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The proposed project seeks to answer three basic questions:
1. Are funded projects “successful” with respect to the goals of the Fund?
2. What is the inter-relation between the level of funding and a project’s success?
3. What categories of projects are most successful?

Answers to these questions will serve as the basis for making recommendations regarding the future direction of the Fund for Instructional Improvement.
Effectiveness Evaluation --- FII Grants and Loans

Since its inception a decade ago, 615 grants and 20 loans have been awarded by the Fund for Instructional Improvement for the purpose of improving learning in community colleges. As stated in the current application guidelines for proposals, the Fund for Instructional Improvement has been ".... the only state level source of support of curricular and pedagogical experimentation and professional development for community college faculty." Consequently, grants have tended to be modest in order to benefit a maximum number of colleges. Emphasis has also been placed on dissemination of project results so that innovative ideas could be shared and replicated. In 1982, a statewide conference was held to facilitate the dissemination of project results.

Overview of Approach

Los Angeles City College proposes to direct such an external evaluation. The proposed project seeks to answer three basic questions?

1. Are funded projects "successful" with respect to the goals of the Fund?

2. What is the interrelation between the level of funding and a project's success?

3. What categories of projects are most successful?

Answers to these questions will serve as a basis for making recommendations regarding the future direction of the Fund for Instructional Improvement. Conclusions and recommendations also need to be formulated so as to harmonize with and facilitate statewide master planning efforts for community college.

In accordance with RFP guidelines, a random sample of 75 projects will be selected from within a five tiered stratification based on funding level. A survey instrument designed to ascertain project success will be designed and administered via mail to project directors, project participants, and chief instructional officers at all sample colleges. Three group meetings will be held (southern, central and northern California) to provide an opportunity for more in depth and open-ended consideration of project success. Representatives from
selected colleges will be invited to these meetings. Finally, site visits will be conducted at 10 colleges to provide further in depth analysis of project success. Data obtained from surveys, discussions, interviews and observations will be analyzed with statistical significance sought at the .01 confidence level. Results, conclusions, and recommendations will be compiled in a written report which will be submitted to the State Chancellor’s Office by December 18, 1987.

An outstanding feature of the proposed project derives from the project team that will conduct the evaluation. The Principal Investigator is a community college Dean of Instruction and thus is knowledgeable about and sensitive to statewide issues related to and impacting instructional improvement. She is also extremely knowledgeable about the Fund for Instructional Improvement having chaired the statewide Dissemination Conference and supervised proposal development and project management since the Fund's inception. This expertise is coupled with the educational research expertise of the subcontractors Fred and Joan Carvell of Carvell Education Management Planning, Inc. The Carvell's have 18 years of consulting experience. The range of their experience with community colleges includes program evaluations at the state level on such topics as sex fairness practices, contracting practices in vocational education, community needs assessment, and sensitive issues related to governance and state master planning. The combined qualifications and experience of the project team enhance the strength of the evaluation and provide a foundation for unique understanding of issues involved.
Effectiveness Evaluation --- FII Grants and Loans

1. Specific Educational Program Being Addressed

Since its inception a decade ago, 615 grants and 20 loans have been awarded by the Fund for Instructional Improvement for the purpose of improving learning in community colleges. As stated in the current application guidelines for proposals, the Fund for Instructional Improvement has been "... the only state level source of support of curricular and pedagogical experimentation and professional development for community college faculty." Consequently, grants have tended to be modest in order to benefit a maximum number of colleges. Emphasis has also been placed on dissemination of project results so that innovative ideas could be shared and replicated. In 1982, a statewide conference was held to facilitate the dissemination of project results.

Recently, the Board of Governors has encouraged Fund support that would enable colleges to address statewide educational issues. For 1987-88, 45% of Fund dollars has been reserved to support "Statewide projects which assist the realization of the Boards' Basic Agenda Addendum for 1987."

Furthermore, the Joint Legislative Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education recommends "that the Education Code governing the Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement be amended to include a category of programs for the improvement of the intellectual environment of faculty and staff."

The current climate of community college reform provides an excellent atmosphere in which to conduct an external evaluation of and make recommendations concerning the future direction of the Fund for Instructional Improvement.
2. Specific Problems Being Addressed

[NO “PROBLEMS” ACCOMPANIES THIS DOCUMENT.]
3. Population To Be Served

[NO "POPULATION" ACCOMPANIES THIS DOCUMENT.]
4. Objectives

Overview of Approach

Los Angeles City College proposes to direct such an external evaluation. The proposed project seeks to answer three basic questions?

1. Are funded projects "successful" with respect to the goals of the Fund?
2. What is the interrelation between the level of funding and a project's success?
3. What categories of projects are most successful?

Answers to these questions will serve as a basis for making recommendations regarding the future direction of the Fund for Instructional Improvement. Conclusions and recommendations also need to be formulated so as to harmonize with and facilitate statewide master planning efforts for community college.

In accordance with RFP guidelines, a random sample of 75 projects will be selected from within a five tiered stratification based on funding level. A survey instrument designed to ascertain project success will be designed and administered via mail to project directors, project participants, and chief instructional officers at all sample colleges. Three group meetings will be held (southern, central and northern California) to provide an opportunity for more in depth and open-ended consideration of project success. Representatives from selected colleges will be invited to these meetings. Finally, site visits will be conducted at 10 colleges to provide further in depth analysis of project success. Data obtained from surveys, discussions, interviews and observations will be analyzed with statistical significance sought at the .01 confidence level. Results, conclusions, and recommendations will be compiled in a written report which will be submitted to the State Chancellor's Office by December 18, 1987.

An outstanding feature of the proposed project derives from the project team that will conduct the evaluation. The Principal Investigator is a community college Dean of Instruction and thus is knowledgeable about and sensitive to statewide issues related to and impacting instructional improvement. She is also extremely knowledgeable about the Fund for Instructional Improvement having chaired the statewide Dissemination Conference and supervised proposal development and project management since the Fund's inception. This expertise is coupled with the educational research expertise of the subcontractors Fred and Joan Carvell of Carvell Education Management Planning, Inc. The Carvell's have 18 years of consulting experience. The range of their experience with community colleges includes program evaluations at the state level on such topics as sex fairness practices, contracting practices in vocational education, community needs assessment, and sensitive issues related to governance and state master planning. The combined qualifications and experience of the
project team enhance the strength of the evaluation and provide a foundation for unique understanding of issues involved.
5. Workplan Narrative

WORK STATEMENT

The project involves the following phases:
1. Establish Project Framework
2. Survey Sample
3. Survey and Document Review Follow Up
4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Phase 1 Establish Project Framework

The project universe will be reviewed to provide a contextual framework for the study. From this universe, a random stratified sample will be selected. Seventy-five projects will be selected at random from within five categories defined by project funding level: Level #1 - Less than $7,000, Level #2 - $7,001 to $15,000 Level #3 - $15,001 to $22,000, Level #4 $22,001 to $30,000, and Level #5 - More than $30,000.

A document review will be conducted within the selected sample. Proposals and final reports will be reviewed to determine the extent to which project objectives were achieved.

A written survey instrument will be constructed by the Principal Investigator in consultation with Carvell Education Management Planning Incorporated. The instrument will contain two types of questions distinguished by the type of response to be made. One type will allow for a simple check response. The other will be open-ended, and response space will be provided.

The instrument will consist of items designed to elicit information on project success. In accordance with RFC guidelines, components of success include longevity, transfer, impact, planned outcome, and personal worth. Recommendations for the future for the Fund for Instructional Improvement will also be sought.

The Principal Investigator will meet with the Project Monitor in Sacramento for the purpose of reviewing and revising the survey instrument.

Phase 2: Survey Sample

The survey instrument will be mailed with an appropriate cover letter to three groups at each institution within the selected sample: (1) project director(s), (2) project participant(s), and (3) Chief Instructional Officer. These groups are to be surveyed in order to determine perceived differences in success from the view point of those most directly involved with the project and those who have overall instructional responsibility at the institution.
Phase 3: Survey and Document Review Follow Up

Four types of follow up are planned. (1) Telephone calls and/or letters will be made/sent to ensure 100% response to the survey. (2) Telephone calls will be made as needed to clarify open-ended responses or to obtain additional information when necessary. (3) Three group meetings will be held to facilitate open, face-to-face consideration of the success of the Fund for Instructional Improvement. One meeting will be held in Los Angeles, at the home institution of the Principal Investigator. Southern California colleges within the sample will be invited. A second meeting will be held for central California colleges within the sample in the Monterey area, the location of the project sub-contractor. A third meeting for northern California colleges will be held in Sacramento in conjunction with one of the Principal Investigator/ Project Monitor meetings. (4) On-site visits will be made to selected colleges. Criteria for selection of colleges for on-site visits include particularly significant information perceived as a result of document review and/or survey response and geographical proximity to Principal Investigator or sub-contractor in order to contain costs.

Data will be compiled by a Program Assistant working with the Principal Investigator.

Phase 4: Data Analysis and Interpretation

Technical data analysis will be provided by Carvell Education Management Planning, Inc. Specifically, the sub-contractor will be responsible for statistical analysis, computer work, and preparation of appropriate charts, graphs and tables. While technical analysis will be the responsibility of the sub-contractor, both the Principal Investigator and sub-contractor will analyze and interpret data.

The Principal Investigator, sub-contractor, and Project Monitor will meet to review data analysis and interpretation. The final results of the study, including evaluation and conclusion remarks, will be written by the Principal Investigator in consultation with and subject to review by the sub-contractor and Project Monitor.

Input from the Advisory Committee for the Fund for Instructional Improvement will be at the discretion of the Project Monitor.

IV PROGRAM --- SCHEDULE

Phase 1: Establish Project Framework - June 1 - August 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>June 1 - 5</th>
<th>June 8 - 12</th>
<th>June 15 - 19</th>
<th>June 22 - 26</th>
<th>June 29 - July 17</th>
<th>July 20 - 24</th>
<th>July 27 - 31</th>
<th>August 3 - 7</th>
<th>August 10 - 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Phase 2:  Survey Sample - August 31 - October 16
Activity  September 1      Mail Survey
           Sept 15 - Oct 16  Tabulate data as surveys are returned

Phase 3:  Survey and Document Review Follow September 28 - October 31
Activity  Sept 28 - Oct 16  Follow up to obtain survey response
           Sept 28 - Oct 23  Telephone respondents as appropriate
           October 1 - 31  Group meetings
           October 1 - 31  On-site visits
           October 26 - 31  Meet with Project Monitor

Phase 4-  Data Analysis and Interpretation - November 2 - December 18
Activity  November 2 - 13  Computer input/technical data analysis
           November 9 - 14  Meet with Project Monitor
           Nov 16 - Dec 4  Write results of evaluation
           December 4 - 8  Meet with Project Monitor
           December 9 - 17  Revise and finalize written report
           December 9 - 17  Submit camera ready copy to Chancellor's Office

Benchmark Summary
Benchmark Date
    July 31       Completion of survey instrument
    October 16    Completion of written survey process
    November 13   Completion of survey follow up
    December 18   Completion of evaluation report
6. Expected Outcomes

[NO “OUTCOMES” ACCOMPANIES THIS DOCUMENT.]
7. Evaluation Plan

It should be noted that a compressed time-line near the end of the project is necessitated due to the fact it will be difficult to conduct a survey during the summer months. Dates in the program schedule reflect final dates. If the time-line can be advanced during the summer because of early semester starting dates at sample colleges, the overall schedule will be moved up accordingly.

PROJECT ORGANIZATION

General Approach

In as much as specific technical tasks will be subcontracted to Carvell Education Management Planning, Inc., the technical capabilities of the subcontractor are delineated here. Carvell has 20 years experience working with community colleges, the State Department of Education, and the State Chancellor's Office in instrument design and program evaluation. Carvell has the technical capability to design a project and carry it out so that data yielded will be compatible with computer tabulation requirements.

In addition, Carvell has the computer capability to do word processing, data tabulation, and graphic presentation. Carvell has an IBM XT compatible with hard disc as well as access to a large main frame computer system.

Staffing

Personnel who will perform activities described in the Work Statement include the Principal Investigator, Dr. Jackie Ireland, and a program assistant, to be selected. The Principal Investigator will devote 65 days to the project. The program assistant will work 25 hours per week on the project.

Fred and Joan Carvell of Carvell Education Management Planning, Inc. will serve as subcontractors. Sixty days of service will be provided by the subcontractor. The subcontractors will be responsible for: collaboration on instrument design, on-site visits and the group meeting in Central California, statistical analysis of hard and soft data, supervision of computer applications, and consultation with regard to data interpretation.

Dr. Don Medley, Chair of the Information Science Department at California State Polytechnic University at Pomona and former head of the Moorpark Computer Center, works with the subcontractor to provide computer services. He will provide 60 hours of service as a product consultant, in formatting data for summaries, and in overseeing data input and computer runs.
8. Dissemination Plan

[NO “DISSEMINATION” ACCOMPANIES THIS DOCUMENT.]
9. Budget Narrative

[NO “BUDGET NARRATIVE” ACCOMPANIES THIS DOCUMENT.]