



In collaboration with DaSy, ECTA, NCSI, & NTACT

## Gallery Presentation: Evaluation Project Management Tools







#### **SSIP Interactive Institutes**

Albuquerque, NM; April 29-30, 2015 Jacksonville, FL; May 12-13, 2015 Chicago, IL; May 27-28, 2015 Jill Lammert, CIPP

## **Evaluating Your SSIP: Process**

- How will you monitor implementation of your SSIP?
- How will you measure progress toward achieving your SiMR?
- What kinds of data will you need to collect to monitor SSIP implementation and outcomes?
  - From whom?
  - How frequently?
- What resources are available for evaluation?
  - Personnel
  - Time
  - Budget
- How will evaluation results be used to improve the SSIP?





## **Evaluating Your SSIP: Roles**

- Who will prepare the evaluation plan?
  - SSIP team members?
  - State Research & Evaluation Department staff?
  - Third-party evaluator?
- Who will oversee the evaluation as SSIP implementation progresses?
- What role will stakeholders play in the evaluation?
- Who will conduct the evaluation activities?
  - Data collection
  - Data entry, cleaning, & management
  - Data analysis
  - Reporting





## Planning Your SSIP Evaluation

- 1. Conduct an Evaluation Needs Assessment
- 2. Create an Evaluation Scope of Work
- 3. Create an Evaluation Budget
- 4. Assemble an Evaluation Team
- 5. Develop a Request for Proposals (if applicable)
- 6. Navigate the Proposal Process (if applicable)
- 7. Execute a Contract (if applicable)





## **Assembling an Evaluation Team**

- State team evaluation liaison
- Stakeholders
- Evaluation project manager
- Data collectors
- Data manager
- Data analyst
- Report writer





# **Benefits & Limitations of Working With Third-Party Evaluators**

#### **Benefits** Limitations

#### Third-party evaluators can:

- Bring technical expertise in research methodology, statistics, or related topics to the project team
- Provide credibility and objectivity by acting as an external "critical friend"
- Take on responsibility for completing some or all of the (formative and summative) evaluation tasks, allowing project staff to focus on project implementation

#### Third-party evaluators may:

- Add unanticipated or additional cost to the project
- Add to project monitoring and management tasks focused on the work of contractors
- Not know the project background or content area as well as project staff
- Be less available or accessible, as compared to project staff





# **Important Tips for Evaluating Your SSIP**

- Begin thinking about evaluation as early as possible
- Conduct an evaluation needs assessment
- Devote time to the evaluation
- Communicate regularly with staff conducting the evaluation
- Monitor progress of the evaluation—receive interim reports and work products at regular intervals
- Take advantage of the support your IDC TA Liaison can provide!





## **Conducting an Evaluation Needs Assessment**

Question	Check the best option	Possible evaluation team tasks
(3) Can State SSIP team staff be sufficiently allocated to perform all evaluation tasks & responsibilities?	☐ Yes—proceed to question 4 ☐ Unsure or No— complete the checklist at right to identify possible evaluation team tasks	☐ Create/pilot test data collection instruments ☐ Collect data on ☐ Implementation progress ☐ Service statistics (e.g., numbers served; numbers of services provided) ☐ Fidelity of implementation ☐ Outcomes/impact ☐ Perform data entry/management ☐ Conduct data analysis ☐ Provide performance feedback to project team ☐ Write reports ☐ Other:





## **Creating an Evaluation Budget**

Evaluation element	Low cost (1 point/item)	Moderate cost (2 points/item)	High cost (3 points/item)	Score
		Evaluation Design Elements		
Focus of Formative Study	<ul><li>— Participant satisfaction</li><li>— Project implementation</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Outputs (e.g., satisfaction, quality, relevance)</li> <li>Implementation fidelity (key components, activities, outputs, possibly some direct outcomes)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Intervention fidelity that includes mediators, intermediate outcomes</li> </ul>	
Focus of Summative Study	<ul> <li>Changes in participant satisfaction</li> <li>Changes in existing data (e.g., student scores on state tests)</li> </ul>	— Short-term outcomes	<ul> <li>Intermediate/long-term         outcomes</li> <li>Comparative outcomes (e.g.,         treatment vs. control groups)</li> <li>Causal attribution</li> </ul>	
Evaluation Study Design	<ul> <li>Non-experimental (descriptive study, basic qualitative methods)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Non-experimental (case studies, advanced qualitative methods)</li> <li>Simple quasi-experiment (QED, e.g., basic comparison study)</li> <li>Single-case design (SCD; reversal design)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Complex QED (e.g., with matching, multiple comparison groups)</li> <li>Randomized controlled trial (RCT)</li> <li>Multi-site or cluster RCT</li> <li>SCD (multiple baseline, alternating treatment design)</li> </ul>	
# of Participants/ Sites, Sampling	<ul> <li>Small target</li> <li>population</li> <li>1-2 sites</li> <li>Simple sampling plan (e.g., purposive, simple random)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Moderate-size target population</li> <li>3-5 sites</li> <li>Somewhat complex sampling plan (e.g., stratified)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Large target population</li> <li>&gt;5 sites</li> <li>Highly complex sampling plan (e.g., stratified, clustered, weighted)</li> </ul>	





### **Monitoring Evaluation Progress**

Questions to Consider	Evaluation Is On Target If (one or more of the following may apply)	Evaluation Is Experiencing a Challenge If (one or more of the following may apply)				
Timing and Deadlines						
(1) When was the evaluation team assembled?	<ul> <li>Evaluation team was assembled prior to submission of the SSIP Evaluation Plan.</li> <li>The evaluation team was assembled on schedule (according to the SSIP management plan).</li> </ul>	There is no evaluation team.  The evaluation team was assembled after submission of the SSIP Evaluation Plan.				
(3) Is the evaluation meeting its deadlines?	<ul><li>The evaluation has met all deadlines.</li><li>The evaluation has met most deadlines, with 1 or 2 delays.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>✓ The evaluation has not established any deadlines.</li> <li>There have been 3 or more delays in meeting deadlines.</li> </ul>				





## **Completing the Evaluation**

Close-out task	The State team can	The evaluator can
Complete all contracted items, including payments	<ul> <li>Review the contract and identify any outstanding contracted items</li> <li>Develop a list of outstanding items to respond to, the order in which they can be addressed, and a timeline/deadline for addressing the items</li> <li>Process any and all final invoices, per contracted terms (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Review the contract and identify any outstanding contracted items (if applicable)</li> <li>Submit any outstanding products or deliverables to the state team</li> <li>Submit a final request for payment or invoice, with a deadline for payment (if applicable)</li> </ul>
Ensure the receipt of all evaluation documents	<ul> <li>□ Review the evaluation documents received to-date, compare to the list of contracted deliverables, and create a list of documents that are outstanding</li> <li>□ Remind the evaluator that final payment may be delayed until all contracted documents are received (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Review the evaluation documents produced to-date, compare to the list of contracted deliverables, and create a list of documents that are outstanding</li> <li>□ Confirm with the state team the documents that have been delivered to-date</li> <li>□ Create a zip file, CD, or "thumb drive" with all evaluation materials and products. Ensure the secure transfer of the zip file, CD, or "thumb drive" to the state team</li> </ul>





### For More Information

Visit the IDC website

http://ideadata.org/



https://twitter.com/ideadatacenter





This presentation was supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, #H373Y130002. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Project Officers: Richelle Davis and Meredith Miceli







