



Mel King Institute
for community building

Mel King Institute for Community Building
Final Evaluation Report
Year Nine: July 2017 – June 2018

Prepared by Diane Gordon
August 2018

Executive Summary

The Mel King Institute for Community Building concluded its ninth year (July 2017 – June 2018) of high quality training for the community development field. The Institute offered 34 courses, serving 599 participants, a significant increase from its first year when it offered twelve courses serving 243 participants. For the purposes of this evaluation, 31 courses (523 in attendance) were analyzed. 76% of this year's participants completed the day-of-survey to assess outcomes from each course, a higher percentage than last year's response rate. The evaluation report summarizes and provides analysis based on the data obtained from the surveys.

The King Institute continues to provide high quality, affordable, and convenient training to practitioners in the community development field. Ratings for each question were higher in nearly every category than last year indicating that participants were exceptionally pleased with the offerings. Individuals who attend workshops leave with practical skills and knowledge they can readily apply to their work, and report increased confidence. The King Institute is helping to build peer networks, advancing professional development and sharing best practices across the community development field.

Demographics

The evaluation analyzes the demographic make-up of the audience.

- **Geography:** The percentage of participants from Greater Boston jumped to 76%, the highest it has been since Year 5. As an associated fact, only slightly more than one-quarter of the courses were offered outside of Greater Boston, a reduction from one-third last year.
- **Age:** This year saw an increase in the percentage of participants under the age of 25 which is still below some earlier years, and an increase in participants between 26-39, bringing it more in line with prior years.
- **Position:** The percentage of Americorps/Students/Interns increased slightly, which is likely tied to the increase in the percentage of people under the age of 25. The percentage of board members dropped slightly which is generally attributed to the number of courses specifically tailored to board members.
- **Race:** This year saw an increase in the percentage of people of color attending from 35% to 43% with the highest gains among Latinos.
- **Organizational Affiliation:** There was a slight drop in the percentage of MACDC member organizations sending participants to courses from 43% to 40%.

Process Results

Analysis of process outcomes indicates a continued high degree of satisfaction.

- **Quality of presenters:** 99% of participants agreed that the presenters were clear, had expertise and knowledge in the subject area, and had an effective presentation style. Year 9 saw the largest percentage of people strongly agreeing with the statement about the quality of the presenters, a 17% increase from last year. Every course had a presenter rating of more than 3.0 out of the 4.0 scale.
- **Organization of the training:** 95% of participants agreed that the training was well-paced and the structure was conducive to their learning, and 97% agreed that the training was well coordinated logistically. Ratings for these questions were consistently higher than in prior years.
- **Registration process:** It continues to be easy to register for courses, with more people strongly agreeing with this statement than in the past.

Impact Results

As with the process outcomes, a higher percentage of participants selected the highest ratings for every question with one exception than in years past. In some cases, there was a 10% or greater increase in the percentage of those who selected “strongly agree” from Year 8 to Year 9.

- Training content: While the overall percentage of people who agreed that the content added to their knowledge base for their current role was consistent with last year (95% agreed), the percentage of people selecting ‘strongly agree’ increased from 46% to 61%.
- Confidence level: 90% of participants agreed that they felt more confident in applying what they learned. There was an increase of 8% of participants from last year who strongly agreed with the question bringing it to nearly 50% of participants.
- Broader perspective: 90% of participants reported that the training helped them gain a broader perspective, up from 88% last year; there was an increase in the percentage of people who gave this the highest rating from 45% to 52%, and fewer people disagreeing.
- Relevance: The courses continue to be rated very well on all of the Relevance questions. Nearly everyone reported that the courses are relevant to their current role, their organization’s goals, and their professional development. Each aspect of the questions saw an increase in the highest ratings, with the biggest leap of 10% more people selecting ‘very relevant’ on the question of professional development.
- Usefulness: Year 9 saw the greatest number of courses (81% of the courses) where 90% or more of the course topics were rated ‘extremely useful’ or ‘useful.’ This was an increase in this rating of 22% from Year 8.
- Peer to Peer Interactions: 91% of participants reported they had meaningful interactions with their peers that were beneficial to their learning. There was an increase of 13% who chose the highest rating for this question from Year 8.
- Course expectations: 99% of participants said the courses met expectations to some degree. Roughly the same percentage of people said the course exceeded expectations (at 34% this was the only rating where the highest ranking choice did not increase), yet more people said the course met expectations than in Year 8.

Participants offered recommendations about future course offerings of interest as well as strategies to deepen their learning experience. In particular, participants requested more in-depth and more advanced courses in a number of subject areas. In addition, they would like the King Institute to consider how to provide continuity between courses and more follow-up to help participants implement the knowledge they have gained in the initial course. This has been a repeated theme that has emerged throughout the King Institute evaluations and is aligned with ideas that surfaced during the MACDC strategic planning process.

Year ten begins with the Institute on solid ground. As MACDC launches the implementation of its strategic plan and the King Institute begins its next decade, it will be important to build on the successes and consider how to deepen impact among and across the community development field.

Section 1: Introduction

The Mel King Institute for Community Building fosters vibrant and thriving Massachusetts communities by advancing the skills, knowledge and leadership ability of professional practitioners and volunteer leaders in the community development field. The King Institute leverages collaborative educational partnerships that increase access, encourage innovation, and promote and institutionalize systemic success. The Institute is designed to bring community development professionals and volunteers the skills they need to be effective in their positions in the community. To reach its goals, the Institute sponsors trainings, innovation forums, mentorship opportunities, website resources, serves as a clearing house, and provides technical assistance.

The Institute is committed to evaluation and continual learning and as such, developed a theory of change illustrated in a logic model during its first year (2009 – 2010) and has evaluated its work each year. In April 2015, the Institute revised its logic model to better align with its current vision. For every course, participants are asked to complete a “day-of-survey” to evaluate the content, approach, and lessons learned that may have applicability to the participant’s professional development and to his/her organization’s ability to reach outcomes. The survey was revised during the seventh year of the program, and utilized in subsequent years. These surveys are tabulated, analyzed, and summarized in this report at the end of each program year, and reviewed by the Steering Committee.

Evaluation Methodology

The Year 9 (2017-2018) day-of-surveys were collected and the data analyzed by the MKI Program Coordinator Mariela Renquist who prepared an initial set of data used for this report. As the evaluation consultant, I reviewed the data, read the qualitative responses to questions on the day-of-surveys, and prepared this report with the highlights of the data, findings, and recommendations.

Evaluation Numbers

The evaluations record the number of courses analyzed, the total number of participants in attendance, the number of evaluations received, and an evaluation survey return-rate. Given that some individuals take more than one course during a year, the total number of unique individuals is calculated to analyze the demographics of the King Institute’s audience. Not every course collects evaluation forms, and therefore, the number of courses offered (and the participants who attend) are different in some years from the total number of **courses analyzed**. (In Year 9, three courses were not evaluated: Undoing Racism, MEPP: Electrical, and MEPFP: Fire Protection.)

As **Table 1.a.** illustrates, the King Institute has analyzed 210 courses over nine years, and reviewed 2,913 day-of-surveys. On average, the response rate has been largely consistent over the years at average of 80%. Year 9 saw an increase in the response rate to 76% from a Year 8 low of 66%.

Table 1.a. Evaluation Numbers										
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	All Years
Courses Held	12	19	25	20	25	24	30	30	34	219
Total Participants	243	263	525	371	361	498	552	584	599	3,996
Courses Analyzed	9	19	24	20	25	24	30	28	31	210
Participants in Analyzed Courses	157	263	462	371	361	498	552	524	523	3,711
Evaluations Reviewed	137	227	376	296	314	381	439	347	396	2,913
Unique # individuals	108	160	275	270	256	310	364	275	307	N/A
Evaluation response rate	87%	86%	81%	80%	87%	77%	80%	66%	76%	80%

Year 9 Courses Reviewed

Table 1.b. shows the 31 courses reviewed as part of this evaluation and the response rate for each.

Table 1.b. Year 9 Courses Evaluated				
Name of Course	Location	Participants	Evaluations	Response Rate
Careers in Community Development	Boston	13	11	85%
Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships	Boston	22	13	59%
Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships	Lawrence	10	9	90%
Group Facilitation	Boston	17	17	100%
Planning 101	Boston	21	17	81%
Group Facilitation	Springfield	11	9	82%
Best Practices in Packaging Small Business Loan Applications	Boston	20	12	60%
Implicit Bias	Boston	13	9	69%
Board Chairs Leading the Way: A New Training Series for Current and Prospective CDC Board Chairs	Boston	12	5	42%
Planning 102	Boston	17	16	94%
Development Decoded: Real Estate Basics	Boston	24	19	79%
Bypassing Burnout: Building Stress Reduction and Resiliency Skills	Boston	16	14	88%
Fundamentals of Affordable Housing Finance	Boston	37	23	62%
Understanding Census Data	Worcester	8	5	63%
Technical Strategies to Ensure Full Participation in Multi-Lingual Meetings	Boston	20	17	85%

Table 1.b. Year 9 Courses Evaluated				
Name of Course	Location	Participants	Evaluations	Response Rate
Community Reinvestment Act Basics	Boston	16	10	63%
Intro to Community Economic Development	Boston	14	14	100%
Community Engagement Basics	Boston	13	11	85%
Data Storytelling	Framingham	22	17	77%
Implicit Bias for Homeownership Professionals	Boston	36	33	92%
MEPFP: HVAC	Boston	22	14	64%
Intermediate Project Management	Boston	8	7	88%
What's in the Numbers? CDC Financial Statements	Boston	13	10	77%
Community Engagement	Quincy	15	13	87%
MEPFP: Plumbing	Boston	16	7	44%
Internal Controls	Framingham	12	10	83%
Introduction to Project Management	Boston	20	19	95%
Group Facilitation	Salem	9	9	100%
Program Budgets	Boston	15	10	67%
Understanding Tax Assessments of Affordable Properties	Boston/Webinar	25	12	48%
Arts and Equity in the North Shore	Salem	6	4	67%
Totals		523	396	76%

Section 2: Demographic Analysis

The evaluation looks at the participants from a number of perspectives – geography, age, position, race, and organizational affiliation. In order to accurately reflect the participant profile, participants are only counted once even though some attended more than one training. **307 individuals were included in the demographic analysis for this evaluation.** (153 people or 54% took more than one course.)

- Attended 1 training: 46%
- Attended 2-3 courses: 30%
- Attended 4-6 courses: 17%
- Attended more than 6 courses: 7%

The percentages illustrated below for each of the demographic data points reflect a portion of the participants. For each question, a varying percentage of people decline to answer.

Highlights

Every year there are some modest shifts in the demographics of the participants for the Mel King Institute courses. For Year 9, the following shifts are noted:

- Geography: The percentage of participants from Greater Boston jumped to 76%, the highest it has been since Year 5. As an associated fact, only slightly more than one-quarter of the courses were offered outside of Greater Boston, a reduction from one-third last year.
- Age: This year there was an increase in the percentage of participants under the age of 25 which is still below some earlier years, and an increase in participants between 26-39 bringing it more in line with prior years.
- Position: The percentage of Americorps/Students/Interns increased slightly, which is likely tied to the increase in the percentage of people under the age of 25. The percentage of board members dropped slightly which is generally attributed to the number of courses specifically tailored to board members.
- Race: This year saw an increase in the percentage of people of color attending from 35% to 43% with the highest gains among Latinos.
- Organizational affiliation: There was a slight drop in the percentage of MACDC member organizations sending participants to courses from 43% to 40%.
- Marketing: Referrals from supervisors/ coworkers increased by the largest margin from 26% to 32%. (The percentage of people choosing 'other' dropped considerably but that may be attributed to participants selecting another specific option.)

The detailed charts illustrating the percentages for each demographic feature are listed below.

Geography

As **Table 2.1.** indicates, there was an increase in representation from Greater Boston and decreases in other regions in Year 9. The King Institute offered fewer courses outside of Boston than in prior years as **Table 2.1.a.** illustrates.

Table 2.1. Geography										
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average
Greater Boston	59%	50%	71%	74%	76%	61%	72%	60%	76%	67%
Other MA	33%	42%	26%	23%	23%	34%	28%	37%	22%	30%
Other States	8%	8%	7%	3%	2%	4%	1%	3%	2%	4%

Table 2.1.a. Percentage of courses offered outside of Boston				
	YR 6	YR 7	YR 8	YR 9
% courses held outside of Boston	42%	37%	33%	26%

Age of Students

The age distribution of participants depicted in **Table 2.2** shifted in Year 9 from the prior year with a higher percentage of people in the under 25 age group and in the 26-39 age group, and slightly lower percentages of people over age 40.

Table 2.2. Age Distribution										
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average
Under 25	29%	25%	23%	24%	16%	15%	17%	9%	12%	19%
26-39	37%	28%	30%	43%	39%	39%	43%	39%	43%	38%
40-54	27%	17%	27%	19%	28%	30%	24%	31%	26%	25%
Over 55	7%	30%	13%	14%	18%	16%	16%	20%	19%	17%

Positions

In Year 9, there was an increase in the percentage of staff and Americorps members attending, which likely corresponds to the increase in the percentage of participants under the age of 25. The percentage of board members is correlated with the number of board-focused courses – in Year 8, MKI hosted three courses marketed specifically to board members; in Year 9 – there was one session targeted to board chairs.

Table 2.3. Participant Positions											
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average	
Staff	55%	32%	35%	42%	38%	41%	47%	37%	43%	41%	
Manager	40%	35%	29%	28%	32%	26%	30%	30%	30%	31%	
Americorps/Student/Intern	3%	18%	17%	14%	11%	19%	10%	6%	9%	12%	
Board	0%	5%	11%	5%	14%	8%	7%	10%	6%	7%	
Other	4%	10%	8%	11%	5%	6%	6%	17%	11%	9%	

Race of Students

As **Table 2.4.a.** illustrates, the Year 9 distribution of participants by race showed an increase in the percentage of people of color who attended courses especially among the Latino population. Overall, the percentage people of color increased from 35% to 43%. See **Table 2.4.b.**

Table 2.4.a. Racial Demographics – All Categories										
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average
White	65%	68%	56%	56%	56%	61%	65%	65%	57%	61%
Black	12%	13%	21%	20%	17%	11%	11%	19%	20%	16%
Latino	18%	11%	12%	13%	18%	15%	14%	10%	14%	14%
Asian	3%	4%	5%	7%	8%	9%	6%	3%	5%	6%
Other	2%	4%	3%	4%	1%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%

Table 2.4.b. Racial Demographics – Condensed Categories											
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average	
White	65%	68%	56%	56%	56%	61%	65%	65%	57%	61%	
People of color/ other	35%	32%	41%	44%	44%	39%	34%	35%	43%	39%	

Organizational Affiliation

Prior to Year 3, organizational affiliation was not collected. **Table 2.5** shows that participation from MACDC members decreased slightly, while other entity representation increased. MKI has a goal to reach 50% MACDC members, 50% others and therefore Year 9, saw slight movement away from that balance than in Year 8.

Table 2.5 Organizational Affiliation								
	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	7-Yr Average
MACDC Member	36%	38%	59%	45%	39%	43%	40%	43%
Other Nonprofit	43%	35%	35%	32%	41%	29%	29%	35%
Other Entity	21%	27%	6%	23%	21%	27%	31%	22%

Marketing

As part of the day-of-survey, participants indicate one or more ways they heard about a particular event. See **Table 2.6** for the percentages beginning in Year 4 when this data began to be collected. In Year 9, the percentage who indicated they heard about the Institute through a supervisor or co-worker increased, showing a greater variation than any other category bringing it back up to prior year's totals.

Table 2.6. How Participants Heard about MKI							
	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average
MKI Email	1%	34%	26%	34%	41%	41%	30%
Supervisor/ Co-Worker	29%	30%	33%	32%	26%	32%	30%
Other	11%	12%	20%	21%	12%	4%	13%
MKI Website/ Social Media*	14%	8%	7%	10%	13%	15%	11%
Social Media*	N/A	N/A	N/A	2%	3%	1%	2%
MKI Newsletter**	26%	10%	13%	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Partner					5%	6%	6%

*/ ** Changes were made to the survey in subsequent years

Section 3: Evaluation Findings –Process Outcomes

The evaluation examines outcomes along two dimensions – **process outcomes** that are used to evaluate satisfaction levels during the training program itself and **impact outcomes** that are used to measure the impact the training has had on building the skills, knowledge, and overall abilities of participants that can enhance job performance, professional development, and advancement, and that can be used to identify the potential impact the training has had on organizational performance and effectiveness.

Highlights

More participants selected the highest ratings across all of the process outcome categories than in the past.

- **Quality of presenters:** Year 9 saw the largest percentage of people strongly agreeing with the statement about the quality of the presenters, a 17% increase from last year. Every course had a presenter rating of more than 3.0 out of the 4.0 scale.
- **Organization of the training:** Ratings for the structure, pacing, and logistics of the courses were consistently higher than in prior years.
- **Registration process:** It continues to be easy to register for courses, with more people strongly agreeing with this statement than in the past.

The detailed charts illustrating the percentages for each question are listed below.

Quality of Presenters

Beginning in Year 7, the Institute changed the survey instrument pertaining to the quality of presenters as noted below. Taken together, 99% of participants in Year 9 either strongly agreed or agreed that the presenters had expertise, clarity and an effective presentation style. This is consistent with prior years ratings. This year produced the highest percentage of respondents using the rating ‘strongly agree’ with the quality of the presenters.

Table 3.1. Quality of Presenters										
Past phrasing: “The presenters were clear, had expertise and knowledge in the subject area, and had an effective presentation style”										
Beginning YR 7 phrasing: “The presenters had expertise, clarity and an effective presentation style”										
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average
Strongly Agree	75%	75%	66%	72%	70%	64%	71%	65%	82%	70%
Agree	23%	25%	34%	26%	30%	34%	26%	32%	17%	29%
Disagree	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	2%	2%	0%	1%
Strongly Disagree	2%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%

Every course had a rating of more than 3.0 out of a scale of 4.0; the average rating for all courses was 3.8 indicating that this year participants felt strongly that the presenters had the requisite expertise. Ten courses were rated 4.0 for the quality of the presenters:

- Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships (both Boston and Lawrence)
- Understanding Census Data

- Introduction to Community Economic Development
- Community Engagement Basics
- Intermediate Project Management
- What's in the Numbers? CDC Financial Statements
- Internal Controls
- Introduction to Project Management
- Group Facilitation (Salem)

Many participants offered words of praise about instruction techniques and structure.

"Super Interactive and engaging!!! Not just a lecture where we sat and listened." Careers in Community Development

"Very nice mix of slides (info), peer interactive exercises, and solo work." Board Chairs Leading the Way

"Loved how interactive and energetic it was." Community Engagement Basics

Instructors were noted to be a great source of information, knowledge, and expertise.

"I thought the training was excellent and the instructor handled a very sensitive subject effectively." Implicit Bias for Homeownership Professionals

"The instructor was a terrific presenter! She was knowledgeable and engaging and made an all-day training fly by." Introduction to Project Management

"Well presented and easy to following without becoming distracted." Introduction to Community Economic Development

Participants in several courses would like to have more time and a longer training. These included:

- Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships
- Group Facilitation
- Planning 101/ 102
- Bypassing Burnout
- Fundamentals of Affordable Housing Finance
- Community Engagement Basics

Training Structure, Content, and Logistics

The King Institute asks participants to rate various aspects of the structure and logistics of the training to gain a better understanding of how people experience the training. The questions on the survey have changed over the past few years in an attempt to separate out distinct components. Beginning in Year 7, two questions were asked about the structure and the logistics. See Tables **3.2a.** and **3.2.b.**

Year 9 showed a significant increase in the highest ratings regarding the structure of the training and in logistics for the trainings. Taken together, nearly all participants either strongly agreed or agreed with these statements.

Table 3.2.a. Rate the Organization of the Training: Years 7 - 9			
“The training was well-paced and the structure was conducive to my learning”			
	YR 7	YR 8	YR 9
Strongly agree	59%	55%	67%
Agree	32%	37%	29%
Disagree	7%	6%	4%
Strongly disagree	2%	2%	1%

Table 3.2.b. Rate the Organization of the Training: Years 7-9			
“The training was well coordinated logistically and the site was conducive to the group’s learning.”			
	YR 7	YR 8	YR 9
Strongly agree	71%	59%	78%
Agree	25%	38%	19%
Disagree	3%	2%	2%
Strongly disagree	1%	1%	1%

For comparison to prior years, see **Table 3.2.c.** [Note – the question was asked in a slightly different way in Year 4 and therefore those numbers are not included below.]

Table 3.2.c. Rate the Organization of the Training Years 1-6						
“The training was well organized and the site was conducive to the group’s learning”						
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 5	Year 6	Average
Strongly agree	61%	67%	57%	53%	55%	59%
Agree	37%	33%	42%	46%	42%	40%
Disagree	0%	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Strongly disagree	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%

The King Institute is also interested to learn how participants view the registration process. [Year 4 is not included below as the question was dropped from the survey in Year 4 and then added back in for Year 5 and beyond.] There was an increase in the percentage of participants who rated this question as “strongly agree” and taken as a whole, nearly all participants rated this question as either ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree.’

Table 3.2.d. Registration Process									
“It was easy to register through the website or other means.”									
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average
Strongly agree	55%	55%	55%	59%	58%	80%	71%	82%	62%
Agree	43%	42%	43%	38%	41%	18%	27%	16%	36%
Disagree	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	0%	2%	2%	2%
Strongly disagree	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	1%

Section 4: Evaluation Findings – Impact Outcomes

The King Institute is interested in helping participants learn new skills and then apply those practices to improve their performance and ultimately, to improve organizational effectiveness. Using the day-of-survey, it is possible to assess the King Institute’s success at helping participants learn new tools or knowledge, the degree of usefulness in the curriculum, whether the course might help the participant advance professionally, and the degree of peer to peer interaction. During Year 5 and continuing into Year 9, the Institute added some questions to gauge how well the course met the participant’s expectations, and in Year 7, several of the questions that assess knowledge gained were also changed.

Highlights

As with the process outcomes, more participants selected the highest ratings for every question with one exception than in years past. In some cases, there was a 10% or greater increase in the percentage of those who selected “strongly agree” from Year 8 to Year 9.

- Training content: While the overall percentage of people who agreed that the content added to their knowledge base for their current role was consistent with last year, the percentage of people selecting ‘strongly agree’ increased from 46% to 61%.
- Confidence level: 90% of participants agreed that they felt more confident in applying what they learned. There was an increase of 8% of participants from last year who strongly agreed with the question bringing it to nearly 50% of participants.
- Broader perspective: 90% of participants reported that the training helped them gain a broader perspective, up from 88% last year; there was an increase in the percentage of people who gave this the highest rating from 45% to 52%, and fewer people disagreed.
- Relevance: The courses continue to be rated very well on all of the Relevance questions. Each aspect of the questions saw an increase in the highest ratings, with the biggest leap of 10% more people selecting ‘very relevant’ on the question of professional development.
- Usefulness: Year 9 saw the greatest number of courses (81% of the courses) where 90% or more of the course topics were rated ‘extremely useful’ or ‘useful.’ This was an increase in this rating of 22% from Year 8.
- Peer to Peer Interactions: More people strongly agreed that they had meaningful interactions with their peers that were beneficial to their learning; an increase of 13% who chose the highest rating for this question from Year 8.
- Course expectations: Roughly the same percentage of people said the course exceeded expectations (the only rating where the highest ranking choice did not increase), yet more people said the course met expectations than in Year 8.

Learning and Applying New Skills

Prior to Year 7, the King Institute asked participants if they learned about new tools or gained knowledge that would be applicable to their position. The ratings have been consistently very high as **Table 4.1.** illustrates.

Table 4.1. Learned Applicable Tools Years 1-6							
“Did you learn about new tools or gain knowledge that is applicable to your position?”							
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Average
Yes	84%	85%	86%	90%	84%	84%	85%
Somewhat	16%	15%	13%	10%	14%	14%	14%
No	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%

Beginning in Year 7, the Institute asked two related questions pertaining to learning outcomes. As **Table 4.2.** illustrates, more people strongly agreed in Year 9. Taken as a whole, 95% of participants either strongly agreed or agreed that the content added to their knowledge for their current role. This is comparable to prior years when the affirmative choices were “yes” or “somewhat” for a total of 98%.

Table 4.2. Training Content Years 7-9			
“The training content added to my knowledge/ skill base for my current role”			
	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Strongly agree	55%	46%	61%
Agree	35%	49%	34%
Disagree	8%	4%	5%
Strongly disagree	2%	1%	0%

All courses rated above a 3.0 out of a 4.0 scale, with an average rating of 3.60.

The highest ranked courses included:

- Introduction to Community Economic Development (3.93)
- Group Facilitation (Salem) (3.89)
- Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships (Boston) (3.85)
- Community Engagement (3.85)
- Group Facilitation (Boston) (3.82)
- Small Business Loan Packaging (3.82)
- What’s in the Numbers? CDC Financial Statements (3.80)
- Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships (Lawrence) (3.78)
- CRA Basics (3.78)

Participants answered the question: What did you gain today and how will you apply it in your work?

“I will use the information and ideas to frame our projects for a hospital community benefits audience.” Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships

“Practice facilitating a meeting; better understanding of role of facilitator, better understanding of personal areas of growth.” Group Facilitation

“I gained perspective on the role of planners and how much power zoning boards have relative to potential lack of training. I will be able to look into how my city organizes its various planning committees and be a more active resident.” Planning 101

“I gained more awareness of implicit bias 'in action', meaning how it applies to me and to our agency's work. I am applying it both as an internal awareness tool and as something we are spreading out to our staff and into our projects.” Implicit Bias for Homeownership Professionals

“I gained more insight into how the asset management numbers work and what goes into those numbers.” Fundamentals of Affordable Housing Finance

“I gained knowledge about best practices and technology for facilitating multilingual communication. I hope to apply these techniques at trainings and client meetings.” Technical Strategies to Ensure Full Participation in Multi-Lingual Meetings

“A clearer picture of what other CDC's do, and how art can be used in multiple fashions as a social draw and to create awareness of a neighborhood.” Arts and Equity in the North Shore

Beginning in Year 7, the King Institute added Q5.b (**Table 4.3.**) to gauge participant level of confidence in the application of new skills. As with other categories, this year saw an increase in the percentage of people who chose ‘strongly agree’. Similar to Year 8, 90% of participants agreed to some extent that they felt confident in applying knowledge and skills.

Table 4.3. Confidence Level			
“I feel confident in applying the knowledge/ skills I learned today at my organization.”			
	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Strongly agree	41%	41%	49%
Agree	44%	49%	41%
Disagree	13%	9%	10%
Strongly disagree	2%	1%	0%

“It made me more aware (and confident) of how what I am doing now does fit with a larger plan, how I can develop skills in current role.” Careers in Community Development

“This will help me to grow as a board member.” Group Facilitation

“The skills and knowledge I learned during both trainings (Planning 101, 102) are going to help me be more effective as a board member of the planning board commission.” Planning 101/ 102

“Helps me in knowing how I can do my best work by being filled and not just a constant pouring pitcher.” Bypassing Burnout

“I have more confidence reading plans and participating in job meetings.” MEPFP: HVAC

“This training definitely built my confidence in any future community engagement I will have to do, in persuading supervisors to alter current engagement practices.” Community Engagement

“Terrific training! Perfect level of knowledge for me and I feel excited to bring these ideas back to my work.” Intermediate Project Management

Perspectives and Relevance

Perspectives

As reflected in the revised logic model, the King Institute strives to impact the field of community development by establishing a shared understanding of the knowledge and values at the core of the sector, and helping to broaden participant’s perspectives about the community development field.

Beginning in Year 7, the Institute asked participants to consider if the training had helped them to gain a broader perspective on the community development field. As **Table 4.4.** shows, 90% of participants agreed to some extent, reflecting a slightly higher overall percentage than in Years 7 and 8, with more people selecting 'strongly agree' on this question.

Table 4.4. Broader Perspectives			
"The training helped me gain a broader perspective of the community development field."			
	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Strongly agree	47%	45%	52%
Agree	36%	43%	38%
Disagree	11%	11%	9%
Strongly disagree	6%	1%	1%

Relevance

The King Institute asked participants to rate the relevance of the training to their current role, the organization's current work and goals, and to their own professional development. **Table 4.5** shows that relevance in the participant's current role is nearly identical to last year, with a total of 87% in Year 9 agreeing to some extent, with more participants selecting 'very relevant' than in past years.

Table 4.5. Relevance in Current Role			
Please rate the relevance of the training to your current role			
	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Very Relevant	53%	51%	57%
Relevant	33%	37%	30%
Somewhat Relevant	12%	12%	12%
Not at all Relevant	2%	0%	1%

"Great facilitation! I didn't know this was relevant to me and my work until today." Introduction to Project Management

Participants rated the relevance to their organization's goals and to their own professional development higher than in Years 7 and 8. While the total percentage of people who rated these questions combined 'very relevant' and 'relevant' are consistent, there were noted increases in the percentage of people who selected the higher rating in these questions as well as many others throughout the survey.

Table 4.6. Relevance to the Organization's Work and Goals			
Please rate the relevance of the training to your organization's work and goals			
	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Very Relevant	60%	56%	64%
Relevant	32%	35%	29%
Somewhat Relevant	6%	8%	6%
Not at all Relevant	2%	0%	0%

Table 4.7. Relevance to Professional Development			
Please rate the relevance of the training to your professional development			
	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Very Relevant	62%	59%	69%
Relevant	31%	35%	26%
Somewhat Relevant	6%	6%	4%
Not at all Relevant	1%	1%	0%

Given that Questions 6a-c were new in Year 7, we cannot offer comparisons with exact wording from prior years. However, **Table 4.8.** shows that in prior years nearly everyone felt to some degree that the trainings would help them advance professionally in the community development field.

Table 4.8: Professional Advancement Years 1-6							
"Do you believe that the new skills or knowledge you gained today will help you to advance professionally in the community development field?"							
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Average
Yes	78%	85%	83%	80%	80%	79%	81%
Somewhat	14%	14%	17%	15%	17%	18%	15%
No	2%	1%	0%	5%	3%	3%	2%

"I have a more precise understanding of skills and steps required to advance in Community Development field." Careers in Community Development

Usefulness of the Curriculum

For each training, participants rate the usefulness of major topics in the course to strengthening their current work. Before each training, the instructor provides a list of learning outcomes for the training that are included in the evaluation and participants rate the learning outcomes on a 'usefulness' scale. **Table 4.9.** shows the percentages for courses in order of rankings.

Table 4.9. Usefulness of Training Topics Year 9				
Training	Extremely Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not at all Useful
Internal Controls	90%	10%	0%	0%
Introduction to Project Management	86%	8%	7%	0%
Group Facilitation	83%	17%	0%	0%
Community Engagement	82%	18%	0%	0%
Intro to Community Economic Development	76%	21%	2%	0%
Intermediate Project Management	75%	25%	0%	0%
Board Chairs Leading the Way: A New Training Series for Current and Prospective CDC Board Chairs	75%	20%	5%	0%
Best Practices in Packaging Small Business Loan Applications	74%	24%	3%	0%
Community Engagement Basics	73%	23%	5%	0%
Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships	71%	27%	2%	0%
Development Decoded: Real Estate Basics	70%	26%	4%	0%

Table 4.9. Usefulness of Training Topics Year 9				
Training	Extremely Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not at all Useful
What's in the Numbers? CDC Financial Statements	65%	35%	0%	0%
Group Facilitation	64%	30%	6%	0%
Technical Strategies to Ensure Full Participation in Multi-Lingual Meetings	62%	31%	6%	1%
Planning 102	60%	36%	3%	0%
Careers in Community Development	60%	33%	7%	0%
Community Reinvestment Act Basics	59%	37%	4%	0%
Implicit Bias	56%	24%	20%	0%
Group Facilitation	54%	44%	2%	0%
Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships	51%	49%	0%	0%
Fundamentals of Affordable Housing Finance	51%	36%	14%	0%
Implicit Bias for Homeownership Professionals	49%	44%	5%	1%
MEPFP: Plumbing	48%	43%	10%	0%
MEPFP: HVAC	46%	36%	18%	0%
Program Budgets	45%	43%	12%	0%
Planning 101	45%	49%	6%	0%
Arts and Equity in the North Shore	42%	58%	0%	0%
Understanding Tax Assessments of Affordable Properties	39%	53%	8%	0%
Data Storytelling	39%	45%	15%	1%
Bypassing Burnout: Building Stress Reduction and Resiliency Skills	38%	45%	14%	2%
Understanding Census Data	30%	60%	10%	0%

As **Table 4.10.** shows, Year 9 showed an increase of the percentage of courses with high ratings and an decrease in the percentage of courses with lower ratings as contrasted with prior years.

Table 4.10. Usefulness Ratings Comparisons Years 5 - 9					
	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
% courses: 90% responses 'extremely useful' or 'useful'	71%	75%	55%	59%	81%
% courses: Less than 80% rated 'extremely useful' or 'useful'	8%	8%	21%	22%	0%
% courses: Any ratings of 'not at all useful'	21%	21%	41%	15%	13%

While the ratings were high, some suggestions were offered about content to make the course more useful:

"I strongly believe that more focus should have been placed on the criteria for selecting the specific development project and the role the developer play in this process. It was not clear who are the decision makers in this process and what point they become involved in the process."
 Planning 101

“It would be helpful to have a definition sheet for the terms. I liked taking my own notes on terminology but it would have been helpful to reference back to something.” Development Decoded

“Very little focus on practical solutions. Little distinction made between meetings providing essential rights and meetings to create community access. The idea of “language justice” is vague and poorly developed. Trainer was not well equipped to address situations when simultaneous translation is difficult, challenging. How do you create listening situations so that different voices can be heard?” Technical Strategies to Ensure Full Participation in Multi-Lingual Meetings

Several comments illustrate that participants would like courses to go deeper, and as in the past have requested that the King Institute to offer more advanced courses.

“I was hoping for more focus on the storytelling aspect- how to effectively communicate with data. Would have been great to see more examples of stories told with data.” Data Storytelling

“Great information and facilitation. I wish we'd had more time to dig in more deeply and talk more about personal/direct application”. Implicit Bias for Homeownership Professionals

“I would like more in-depth discussion and presentation of actual HVAC systems and trade-offs of each type.” MEFPF: HVAC

Peer to Peer Interactions

One of the goals of the King Institute, as more clearly articulated in the new 2015 logic model, is to foster connections across the community development field. Trainings can be an opportunity for community development staff to meet with and learn from their peers at other organizations. Prior to Year 7, the survey asked to ascertain the degree to which participants had an opportunity to work with their peers. As **Table 4.11.** illustrates, most participants in the prior years reported at least some opportunity to work with peers that was beneficial, but the average who said “extensive” was less than 50% and on average was slightly less than 40% of participants.

Table 4.11. Beneficial Work with Peers, Years 1-6							
<i>“During the training, did you have an opportunity to work with peers that you found beneficial to your learning?”</i>							
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Average
Extensive	41%	45%	39%	44%	38%	29%	39%
Some	56%	54%	56%	53%	48%	63%	55%
None	3%	1%	5%	3%	13%	7%	5%

Beginning in Year 7, the question was rephrased to assess whether there had been meaningful interactions that were beneficial to the participants learning during the course. As **Chart 4.12.** shows, a total of 91% of participants either strongly agreed or agreed, which is slightly greater than the total for Year 8. Given that the question is worded differently and the answer choices also have greater delineation, it is difficult to compare to prior years, but it is noteworthy to see that a higher percentage of people this year gave this question the highest ranking as compared with all other years and with the average for the past six years.

Table 4.12. Meaningful Peer Interactions			
“I had meaningful interactions with peers that were beneficial to my learning.”			
	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9
Strongly agree	46%	44%	57%
Agree	38%	45%	34%
Disagree	12%	9%	9%
Strongly disagree	4%	1%	0%

“At this training I reconnected with fellow cohort members and every meeting increasing the strength of those relationships.” Introduction to Community Economic Development

“It was an opportunity to meet similar professionals in the field and discuss an important but difficult topic safely. Thank you!” Implicit Bias for Homeownership Professionals

Some participants want to see more interactive exercises and time with their peers. This was noted in comments on the following courses:

- Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships
- Group Facilitation
- Bypassing Burnout
- Community Reinvestment Act Basics
- Data Storytelling
- Program Budgets
- Introduction to Project Management

Participant Expectations for the Training

Starting with the Year 5 survey, participants were asked whether the training met their expectations. The percentages are roughly equivalent to prior years although the Institute received slightly higher ratings for met expectations than in Year 8, bringing the total of the percentage of participants who either exceeded or met expectations up from 83% in Year 8 to 89% in Year 9.

Table 4.13. Course Expectations Years 5-9						
“Did the training meet your expectations?”						
	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Average
Exceeded expectations	37%	33%	32%	35%	34%	34%
Met expectations	53%	55%	52%	48%	55%	53%
Partially met expectations	9%	11%	13%	15%	10%	12%
Did not meet expectations	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%

Highest ranked courses on instructor, content, and usefulness

Many of the courses that ranked highly in one major category did so in other categories. The highest ranked courses in all 3 categories (sorted by usefulness first) are listed below (**Table 4.14.**)

Table 4.14. Highest Ranked Courses			
Course	Extremely Useful	Content Ranking	Instructor Ranking
Internal Controls	90%	3.60	4.00
Introduction to Project Management	86%	3.63	4.00
Group Facilitation (Salem)	83%	3.89	4.00
Community Engagement	82%	3.85	3.92
Introduction to Community Economic Development	76%	3.93	4.00
Intermediate Project Management	75%	3.71	4.00
Board Chairs Leading the Way	75%	3.80	3.40
Best Practices in Small Business Loan Applications	74%	3.82	3.45
Community Engagement Basics	73%	3.60	4.00
Forging CDC Hospital Partnerships (Boston)	71%	3.85	4.00
Development Decoded	70%	3.47	3.68

Section 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

The King Institute concluded its ninth year with a strong track record of excellence. From the day-of-surveys, evidence shows that participants are learning important skills to improve their performance in their current job, to support organizational goals, and to advance professionally. The King Institute is helping to build peer networks and sharing best practices across the community development field. Nearly all participants reported that the course either met or exceeded their expectations.

As in every year, there were slight shifts in the demographic profile of the participants. In Year 9, there were more people coming from Greater Boston, more people under the age of 25, fewer board members, and an increase in the percentage of people of color with the highest gains among Latinos. There was a drop in the percentage of MACDC members sending participants to courses.

The process outcomes – or measures of satisfaction – continue to be largely very positive. Nearly all of the participants rated the quality of the presenters highly. The same is true for the other process outcomes measuring satisfaction with the organization of the training and the registration process.

The impact outcomes – or measures of results – are also a strong indicator of the success for the King Institute this year. Participants are gaining applicable skills that are relevant to their current position, to their organization's goals, and to their own professional development. Percentages were higher on nearly every rating than in Year 8.

Next Steps - Recommendations

Participants offer ideas for future courses which included:

- Board development and tenant responsibilities
- Strategies for overcoming resistance to change
- Building effective and empowering intergenerational, intercultural workplaces.
- Technical assistance consulting certification
- Professional activism
- Public relations
- Budgets and capital improvement
- Financial Analysis / go or no go / feasibility Analysis
- Board chairs to community members fostering culture of collaboration
- Finance & legal issues- how to read financial statements, basics of affordable housing law
- Organizational Management
- Public Speaking
- Professional writing course
- Non-violent communication
- Work-planning and organizing time, prioritizing along with stress management
- Popular education- facilitating in such a way that brings out the wisdom of the group
- Asset Management
- How to Manage the Finances of a Mixed-Use site.
- Translation skills
- Professional development for Americorps VISTAs working with CDCs/nonprofits
- Grantwriting
- Boston permitting ecosystem

- Negotiation
- Accounting for project managers

As in prior years, participants are often looking for more in-depth content including longer courses. Many participants also request level 2 or more advanced courses on similar topics to the course they took this year. The list included:

- Public health planning
- Health impact measurements
- Planning 103 and beyond
- Organizing and power mapping
- Affordable housing finance
- Community economic development
- Empowerment of marginalized communities

Participants also requested that the King Institute consider how to provide continuity between courses and more follow-up to help participants implement the knowledge they have gained in the initial course. This has been a repeated theme that has emerged throughout the King Institute evaluations and is aligned with ideas that surfaced during the MACDC strategic planning process. Suggestions included:

- Homework assignments online after the course
- Opportunities to revisit lessons and share implementation ideas
- Engaging participants to share how they are using what they learned
- Support/ knowledge group to deepen the impact and help the learning 'stick'

Year ten begins with the Institute on solid ground. As MACDC launches the implementation of its strategic plan and the King Institute begins its next decade, it will be important to build on the successes and consider how to deepen impact among and across the community development field.