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## Program Evaluation Standards 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>CEP students</td>
<td>Every section</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, disaggregated by instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>CEP alumni, one year out</td>
<td>Every year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>CEP alumni, four years out</td>
<td>Every three years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Instructors, Principals, Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>Every three years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, disaggregated by role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response rates are more important when the study’s purpose is to measure effects or make generalizations to a larger population; they are less important if the purpose is to gain insight.
Reports

- Explain the survey’s methodology:
  - Who was surveyed?
  - How? (format, timing)
  - What was the response rate?
  - Include the survey instrument

- Provide the results
  - How are the results used/shared?
  - For alumni & impact surveys - draw conclusions
Common Accreditation Issues

- Not working with qualified researcher
- Incorrect survey frequency
- Lack of follow-up with non-respondents
- Low response rates
- Limited analysis in summary report
- Lack of evidence that survey results prompted any reflection on possible program improvement
Program Evaluation Standard 1

SMSU Example:

- Survey Monkey is used to conduct all of our NACEP evaluations
- Email sent to high school contacts containing a link to College Now survey page with one month remaining in the course
- Reminder email sent to high school contacts and teachers with two weeks remaining in the course
- Student worker tracks response rates as the end dates approach. We reach out a third time to classes with low/no survey response rates
- Responses are pulled and emailed to both the high school teachers and their SMSU mentoring faculty

**Challenge:** All of our courses have different end dates so this requires close attention
Program Evaluation Standard 1
UConn Example:

Survey Instrument – Paper to Online (SurveyMonkey & Qualitrics)

• Anonymity, time to complete, contact info, NetID instructions
• No required NACEP questions
• Not an evaluation of instructor

Open-ended questions:
Q12: What was the most difficult topic?
Q13: What topic received too much class time?
Q14: What topic received too little class time?
Q15: What did or did not convince you this was a college course?
Program Evaluation Standard 1
UConn Example:

Send notifications to community of the upcoming evaluation period and deadlines
• Include principals

Prepare student data
• NetID sign-in or password
• Include instructor email in data
• Unique course ID Christian Heritage School;HIST1501;805 – Husky, Jon
Program Evaluation Standard 1
UConn Example:

Email students including reminders
  • Message overload

Process data
  • Response rate
  • Totals
  • Word analysis
  • Prepare to send

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. University grading procedures were explained to the class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/no opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Evaluation Standard 1

UConn Example:

Send results

• Individual instructors

• Aggregate to faculty
Program Evaluation Standard 1
UConn Example:

Different school calendars
Inaccurate email addresses
Low community buy-in
NetID use is confusing

Cultural Shift in progress – Steady response rates
Program Evaluation Standard 2: SMSU Example

• Sent initial email with survey link the end of April

• We used $100 Prepaid Visa gift card as incentive, added logo to the email, and included both a link and a hyperlink to the survey

• Reminder emails sent after one week and then again the day before the drawing

• SMSU Office of Institutional Research and Data Management reviews and analyzes our survey responses
Program Evaluation Standard 2: UConn Example

- Similar prep work as with course evaluations
- Took advantage of survey flow feature
- Worked with IR to validate questions – run the assessment internally
- Include opt-in feature for more in-depth survey
- Incentivize survey completion
- NACEP essential questions
Program Evaluation Standard 2: UConn Example

- Timing can be tricky
- Email addresses inaccurate
- Response bias

View I registered for the program and paid, but do not remember doing anything else for it. Never took an exam, never had any communication from UConn, but I guess I received credit for an Econ course somehow, even though that credit is useless at most colleges.

View This program was so beneficial. It really helped me prepare for college and now has made me ahead in my coursework so I might graduate early!
Program Evaluation Standard 2: UConn Example- Bias

• **No-response bias:** students who do not respond may have had a different experience
  • Hate the course or love the course
  • Hate the instructor or love the instructor

• **Low response rate:** mean is susceptible to the influence of extreme scores, whether positive or negative
  • Increasing the response rate can smooth out these effects
Program Evaluation Standard 3: SMSU Example

• Survey conducted annually for consistent reporting

• Sent initial email with survey link the end of April, with reminders sent one week later and again the day before the drawing

• We used $100 Prepaid Visa gift card as incentive, added logo to email, and included both link and hyperlink to the survey

• **Challenge**: Email addresses bouncing with this group

• **Improvement**: Email sent to current seniors making them aware of alumni surveys in the future and encouraging them to update their email addresses in our system before graduation
Program Evaluation Standard 3: UConn Example and Challenges

Process: Same prep work as 1-year alumni survey + postcard

NACEP essential questions

Challenges: inaccurate emails/mailing addresses
Program Evaluation Standard 4: SMSU Example

• Emails are sent to high school contacts containing a link to College Now survey page one month prior to the school year ending

• Reminder emails are sent to high school contacts two weeks later

• Monitor responses and follow up with specific groups as needed
Program Evaluation Standard 4: UConn Example

- Similar prep work as for course evaluations
- Separate surveys for each group
- NACEP essential questions
Program Evaluation Standard – UConn Tips for increased response rate

• Will rise if the culture of taking evaluations is strengthened
• Over time users become familiar with system and process
• Motivate students to provide feedback – instructor request
• Provide class time to do evaluations
• Provide all information needed to take evaluations clearly
• Provide frequent remainders to students and instructors
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- Evaluation Survey Templates
- Survey Guide

Contact Jennie Patteson <jpatteson@nacep.org> for SurveyMonkey or Qualtrics Templates of NACEP Essential Questions