
Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training	Not Applicable	Very Strong
TRAINING SUGGESTIONS		
Suggestions, Methods, and Curriculum	Not Applicable	None (4)
TEAM TAKEAWAYS		
For Application at Home Sites/Other Venues	Not Applicable	None (5)
FINAL THOUGHTS AND COMMENTS		
Additional Feedback, If Any	Not Applicable	None (4)

Summary of Findings
Visit 2

KEY FINDINGS			VISIT TWO
PRT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SCORECARD| Cycle 11A			
AREA OF INTEREST	**CLIENT INSTITUTION FEEDBACK**		**PRT FEEDBACK**
FAMILIARITY			
With Areas of Focus	Very Strong		Not Applicable
With the PRT Process	Very Strong		
CONFIDENCE IN PRT PROCESS TO IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS	Very Strong		Very Strong
EXPECTATIONS FOR THE VISIT			
Areas of Interest	Guide the Institution in the Creation of the I&EP (4)	Met	Not Applicable
PRT APPROACH			
Sufficiency of Information Provided	Very Strong		Not Applicable
PRT's Preparedness	Very Strong		Very Strong
PRT Positive, Constructive Approach	Very Strong		Not Applicable
PRT Solutions-Based Approach	Not Applicable		Very Strong
PRT Knowledge of Sound Practices	Very Strong		Very Strong
PRT Helpful Attitude	Very Strong		Very Strong
PRT Consideration the Specific Needs, Culture and Practices	Very Strong		Very Strong
PRT Open-mindedness	Very Strong		Very Strong
PRT Institutional Fit	Very Strong		Very Strong
Focus on Sustainable and Sound Practices	Very Strong		Very Strong
PRT Solutions-Focused Rather than Problems	Very Strong		Very Strong
Recognition of Institutional Personnel as Problem-Solving Peers	Very Strong		Very Strong
Menu of Options (MOO) Useful Options and Examples	Very Strong		Not Applicable
PRT Lead Facilitation of Discussion of Options	Very Strong		Not Applicable
Guidance on the I&EP	Very Strong		Not Applicable
LOGISTICS			
Communication with IEPI Project Director/PRT Lead Before the Visit	Very Strong		Not Applicable
Communication with IEPI Project Director/PRT Lead After the Visit	Very Strong		Not Applicable
Scheduling Visit Date	Very Strong		Very Strong
Scheduling Meetings During Visit	Very Strong		Very Strong
Coordination and Leadership: PRT Lead	Very Strong		Not Applicable
Coordination and Leadership: PRT Lead	Very Strong		Not Applicable
Dissemination of Information: Next Steps	Very Strong		Not Applicable
Dissemination of Information: Seed Grants	Very Strong		Not Applicable

Summary of Findings
Visit 2

KEY FINDINGS (Continued)		VISIT TWO
PRT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SCORECARD | Cycle 11A		
AREA OF INTEREST	**CLIENT INSTITUTION FEEDBACK**	**PARTNERSHIP RESOURCE TEAM FEEDBACK**
PRT PROCESS		
How the PRT Functioned Well	Afforded Space for the Institution to Carve out Unique Solutions (4)	Responses Varied; No Theme Emerged
How the PRT Could Have Functioned Better	None (8)	None (8)
ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED	None (4)	Not Applicable
CHALLENGES		
General Areas	Preparedness for the Goals of the Visit (2)	Responses Varied; No Theme Emerged
TEAM OPERATION		
Clarity of Roles	Not Applicable	Very Strong
Shared Outcomes for Visits		Very Strong
Communication: Clarity		Very Strong
Communication: Timeliness		Very Strong
Access to Information: Areas of Focus		Very Strong
Access to Information: Travel		Very Strong
Time Availability: Institutional Meetings		Very Strong
Time Availability: Team Meetings		Very Strong
Effectiveness of PRT Phone or Zoom Conference(s) before the Visit		Very Strong
Usefulness of Face-to-Face Before the Visit		Very Strong
Effectiveness of Communication During Visit		Very Strong
Time Available for PRT Meetings during the Visit		Very Strong
Coordination and Leadership of PRT Lead		Very Strong
Average Preparation Time for Visit (hrs)		2.9
Average Time Completing Follow-up Activities (hrs)		1.4
Average Time Preparing for Next Visit (hrs)		0.5
TRAINING		
Concepts Applied to the Visit	Not Applicable	Appreciative Inquiry (7)
Particular Helpful Practice	Not Applicable	Appreciative Inquiry (4)
Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training		Very Strong
TRAINING SUGGESTIONS		
Suggestions, Methods, and Curriculum	Not Applicable	None (7)
TEAM TAKEAWAYS		
For Application at Home Sites/Other Venues	Not Applicable	Institutions Resolve Common Community College Challenges Uniquely Based on Local Culture and History (4)
CLIENT INSTITUTION NEXT STEPS		
Reported Next Actions in the PRT Process	Secure Institutional Buy-In to the Efforts of the PRT (4)	Not Applicable
OVERALL SATISFACTION		
With PRT Technical Assistance	Very Strong	Not Applicable

The Visit Process

Familiarity with Areas of Focus and *the PRT Process*

The first Area of Inquiry in the Visit 1 Client Institution survey examined institutional representatives' familiarity with the technical assistance process after completing the initial visit of the Three-Visit PRT Process. Specifically, the survey assessed familiarity with two key aspects:

- The institution's Areas of Focus (AOFs) for improving institutional effectiveness, as outlined in the Letter of Interest and any subsequent documents.
- The overall Three-Visit PRT Process: gathering information and establishing scope during Visit 1, supporting the institution with developing its Innovation and Effectiveness Plan (I&EP) in Visit 2, and following up on the early implementation of the I&EP during Visit 3.

Respondents rated their familiarity on a four-point scale: ***Very familiar***, ***Familiar***, ***Somewhat familiar***, or ***Not at all familiar***.

The Cycle 11A cohort included 11 institutions -- four single-college districts, three colleges within multi-college districts, and four district offices. Ten institutions responded to the Visit survey. Among them, seven reported being ***Very familiar*** with their specific AOFs, while three indicated they were ***Familiar.*** No institution reported being either ***Somewhat familiar*** or ***Not at all familiar*** with their *AOFs*. The average familiarity rating for the *AOFs* across institutions was ***Very familiar*** (M = 3.70).

For familiarity with the overall Three-Visit PRT Process, seven institutions reported being ***Very familiar***, and three reported being ***Familiar*** with no lower ratings. The overall rating for familiarity with the Three-Visit Process was also ***Very familiar*** (M=3.70).

Table 4 provides a detailed breakdown of the mean responses for each aspect of familiarity.

Table 4. Client Institution Overall Level of Familiarity with AOFs and PRT Process, Visit 1		
Level of Familiarity	Client Institution **Mean of Means** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**
With Institution's *AOFs*	3.70 *(Very familiar)*	10
With Three-Visit PRT Process	3.70 *(Very familiar)*	10
		Total Institutions: 10

Tables A.1 and **A.2** in the Appendix to this report provide a more detailed overview of the responses from the client institutions.

Confidence in the PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness

In the respective surveys, both PRT Members and Client Institution representatives reported their level of confidence that the PRT Process would help improve the Client Institutions' effectiveness in their *AOFs*. Confidence was measured on a four-point scale: ***Very confident***, ***Confident, Somewhat confident***, or ***Not at all confident***.

As with the familiarity ratings, confidence scores are presented as aggregate data for the entire cohort; no ratings were computed for individual Client Institutions or PRT Members.

Client Institutions

Among the 10 Client Institutions responding to the Visit 1 survey during Cycle 11A, seven reported being ***Very confident*** that the PRT Process would improve effectiveness with their specific *AOFs,* while three indicated they were ***Confident.*** No Client Institution reported being ***Somewhat confident*** or ***Not at all confident***. The overall rating *of the client institutions* for confidence in the PRT Process in this reporting cycle was ***very*** high (M = 3.70).

PRT Members

A total of 37 PRT Members responded to the survey, representing 11 institutions in Cycle 11A – more respondents than the Client Institutions. Regarding confidence in the PRT Process, 30 PRT Members reported that they were either ***Very confident*** (N=25) or ***Confident*** (N=5) that the PRT Process would support institution improvement. Seven (7) PRT Members reported being ***Somewhat confident***. N*o* PRT Member in Cycle 11A reported being ***Somewhat confident*** or ***Not at all confident***. The overall rating for the PRT members' confidence was ***"Confident"*** (M =

3.49). Historically, PRT members have reported slightly lower levels of confidence than Client Institution representatives reported.

Table 5 presents the overall mean score for Client Institution representatives and PRT Member responses, as well as the scale categories for confidence at Visit 1. **Tables A.3** and **A.4** in the Appendix to this report detail the overall client institution responses and PRT member responses regarding the level of confidence in the PRT approach to improving institutional effectiveness.

Table 5. Level of Confidence in the PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness in the Identified Area of Focus, Visit 1				
Level of Confidence	Client Institution **Overall Response**		**PRT Member Response**	
	Mean of Means *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**	**Mean** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**
In the PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness	3.70 *(Very confident)*	10	3.49 *(Confident)*	37

Expectations for the Visit

Client Institution representatives identified their expectations for Visit 1 and whether their expectations were met. If expectations were not met, respondents provided examples or elaborated on the reasons. Ten Client Institutions responded. Six responses listed two expectations, each of the remaining institutions listed only one. The evaluator analyzed and categorized the responses to identify common themes.

Two themes emerged from the responses: Client Institutions expected the PRT to 1) listen and facilitate conversations in the Areas of Focus and 2) frame the issues with the college representatives. Client institutions reported that expectations were met. Other expectations identified in the responses were unique to each institution, making it impossible to group them into broader categories. Importantly, however, no Client Institution reported any expectation as unmet. **Table 6** presents the categorized expectations, including a count for each category.

Table 6. Client Institution Expectations for Visit 1	
Area	**Met**
Listen and Facilitate Conversations on the Areas of Focus (3)	Yes
Frame the Issues with the College Representatives (2)	Yes

Adherence to the PRT Approach

The IEPI approach to technical assistance aims to maximize the likelihood that participating institutions successfully address their *AOFs*. The closer a PRT aligns with the IEPI-defined concepts, practices, and techniques covered in training and applied during visits, the more likely a positive technical assistance experience leading to favorable outcomes.

To evaluate adherence to the *PRT Approach*, both Client Institution representatives and PRT Members rated their agreement with a list of statements about the *Approach*. Both groups used a four-point scale: ***Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree***, or ***Strongly disagree,*** with an option of ***Not Applicable/Don't Know***.

While most of the survey items were consistent for both groups, PRT Members specifically assessed whether appreciative inquiry practices were applied during meetings, whether judgmental comments were avoided, whether sound practices were demonstrated, and whether the focus remained on solutions rather than problems. Client Institution representatives provided feedback on whether the PRT maintained a positive, constructive approach.

For Cycle 11A, Client Institution representatives overwhelmingly strongly agreed that the PRT adhered to all aspects of the PRT Process, with all responses falling within ***Strongly Agree*** or ***Agree***. No respondents indicated disagreement with any element of the PRT Process.

Similarly, PRT Members strongly agreed that the PRT adhered to all relevant elements of the PRT Process, with all responses falling within ***Strongly Agree*** or ***Agree***. No respondents indicated disagreement with any element.

Table 7 reports the mean overall responses from Client Institutions and PRT Members' adherence to aspects of the *PRT Approach* for Visit 1. Additional detailed results are available in **Tables A.5** and **A.6** in the Appendix.

Table 7. Level of Adherence to PRT Approach, Visit 1				
Area of PRT Approach	**Client Institution Overall Response**		**PRT Member Response**	
	Mean of Means 1 (Low) – 4 (High)	**Count**	**Mean** 1 (Low) - 4 (High)	**Count**
We had the information we needed to work effectively with the PRT.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	N/A	N/A
The PRT was well prepared for the visit.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37
The PRT applied Appreciative Inquiry in meetings with institutional personnel.	N/A	N/A	3.81 (Strongly agree)	37
The PRT refrained from making judgmental or prescriptive comments in meetings with institutional personnel.	N/A	N/A	3.81 (Strongly agree)	37
The PRT took a positive and constructive approach to the work.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	N/A	N/A
The PRT was knowledgeable about sound practices related to the institution's identified *AOFs*.	N/A	N/A	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37
The PRT conveyed a helpful attitude in interactions with members of the institutional community.	3.70 (Strongly agree)	10	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37
The PRT took into consideration the institution's specific needs, culture, and practices.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.81 (Strongly agree)	37
The PRT focused on solutions rather than problems or where to place blame.	N/A	N/A	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37
The PRT Members kept an open mind about issues and possible solutions.	3.70 (Strongly agree)	10	3.84 (Strongly agree)	37
The expertise of the PRT Members was a good fit for the institution's *AOFs*.	3.70 (Strongly agree)	10	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37
The PRT recognized institutional personnel as problem-solving peers.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37

Client Institution Receptiveness

Visit 1 is the first contact between the PRT and the Client Institution representatives during the PRT Process. Establishing positive relationships is essential for the process's ultimate success. To help assess the impact of the first meeting, PRT Members reported the level of receptiveness demonstrated by the institutional representatives towards the PRT Process during the visit. The item is an open-ended response, allowing PRT members to provide free responses to the prompt.

The evaluator compiled the responses into a list and examined them to determine whether, collectively, the institutions were overall receptive to the visiting PRTs. The level of receptiveness was considered for the entire cohort of institutions, recognizing that individual levels of openness to PRTs would vary from one institution to another. Twenty-four PRT Members supplied responses to this item. The responses were all general and provided no identifiable themes for Cycle 11A.

As with previous iterations of the survey for prior cycles, PRT Members used terms such as "open," "hospitable," and "welcoming" to describe the level of receptiveness demonstrated by institutional personnel. A general conclusion, however, could be drawn that the institutions were receptive to the PRTs during Visit 1. No PRT Member reported any institution being unreceptive to the team.

PRT Functioning

The PRT's performance, both in preparing for and during the visit, was examined to determine the level of preparedness and the efficacy of existing processes and practices. The evidence collected from this item will be used to identify steps for formative improvements to within-cycle PRT practices and to detect possible topics for PRT training for future cycles. The Client Institution representatives and the PRT Members identified examples of how the PRT functioned well.

Ten Client Institution representatives and 30 PRT Members responded to this question. One theme emerged from the responses for each reporting group. For Client Institution representatives, the PRT arrived ready to complete the work. For PRT Members, the team performed well by actively listening to the institutional representatives as directed in the PRT training. *Table 8* reports the most common Client Institution and *PRT* member-coded ways the PRT functioned well for Visit 1.

Table 8. Examples of PRT Functioning Well, Visit 1	
Client Institution**s**	**PRT Members**
• PRT Readiness for the Work (4)	• Active Listening (8)

How the PRT Could Have Functioned Better

Client Institutions and the PRT Members were asked to share suggestions on how the PRTs could have functioned better before or during Visit 1. Eight Client Institutions responded to this

item, with four indicating they had no suggestions (i.e., "None"). Similarly, 21 PRT Members, with eight also reporting no suggestions for improvement (i.e., "None").

The remaining responses from both groups were individualized and did not reveal any consistent themes. *Table 9* summarizes the most common suggestions, where applicable, from *Client Institutions* and *PRT Members* regarding areas for potential improvement in Visit 1.

Table 9. Examples of How PRTs Could Function Better, Visit 1	
Client Institutions	PRT Members
• None (4)	• None (8)

Challenges Preparing for or During the Visit

Client Institution representatives and PRT Members were also asked to identify any challenges encountered while preparing for or during Visit 1. Six Client Institutions responded, with three reporting that having sufficient time for in-depth discussions during the visit was a significant challenge. Of the 18 PRT Members who responded, ten echoed this concern, noting that having adequate time for engagement was a particular challenge.

Table 10 highlights the most frequently reported challenges from both *Client Institutions* and *PRT Members* during Visit 1 of the PRT Process.

Table 10. Challenges Preparing for or during Visit 1	
Client Institutions	PRT Members
• Insufficient Time During the Visit (6)	• Insufficient time for the Discussions Needed at the Meetings (10)

Takeaways

To assess the perceived value of participation, PRT Members were asked to report any personal or professional takeaways from their experience for Visit 1. As with previous open-ended items, responses were reviewed for common themes.

Ten PRT Members responded to this question; five indicated they had no takeaways (i.e., "None"). The remaining responses were varied and highly individualized, with no single theme emerging across participants. *Table 11* presents the reported takeaways from PRT Members following Visit 1.

Table 11. PRT Member Takeaways from the PRT Process, Visit 1
PRT Members
• None (5)

Additional Information Needed

Client Institution representatives were asked to provide additional information (if any) that would have helped them better prepare for the visit. Three Client Institution representatives responded, with two indicating no additional information was needed. The other response was individual and could not be generalized into a theme for the cycle. *Table 10* reports the most common Client Institution assessment of any additional information needed for the visit.

Table 10. Any Additional Information Needed by Client Institutions, Visit 1
Client Institution**s**
• None (2)

Training Concepts Used During the Visit

Most Useful Aspects of Training

Concepts and practices presented during the PRT trainings are valuable tools for *PRT members* during their visits. PRT Members reported the concepts and practices learned during the PRT training that proved most beneficial to them during the initial visit. Twenty PRT Members responded to the question. Two themes emerged from the responses. PRT Members identified active listening as a critical practice presented at the training and used during the first visit.

Additionally, PRT Members also employed appreciative inquiry during their Visit 1 meetings. Other responses were individual or general, and the data revealed no other themes from the responses. *Table 12* reports the most common training aspect cited as applicable by PRT Members for Visit 1.

Table 12. Most Useful Training Aspects, Visit 1
PRT Members
• Active Listening (6)
• Appreciative Inquiry (3)

Especially Helpful Practice or Action

As a follow-up, PRT Members noted a particular practice they found most helpful in ensuring a successful and effective visit. Eight PRT Members responded to the question. The PRT Members again identified active listening as a beneficial practice during Visit 1. The responses revealed no other theme. *Table 13* shows the most common helpful practice reported by PRT Members for Visit 1.

Table 13. Particularly Helpful Practice or Action, Visit 1
PRT Members
• Active Listening (2)

Training Suggestions

PRT Members offered suggestions for training improvements based on their experiences during Visit 1. Eight PRT Members responded to the question. The most common response to this question was "None." No other theme emerged from the responses. *Table 14* reports the most common responses regarding suggestions for training improvement.

Table 14. Training Suggestions: Visit 1
PRT Members
• None (4)

Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training

In the final training-related question, PRT Members were asked to rate the overall usefulness and effectiveness of the PRT training, considering their experiences both before and during Visit 1. Responses were recorded using a four-point scale: *Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor,* with an option to select *"Don't Know*."

A total of 37 PRT Members responded to the question. The average rating for the training was *Excellent (M = 3.81)*, indicating a high level of satisfaction with both the usefulness and effectiveness of the training provided.

Table 15 presents the mean *PRT Member* response and corresponding scale category for the Visit 1 training. Additional details are provided in *Table A.7* in the Appendix, which displays the full distribution of responses related to the training's overall quality.

Table 15. PRT Member Rating of the Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the PRT Training, Visit 1		
Level	**Mean** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**
Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training	3.81 *(Excellent)*	37

Logistics

Client Institution representatives and PRT Members were asked in their respective surveys about the *Logistics* before, during, and after Visit 1. These include scheduling, communication, and the effectiveness of leadership by the PRT Lead. Responses for both groups were recorded using a four-point scale to measure the areas: ***Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree***, or ***Strongly disagree,*** with an option of ***Not Applicable/Don't Know***. Client Institution representatives and PRT Members reported each aspect of the logistics as ***Excellent***. *Table 16* reports the overall ratings for Visit 1 of the Client Institutions and the PRT Members.

Table 16. Responses Regarding Logistics Before, During, and After Visit 1				
Areas	**Client Institution Overall Response**		**PRT Member Responses**	
	Mean of Means *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**	**Mean** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**
a. Scheduling of the date of the Visit	3.70 *(Excellent)*	10	3.81 *(Strongly agree)*	37
b. Scheduling of meetings to be held during the Visit	3.70 *(Excellent)*	10	3.81 *(Strongly agree)*	37
c. FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Communication with the IEPI Project Director and/or PRT Lead before Visit	3.80 *(Excellent)*	5	N/A	N/A
d. FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Communication with the PRT Lead and/or PRT Members after Visit, to date	3.80 *(Excellent)*	5	N/A	N/A
e. FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Effectiveness of the PRT Lead in coordinating with the institution regarding the visit.	3.80 *(Excellent)*	5	N/A	N/A
f. FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Provision of information about the institution's next steps following the visit.	3.80 *(Excellent)*	5	N/A	N/A
h. Availability of information about travel arrangements, reimbursements, and related logistics	N/A	N/A	3.81 *(Excellent)*	37
I. Access to information related to the institution's *AOFs*	N/A	N/A	3.84 *(Excellent)*	37
j. Effectiveness of PRT Phone conference(s) before the visit.	N/A	N/A	3.84 *(Excellent)*	37
k. Usefulness of face-to-face PRT meeting immediately before the visit	N/A	N/A	3.86 *(Excellent)*	37
1. Time available for meetings with the institution's personnel during the visit	N/A	N/A	3.86 *(Excellent)*	37
m. Time available for PRT meetings during the visit	N/A	N/A	3.81 *(Excellent)*	37
n. Coordination and leadership by the PRT Lead	N/A	N/A	3.84 *(Excellent)*	37

Clarity of Roles

PRT Members were asked to rate their understanding of their Roles, Outcomes, and Communication. A total of 37 respondents agreed on the *Clarity of Roles*, a shared understanding of *Outcomes*, and the clarity and timeliness of communication with each other for Visit 1. The mean results in all four areas indicate that PRT Members **Strongly agreed**. No PRT Member **Disagreed** or **Strongly Disagreed** with the statements. **Table 17** reports the PRT Members' overall ratings for these areas for Visit 1.

Table 17. PRT Member Clarity of Roles, Outcomes, and Communication, Visit 1		
Answer Options	**Mean** *1 (Low) - 4*	**Count**
Were Clear about the Roles and Responsibilities of the Team.	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37
Were on the Same Page about Anticipated Outcomes of the PRT Process.	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37
Communicated Clearly with Each Other.	3.84 (Strongly agree)	37
Communicated in a Timely Fashion with Each Other.	3.84 (Strongly agree)	37

Hours Spent on the PRT Process

To assess the workload for members during the PRT Process, PRT Members were asked to identify the time spent preparing for the visit, completing follow-up activities, and preparing for the next visit. The mean time spent by PRT Members for each phase of Visit 1 during Cycle 11A was calculated as an aggregate. Of the 37 responses, the hours spent preparing for Visit 1 were a mean of 5.1 **Table 18** displays the meantime reported by PRT Members on Visit 1.

Table 18. Mean Hours Spent on PRT Process, Visit 1		
Answer Options	**Mean**	**Count**
Preparing for this Visit	5.1	37
Completing any Follow-up Activities Related to this PRT Visit to Date	1.1	37
Preparing for the Next PRT Visit (if any) to Date	1.0	37

Final Thoughts and Comments

The final item of the survey invited PRT Members to share any additional feedback or comments not addressed in previous questions. Ten PRT Members and three of the ten Client Institution representatives responded. Among PRT Members, the most common response was "None." The remaining responses were general, and no consistent themes emerged. Similarly, the Client Institutions' responses were varied and did not yield identifiable patterns.

Table 19 reports the most frequently reported miscellaneous comments from PRT Members for Visit 1.

Table 19. PRT Member Final Thoughts and Comments, Visit 1
PRT Members
• None (4)

Conclusion

Overall, the survey ratings and responses from both the Client Institutions and the PRT Members for Visit 1 of Cycle 11A were highly positive. Notably, strong results were reported in the areas of adherence to the PRT Process, logistics, and institutional familiarity with their Areas of Focus (AOFs). Confidence in the PRT Process as a tool for improving institutional effectiveness also remained high across the cohort.

As expected, PRT Members consistently cited *active listening* as a particularly valuable training practice. This aligns with the intent of Visit 1, where the PRT's role is to create space for the institution to reflect and self-assess its current state in preparation for improvements. Active listening is a key concept taught in PRT training and an essential expectation for Visit 1 interactions.

The mean number of hours reported by PRT Members for Visit 1preparation and participation appeared appropriate for this stage of the process.

Although most aspects of the PRT Process were rated highly, the collection of *takeaways* from PRT members continues to be an area for reflection. Given the nature of Visit 1, which focused primarily on listening and relationship-building, it may be premature to expect meaningful takeaways in this step. Moving this item to the Visit 2 survey, when deeper engagement and interactions begin, may yield more insightful responses.

Overall, the findings from Visit 1 in Cycle 11A are consistent with trends observed in earlier cycles and continue to reflect the strong implementation of the PRT Process Model.

Visit Two

The Visit Process

Familiarity with Areas of Focus and the PRT Process

Visit 2 centers to help the institution with drafting an *Innovation* and *Effectiveness Plan (I&EP)* to address its *AOFs*.

The first *Area of Inquiry* in the Visit 2 Client Institution survey focused on representatives' level of familiarity with the technical assistance process. Specifically, their understanding of their institutions' Areas of Focus (AOFs) and the PRT Three-Visit Process. Both aspects were evaluated after Visit 1.

A deeper understanding of the AOFs and the structure of the PRT Process is associated with more successful outcomes. As institutions deepen their knowledge and understanding of the AOFs that technical assistance aims to address, the purpose of each visit, they are more likely to experience meaningful progress in institutional effectiveness.

To assess familiarity with these two critical aspects of the PRT Process, the evaluator used separate survey items:

- **The institution's AOFs** for improving institutional effectiveness, as outlined in the Letter of Interest (together with any subsequent modifications and more detailed commentary); and
- **The Three-Visit PRT Process** (Visit 1: gathering information and defining scope; Visit 2: helping the institution develop its I&EP; Visit 3: following up on the early implementation of the I&EP)

Responses were rated on a four-point scale for each aspect: ***Very familiar***, ***Familiar***, ***Somewhat familiar***, or ***Not at all familiar***.

Cycle 11A included 11 institutions: four single-college districts, three colleges in multi-college districts, and four district offices. Ten total Institutions responded to the Visit 2 survey; however, the respondents differed slightly from those in Visit 1.

Of the 10 institutions:

- Nine reported being *Very familiar* with their *AOFs;* one reported being *Familiar.* None reported being *somewhat familiar* or *not at all familiar.* The overall rating then for familiarity was *Very familiar* (M=3.90).
- Eight reported being *Very familiar* with the PRT Three-Visit Process, and two reported being *Familiar*. Again, no respondents selected *Somewhat familiar* or *Not at all familiar*. The overall mean of familiarity with the PRT Process was *Very familiar* (M = 3.80)

Table 20 presents the mean scores for Client Institution responses and the associated scale category regarding familiarity with each *Area of Inquiry*.

Additional detail can be found in **Tables A.8** and **A.9** in the Appendix, which summarizes client institution responses regarding their familiarity with the Areas of Focus and the PRT Three-Visit Process.

Table 20. Client Institution Overall Level of Familiarity with AOFs and PRT Process, Visit 2		
Level of Familiarity	**Client Institution Mean of Means** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**
With Institution's *AOFs*	3.90 *(Very familiar)*	10
With Three-Visit PRT Process	3.80 *(Very familiar)*	10
		Total Institutions: 10

Confidence in the PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness

The next *Area of Inquiry* in Visit 2 surveys assessed the level of confidence that Client Institution representatives and PRT Members had in the PRT Process to improve institutional effectiveness in their identified *AOFs*. Responses were rated on a four-point scale: *Very confident*, *Confident,* *Somewhat confident*, or *Not at all confident*.

Client Institutions

Of the 10 responding Client Institutions, Nine reported being *Very confident* that the PRT Process would help improve institutional effectiveness in their AOF; one reported being *Confident*, and none reported being either *Somewhat confident* or *Not at all confident*.

The overall rating for the Client Institutions' confidence was *Very Confident (M = 3.90).*

Thirty-two (32) PRT Members responded to the question regarding their confidence that the PRT Process would support the Client Institutions in improving effectiveness in their respective AOFs.

Twenty-eight respondents reported being *Very confident*; four reported being *Confident*; and none indicated being *Somewhat confident* or *Not at all confident.*

The overall rating for the PRT Members was *"Very Confident"* (M = 3.88), an improvement from the rating for confidence reported after Visit 1.

Table 21 presents the overall mean scores for Client Institutions and PRT Member responses, as well as the scale categories for confidence at Visit 2. A detailed display of the overall Client Institution responses regarding the level of confidence in the *PRT Approach to Improve Institutional Effectiveness* can be found in *Table A.10* in the Appendix to this report. A detailed display of the overall PRT Member responses regarding the level of confidence in the *PRT Approach to Improve Institutional Effectiveness* can be found in *Table A.11* in the Appendix to this report.

Table 21. Level of Confidence in the PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness in the Area of Focus, Visit 2				
Level of Confidence	**Client Institution Overall Response**		**PRT Member Response**	
	Mean of Means *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**	**Mean** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**
In the PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness	3.90 *(Very confident)*	10	3.88 *(Very confident)*	32

Overall Satisfaction

Client Institutions rated their satisfaction with the quality of PRT technical using a five-point scale: *Not at all Satisfied*, *Somewhat satisfied*, *Satisfied*, *Quite Satisfied*, and *Extremely satisfied*. Of the 10 institutions that responded, nine reported being *Extremely satisfied* and one reported *being Quite satisfied*. The overall satisfaction rating was *"Very satisfied"* (M = 3.90).

Table 22 reports the mean PRT Member response and the associated scale category regarding the overall satisfaction with the PRT technical assistance to date. *Table A.14,* located in the Appendix, displays a more detailed PRT rating of the overall usefulness and effectiveness of the PRT training.

Table 22. PRT Member Rating of the Overall Satisfaction with the PRT Technical Assistance to date.		
Level	Mean *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	Count
Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training	3.90 *(Very satisfied)*	10

Expectations for the Visit

Client Institution representatives were asked to describe their expectations for Visit 2. Within the PRT Process, Visit 2 has a distinct purpose compared to Visit 1. While the initial visit centers on actively listening, allowing PRT Members to gain a deeper understanding of the institution's culture, the *AOFs*, and challenges, Visit 2 emphasizes collaboration. During this second visit, PRT Members support the institution in brainstorming ideas, exploring possible solutions, and initiating the development of the I&EP.

Seven representatives responded to this open-ended question. One provided three expectations, another listed two, and the remaining five each shared one expectation. The evaluator compiled these responses and categorized them into common themes.

A single clear theme emerged: Client Institution representatives expected the PRT to provide guidance in developing the I&EP. Respondents confirmed that this expectation was met. *Table 23* reports the coded responses and frequency of each.

Table 23. Client Institution Expectations, Visit 2	
Area	Met
• Guide the Institution in the Creation of the I&EP (4)	Yes

Adherence to the PRT Approach

Adherence to the PRT Approach during Visit 2 was assessed by asking both PRT Members and Client Institution representatives to indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements reflecting key elements of the process, such as team preparedness and the open-mindedness of the PRT members.

Most survey items were consistent across both groups. However, for Visit 2, the Client Institutions were asked additional questions regarding whether they had the necessary information to work effectively with the PRT, the usefulness of the Menu of Options (MOO), and the effectiveness of the guidance provided in developing the I&EPs.

Responses from both PRT Members and Client Institutional representatives indicated strong agreement that the PRT adhered closely to the intended approach.

Table 24 presents the mean responses from both groups regarding each aspect of adherence to the PRT Approach. On average, both PRT Members and Client Institutions *Strongly agreed* that the PRT followed the PRT Model during Visit 2.

Table 24. Level of Adherence to PRT Approach, Visit 2				
Area of PRT Approach	**Client Institution Overall Response**		**PRT Member Response**	
	Mean of Means 1 (Low) – 4 (High)	**Count**	**Mean** 1 (Low) - 4 (High)	**Count**
We had the information we needed to work effectively with the PRT.	3.90 (Strongly agree)	10	N/A	N/A
The PRT was well prepared for the visit.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.84 (Strongly agree)	32
The PRT took a positive, constructive approach to the work.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	N/A	N/A
The PRT took a positive, constructive, solutions-based approach to the work.	N/A	N/A	3.84 (Strongly agree)	32
The PRT was knowledgeable about sound practices related to the institution's identified *AOFs*.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.84 (Strongly agree)	32
The PRT conveyed a helpful attitude in interactions with members of the institutional community.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.88 (Strongly agree)	32
The PRT took into consideration the specific needs, culture, and practices of the institution.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.84 (Strongly agree)	32
The PRT Members kept an open mind about issues and possible solutions.	3.90 (Strongly agree)	10	3.81 (Strongly agree)	32
The expertise of the PRT Members was a good fit for the institution's *AOFs.*	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.81 (Strongly agree)	32
The PRT focused on sustainable and sound practices.	3.90 (Strongly agree)	10	3.84 (Strongly agree)	32
The PRT focused on solutions rather than problems or where to place blame.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	3.84 (Strongly agree)	32
The PRT recognized institutional personnel as problem-solving peers.	3.90 (Strongly agree)	10	3.88 (Strongly agree)	32
THE PRT's Menu of Options (MOO) provided useful options and examples for our consideration.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	N/A	N/A
The PRT Lead effectively facilitated discussions of our options during the visit.	3.90 (Strongly agree)	10	N/A	N/A
The PRT provided effective guidance to the institution as we worked on the development of our I&EP.	3.80 (Strongly agree)	10	N/A	N/A

Tables A.12 and *A.13* in the **Appendix** to this report detail the overall responses from Client Institutions and PRT Members regarding the level of adherence to the PRT Approach to Improve Institutional Effectiveness.

PRT Functioning

Client Institutions and the PRT Members were asked whether the PRT functioned well and to provide supporting examples. Eight Client Institution representatives responded to this question. Their responses were compiled and reviewed for possible themes. One clear theme emerged: the PRT was effective in allowing institutions the space to create their solutions for the identified Areas of Focus.

Fifteen PRT Members responded. The members' responses were more general, and no distinct themes emerged. *Table 25* reports the most common Client Institution and *PRT* member-coded ways the PRT functioned well for Visit 2.

Table 25. Examples of PRT Functioning Well, Visit 2	
Client Institution**s**	**PRT Members**
• Afforded Space for the Institution to Carve out Unique Solutions (4)	• Responses Varied; No Theme Emerged

How the PRT Could Have Functioned Better

Both the Client Institutions and the PRT Members were asked how the PRT could have functioned better before or during Visit 2. The evaluator compiled and reviewed the responses to identify these areas of improvement.

Eight Client Institution representatives responded to this question, and all noted "None," suggesting no areas in which the PRT needed to improve. Similarly, 20 PRT Members responded to the item. Like the Client Institution respondents, the most common response for PRT Members was "None." *Table 26* reports the most common feedback from Client Institutions and PRT Members regarding potential improvements to the PRT's function during Visit 2.

Table 26. Examples of How PRTs Could Function Better, Visit 2	
Client Institution**s**	**PRT Members**
• None (8)	• None (8)

Challenges Preparing for or During the Visit

Client Institutions and PRT Members were asked to identify any challenges they faced while preparing for or during the visit. Eight Client Institution representatives and fifteen PRT members responded to the question.

The evaluator reviewed and categorized the responses to identify potential themes. For Client Institutions, a recurring theme was *Preparedness for the goals of Visit 2*. PRT Member responses were individual or general, and no themes could be derived. ***Table 27*** reports the most cited ways in which the PRT could have functioned more effectively during Visit 2.

Table 27. Challenges Preparing for and During Visit 2	
Client Institutions	PRT Members
• Preparedness for the Goals of Visit 2 (2)	• Responses Varied; No Theme Emerged

Takeaways

PRT Members were also asked to identify takeaways from Visit 2, to assess the value gained through their participation. Fifteen PRT Members responded. The evaluator listed the identified challenges and then reviewed them to categorize them into possible themes. One theme emerged from the responses regarding the takeaways from Visit 2: *Institutions addressed commonly faced problems based on their culture and history*. ***Table 28*** reports the most common ways the Client Institution and *PRT Member* coded that the PRT could have functioned better for *Visit 2*.

Table 28. Takeways from Visit 2
PRT Members
• Institutions Resolve Common Community College Challenges Uniquely Based on Local Culture and History (4)

Additional Information Needed

Client Institution representatives were asked to suggest any additional information that might have helped better prepare them for the visit. Six Client Institution representatives responded; three indicated that no additional information was needed ("None"). ***Table 29*** reports the most mentioned types of information requested by Client Institution representatives.

Table 29. Any Additional Information Needed by Client Institutions, Visit 2
Client Institutions
• None (4)

Training Concepts Used During the Visit

Most Useful Aspects of Training

PRT Members identified which concepts and practices from the PRT training were most useful during Visit 2. Sixteen Members responded to the prompt. *Appreciative inquiry* emerged as the most frequently cited and impactful practice applied during the visit. Other responses were individual or general, and no additional themes could be derived. *Table 30* reports the most commonly cited training aspect by PRT Members for *Visit 2*.

Table 30. Most Useful Training Aspects, Visit 2
PRT Members
• Appreciative Inquiry (7)

Especially Helpful Practice or Action

As a follow-up, PRT Members identified a particular practice they found most helpful in ensuring a successful and effective visit. Ten PRT Members responded to the item. The PRT Members again identified appreciative inquiry as an especially helpful practice during *Visit 2.* No other themes emerged from the responses. *Table 31* shows the most common helpful practices reported by PRT Members for *Visit 2*.

Table 31 Helpful Practice or Action, Visit 2
PRT Members
• Appreciative Inquiry (4)

Training Suggestions

Based on their experience during the Visit, PRT members suggested improvements for PRTs in future cycles. Fourteen *PRT members* responded to the question. The only common response to suggested training improvements was "None." *Table 32* reports the most common response by PRT Members to this item.

Table 32. Suggested Improvements to Training, Visit 2
PRT Members
• None (7)

Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training

PRT Members rated the overall usefulness and effectiveness of the training, considering their experiences during *Visit 2* and throughout the PRT Process. Responses were captured using a four-point scale: ***Excellent, Good, Fair,*** *or **Poor.***

All PRT Members rated the training as either ***Excellent*** or ***Good***. The overall mean rating was ***Excellent (M = 3.81). Table 33*** reports the mean *PRT Member* response and the associated scale category regarding the usefulness and effectiveness of the PRT training for *Visit 2*. A detailed display of individual responses is available in ***Table A.15*** in the Appendix.

Table 33. PRT Member Rating of the Usefulness and Effectiveness of the PRT Training, Visit 2		
Level	**Mean** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**
Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training	3.81 *(Excellent)*	32

Logistics

The next *Area of Inquiry* focused on the *Logistics* before, during, and after the visits. Both closed-ended and open-ended survey items were used to gather this information. Although there was some variation in ratings, Client Institutions and the PRT Members consistently rated the logistical Visit 2 as ***Excellent***. ***Table 34*** reports on the overall logistical ratings by Client Institutions and the PRT Members for *Visit 2*.

Table 34. Responses Regarding Logistics Before During, and After the Visit, Visit 2				
	Client Institution Response		PRT Member Responses	
Area of Logistics	**Mean of Means** 1 (Low) - 4 (High)	**Count**	**Mean** 1 (Low) - 4 (High)	**Count**
Scheduling of the date of the Visit	3.90 (Excellent)	10	3.81 (Excellent)	32
Scheduling of meetings to be held during the Visit	3.80 (Excellent)	10	3.81 (Excellent)	32
FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Communication with the IEPI Project Director and/or PRT Lead before Visit	3.75 (Excellent)	8	N/A	N/A
FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Communication with the PRT Lead and/or PRT Members after the Visit, to date	3.75 (Excellent)	8	N/A	N/A
FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Effectiveness of the PRT Lead in coordinating with the institution regarding the visit.	3.75 (Excellent)	8	N/A	N/A
FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Provision of information about the institution's next steps following the visit.	3.75 (Excellent)	8	N/A	N/A
FOR CEO AND INSTITUTIONAL POINT PERSONS ONLY: Provision of information about applying for the IEPI Seed Grants	3.75 (Excellent)	8	N/A	N/A
Information about travel arrangements, reimbursements, etc.	N/A	N/A	3.84 (Excellent)	32
Access to information related to the institution's AOFs	N/A	N/A	3.81 (Excellent)	32
Effectiveness of PRT phone conference(s) before the visit	N/A	N/A	3.84 (Excellent)	32
Usefulness of face-to-face PRT meeting just before the visit	N/A	N/A	3.88 (Excellent)	32
Time available for meetings with members of the institutional community during the visit.	N/A	N/A	3.81 (Excellent)	32
Time available for PRT Meetings during the visit	N/A	N/A	3.84 (Excellent)	32
Coordination and leadership by the PRT Lead	N/A	N/A	3.88 (Excellent)	32

For Visit 2, PRT Members rated their level of agreement regarding the *Clarity of Roles*, shared understanding of *Outcomes*, and clarity and timeliness of *Communication* among team members. The mean results across all four areas reflect strong agreement, indicating that members clearly understood their roles and responsibilities, shared a common understanding of intended outcomes, and communicated effectively and in a timely manner. These high ratings are consistent with historical trends throughout the PRT technical assistance initiative. *Table 35* reports the overall ratings by PRT Members for *Visit 2*.

Table 35. PRT Member Clarity of Roles, Outcomes, and Communication, Visit 2		
Answer Options	**Mean** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*	**Count**
Were Clear about the Roles and Responsibilities of the Team.	3.81 *(Strongly agree)*	32
Were on the Same Page about Anticipated Outcomes of the PRT Process.	3.81 *(Strongly agree)*	32
Communicated Clearly with Each Other.	3.81 *(Strongly agree)*	32
Communicated in a Timely Fashion with Each Other.	3.84 *(Strongly agree)*	32

Hours Spent on the PRT Process

PRT Members reported the number of hours spent preparing for Visit 2, completing follow-up activities, and preparing for the visit. The average time spent on each activity was calculated and reported as aggregate data. *Table 36* displays the mean hours reported by PRT Members for Visit 2.

Table 36. Mean Hours Spent on PRT Process, Visit 2		
Answer Options	**Mean**	**Count**
Preparing for this Visit	2.9	32
Completing Any Follow-up Activities Related to this PRT Visit to Date	1.4	32
Preparing for the Next PRT Visit (if any) to Date	.5	32

Next Steps

Client Institutions were asked to list up to three next steps that they planned to take following *Visit 2.* Nine institutions responded, and one theme emerged: to secure institutional buy-in to the efforts of the PRT. *Table 37* reports the most common response by Client Institutions to this item.

Table 37. Next Steps, Visit 2
PRT Members
• Secure Institutional Buy-In to the Efforts of the PRT (4)

Final Thoughts and Comments

The final *Area of Inquiry* invited participants to share open-ended feedback on the PRT Process for Visit 2. One of the ten Client Institutions and 11 of the 32 PRT Members responded. Overall, the responses were positive and reaffirmed satisfaction with the PRT process, though no actional themes or recommendations emerged from the responses.

Conclusion

The survey results for Visit 2 continued to reflect positive assessment of the training, the structure of the visits, and overall adherence to the PRT Approach. *Appreciative inquiry* was identified as a key training concept applied during Visit 2, aligning well with the collaborative and forward-focused goals of the second visit.

Client institution respondents define the work expected from the PRT during Visit 2; however, progress toward Areas of Focus varies across institutions. As a result, the expectations for activities during Visit 2 differ accordingly, depending on the institution's stage of implementation.

The next steps for the institutions focus on building internal buy-in and bringing PRT-supported efforts to governance bodies for broader dissemination and feedback through established councils and committees.

A key takeaway from this cycle is the recognition that while the challenges are common across California Community Colleges, the solutions must be uniquely tailored. There was no singular approach or method identified moving forward. A core strength of the PRT Process is its respect for institutional autonomy, empowering colleges and districts to define their needs and determine their strategies for addressing system-wide goals.

Appendix
Visit One

Table A.1
Client Institution Familiarity with the Identified AOFs, Visit 1

Very familiar		Familiar		Somewhat familiar		Not at all familiar		Mean 1 (Low) – 4 (High)	Count
Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count		
70.0%	7	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.70 (Very familiar)	10

Table A.2
Client Institution Familiarity with the Three-Visit PRT Process**, Visit 1**

Very familiar		Familiar		Somewhat familiar		Not at all familiar		Mean 1 (Low) – 4 (High)	Count
Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count		
70.0%	7	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.70 (Very familiar)	10

Table A.3
Client Institution Confidence in PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness in AOFs, Visit 1

Very confident		Confident		Somewhat confident		Not at all confident		Mean 1 (Low) – 4 (High)	Count
Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count		
70.0%	7	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.70 (Very confident)	10

Table A.4
PRT Member Confidence in PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness in the Area of Focus, Visit 1

Very confident		Confident		Somewhat confident		Not at all confident		Mean 1 (Low) – 4 (High)	Count
Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count		
67.6%	25	13.5%	5	18.9%	7	0.0%	0	3.76 (Confident)	37

Approach	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		NA/Don't Know		Client Institution Mean of Means 1 (Low) - 4 (High)
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	
We had the information we needed to work effectively with the PRT.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT was well prepared for the visit.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT took a positive, constructive approach to the work.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT conveyed a helpful attitude in interactions with members of the institutional community.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT took into consideration the specific needs, culture, and practices of the institution.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT Members kept an open mind about issues and possible solutions.	70.0%	7	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.70 (Strongly agree)
The expertise of the PRT Members was a good fit for the institution's *AOFs*.	70.0%	7	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.70 (Strongly agree)
The PRT recognized institutional personnel as problem-solving peers.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)

Table A.5. Client Institution Responses on PRT Adherence to the PRT Approach, Visit 1

Table A.6
PRT Member Responses on the Adherence to PRT Approach, Visit 1

Area	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Don't Know		Mean
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	1 (Low) - 4 (High)
The PRT was well prepared for the visit.	86.5%	32	13.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.86 (Strongly agree)
The PRT applied Appreciative Inquiry in meetings with institutional personnel.	81.1%	30	18.9%	7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.81 (Strongly agree)
The PRT refrained from making judgmental or prescriptive comments in meetings with institutional personnel.	81.1%	30	18.9%	7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.81 (Strongly agree)
The PRT was knowledgeable about sound practices related to the institution's identified *AOFs*.	86.5%	32	13.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.86 (Strongly agree)
The PRT conveyed a helpful attitude in interactions with members of the institutional community.	86.5%	32	13.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.86 (Strongly agree)
The PRT took into consideration the specific needs, culture, and practices of the institution.	81.1%	30	18.9%	7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.81 (Strongly agree)
The PRT focused on solutions rather than problems or where to place blame.	86.5%	32	13.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.86 (Strongly agree)
The PRT Members kept an open mind about issues and possible solutions.	83.8%	31	16.2%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)
The expertise of the PRT Members was a good fit for the institution's *AOFs*.	86.5%	32	13.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.86 (Strongly agree)
The PRT recognized institutional personnel as problem-solving peers.	86.5%	32	13.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.86 (Strongly agree)

Table A.7											
PRT Member Rating on the Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training, Visit 1											
Excellent		**Good**		**Fair**		**Poor**		**Don't Know**		**Mean** *1 (Low) – 4 (High)*	**Count**
Percent	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**		
86.5%	32	13.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.86 (Strongly agree)	37

Visit Two

Table A.8 Client Institution Familiarity with the Identified AOFs, Visit 2									
Very familiar		**Familiar**		**Somewhat familiar**		**Not at all familiar**		**Mean** *1 (Low) – 4 (High)*	**Count**
Percent	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**		
90.0%	9	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.90 *(Very familiar)*	10

Table A.9 Client Institution Familiarity with the Three-Visit PRT Process, Visit 2									
Very familiar		**Familiar**		**Somewhat familiar**		**Not at all familiar**		**Mean** *1 (Low) – 4 (High)*	**Count**
Percent	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**		
80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.80 *(Very familiar)*	10

Table A.10 Client Institution Confidence in PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness in AOFs, Visit 1									
Very confident		**Confident**		**Somewhat confident**		**Not at all confident**		**Mean** *1 (Low) – 4 (High)*	**Count**
Percent	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**		
90.0%	9	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.90 *Very confident)*	10

Table A.11 PRT Member Confidence in PRT Approach to Improve Effectiveness in the Area of Focus, Visit 1									
Very confident		**Confident**		**Somewhat confident**		**Not at all confident**		**Mean** *1 (Low) – 4 (High)*	**Count**
Percent	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**	**Percent**	**Count**		
87.5%	28	12.5%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.88 *(Strongly agree)*	32

Table A.12 Client Institution Responses on PRT Adherence to the PRT Approach, Visit 2											
Approach	**Strongly agree**		**Agree**		**Disagree**		**Strongly disagree**		**NA/Don't Know**		**Client Institution Mean of the Means** *1 (Low) - 4 (High)*
	%	**Count**	**%**	**Count**	**%**	**Count**	**%**	**Count**	**%**	**Count**	
We had the information we needed to work effectively with the PRT.	90.0%	9	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.90 (Strongly agree)
The PRT was well prepared for the visit.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT took a positive, constructive approach to work.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT was knowledgeable about sound practices related to the institution's identified *AOFs*.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT conveyed a helpful attitude in interactions with members of the institutional community.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT took into consideration the specific needs, culture, and practices of the institution.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT Members kept an open mind about issues and possible solutions.	90.0%	9	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.90 (Strongly agree)
The expertise of the PRT Members was a good fit for the institution's *AOFs*.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT focused on sustainable and sound practices.	90.0%	9	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.90 (Strongly agree)
The PRT focused on solutions rather than problems or where to place blame.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT recognized institutional personnel as problem-solving peers.	90.0%	9	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.90 (Strongly agree)
THE PRT's Menu of Options (MOO) provided useful options and examples for our consideration	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)
The PRT Lead effectively facilitated discussions of our options during the visit.	90.0%	9	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.90 (Strongly agree)
The PRT provided effective guidance to the institution as we worked on the development of our I&EP.	80.0%	8	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	N/A	0	3.80 (Strongly agree)

Area	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		NA/Don't Know		Mean 1 (Low) - 4 (High)
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	
The PRT was well prepared for the Visit.	84.4%	27	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)
The PRT took a positive, constructive, and solution-oriented approach to the work.	84.4%	27	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)
The PRT was knowledgeable about sound practices related to the institution's identified *AOFs*.	84.4%	27	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)
The PRT conveyed a helpful attitude in interactions with members of the institutional community.	84.4%	27	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)
The PRT took into consideration the specific needs, culture, and practices of the institution.	84.4%	27	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)
The PRT Members kept an open mind about issues and possible solutions.	81.3%	26	18.8%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.81 (Strongly agree)
The expertise of the PRT Members was a good fit for the institution's *AOFs.*	81.3%	26	18.8%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.81 (Strongly agree)
The PRT focused on sustainable and sound practices.	84.4%	27	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)
The PRT focused on solutions rather than problems or where to place blame.	84.4%	27	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)
The PRT recognized institutional personnel as problem-solving peers.	84.4%	27	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.84 (Strongly agree)

Table A.13 PRT Member Responses on the PRT Adherence to PRT Approach, Visit 2

Table A.14 Client Institution Rating of the Overall Satisfaction with the PRT Technical Assistance to Date

Very satisfied		Quite satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Not at all satisfied		Mean 1 (Low) – 4 (High)	Count
Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count		
90.0%	9	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.90 (Very satisfied)	10

Table A.15 PRT Member Rating of the Overall Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Training, Visit 2

Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		NA/Don't Know		Mean 1 (Low) – 4 (High)	Count
Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count		
87.5%	28	12.5%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.88 (Strongly agree)	32