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Today’s Agenda

2:00  Introductions
2:10  Overview; Reasons for Conducting a Program Evaluation (David)
2:35  What to Evaluate: CAS and AHEAD Program Standards (Elaine)
2:55  Using Survey Tools to Gather Data (Sam)
3:15  Break
3:35  Use of Non-Survey Tools to Collect Data (Steve)
3:55  Tools for Storing, Analyzing, and Presenting Data (Richard)
4:15  Interactive Segment (Suggestions for Utilizing Evaluation Results; Final Q&A)
Accompanying Materials

Materials accompanying this symposium session are available online at AHEAD’s learning management system:
http://ahead.coursewebs.com

Enter username: assessment
Password: ahead2007
Click on AHEADSYM6 Login

This will bring you to a page with instructions for accessing your copy of Program Evaluation of Postsecondary Disability Services: From Theory to Practice and accompanying materials.
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Reasons for Conducting a Program Evaluation

Ensure Accountability

“Given the fiscal, administrative, and legal accountability of OSDs, it is vital that the personnel responsible for ensuring equal educational access conduct a periodic self-assessment of their performance.”

- Dukes & Shaw (1999)
Reasons for Conducting a Program Evaluation

Inform Decision Making

Conduct an LD program evaluation to:

- Justify program needs (staff, space, equipment) and academic lines of reporting (academic or student affairs)
- Monitor student achievement
- Document compliance with Section 504/ADA
- Analyze effectiveness of program services
- Assist in developing institutional policy (e.g., course substitution policy)

- Brinckerhoff, McGuire, & Shaw (2002)
3) *Promote Self-determination*

When sensitive to context, program evaluations provide data that help DSS professionals establish, implement, and evaluate a programmatic mission:

- Establish descriptive data/baselines
- Clarify problems
- Document successes
- Meet peer-driven standards of “best practice”

Reasons for Conducting a Program Evaluation

“What are our peer institutions doing?”

Program Evaluation of Postsecondary Disability Services: From Theory to Practice

2) DSS Program Evaluations (Questionnaire Results)

- Use of data
- Planning to evaluate
- Anticipated benefits
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Using Survey Tools to Gather Data

Sam Goodin
University of Michigan
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Tip: Try removing quotes from your search to get more results.

Your search - "Program Evaluation Jokes" - did not match any documents.

Suggestions:

- Make sure all words are spelled correctly.
- Try different keywords.
- Try more general keywords.
The “Real” Reasons to do Program Evaluation

- DSS staff do not have the time to reconfigure support service mechanisms on the whims of concerned students, staff, supervisors or officials from the Office of Civil Rights.
- We do not have the blood pressure and cholesterol levels that will allow us to spend our entire professional lives putting out fires.
- We do not have spouses, children and significant others who will forever tolerate our spending weekends and evenings creating pilot projects for which we find no demand.
Modular Mailed Survey

Module I General questions for all students
- Modules II A-D Disability specific questions
- Module III Demographic data

Please read each item and rate the availability and quality of each service.
1 = poor  2 = fair  3 = adequate  4 = good  5 = excellent
___ Reader services (availability)
___ Reader services (quality)
___ Loan of Special equipment (e.g., recorder) (availability)
___ Loan of Special equipment (e.g., recorder) (quality)
___ Test/quiz administration (availability)
___ Test/quiz administration (quality)
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Phone Survey

It's much easier to terminate a telephone interview abruptly, saying something like, “Whoops! someone's at the door. I gotta go.” or “OMIGOD! The pigs are eating my Volvo!”

- Babbie, 1992
Evaluating Other Services

When people ask “how big is your staff?” I am fond of telling them I have a staff of 2,500. That usually gets a look (and a stir) out of the questioner, but in fact, on our campus, that is the approximate number of our faculty and staff.

- Harris, 1984
Instruments for Evaluating Other Services

Other Campus Offices:
- Admissions
- Counseling
- Parking Office
- Health Service
- Housing
- Library
- Career Center
Evaluation of Service Providers

...formal performance evaluation probably began in United States in 1813 (Bellows & Estep, 1954) when army general Lewis Cass submitted to the War Department an evaluation of each of his men using such terms as “a good natured man” or “knave despised by all.”

- Murphy & Clevland, 1995
Instruments for Evaluating Service Providers

- Readers
- Interpreters
- Notetakers
- Professional and Administrative Staff
Each StudentVoice toolkit provides each student affairs unit with specific assessment programs from which they can choose. These programs include common instruments for comparison with peer institutions and the opportunity to add campus-specific questions to address precise issues or concerns that help Directors monitor the usage, satisfaction and outcomes.
Need a Title

How do you rate the ease of finding out about Paratransit/Yellow Cab service?

How do you rate the ease of registering with SSD to be eligible for these services?

Have you used the Yellow Cabs?

Please rate the following regarding your experience with the Yellow Cabs: - The cab consistently came within the promised time.
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Q8. Please rate the following regarding your experience with the Yellow Cabs: - The cab consistently came within the promised time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Respondents

Top 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bottom 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.14
Q8. Please rate the following regarding your experience with the Yellow Cabs: - The cab consistently came within the promised time

- **Excellent**: 14.29%
- **Above Average**: 23.81%
- **Average**: 38.1%
- **Below Average**: 9.62%
- **Poor**: 14.28%
Using Survey Tools to Gather Data

Elaine Manglitz
Clayton State University
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What to Evaluate: CAS and AHEAD Program Standards

- AHEAD Program Standards
  - http://www.ahead.org/resources.php

  - http://www.cas.edu/
AHEAD Program Standards

- Revised professional standards and performance indicators for our field
- Developed with input from experts within the field
- Can direct program evaluation and development efforts
- Supports staff development efforts
CAS Professional Standards

- Consistent format across all functional areas, including disability support services
- Tied to student learning and development
- Self-assessment guides
- Use to gauge program effectiveness
- Use to create an action plan for improvement
- Supports professional staff development
Recommendations for Using the Assessment Tools

- Using both AHEAD program standards and CAS professional standards
- Tie to institution’s vision and mission
- Implementation of evaluation efforts: no one right way
- Making the tools work for your office and your needs
Additional Recommendations

Assess/evaluate how well the disabilities service office meets the mission of the University

Assess/evaluate how well the disabilities service office meets the vision and mission of the general Division of which it is a part (Academic or Student Affairs)
Using Survey Tools to Gather Data

Steve Robillard
SR-PS, Inc.
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Why Use Non-Survey Data?

If the only tool you have is a hammer, every problem is a nail.
Trends

- Overall shift from qualitative to quantitative, or better yet, both.
- Graduation, retention, student learner outcomes
What is available?

- Looking in your own backyard
- The University
- State
- Federal
- Peer institutions
Examples

- Staff activity
- CSP 100
- Designated Math
- Extended Time
Using Survey Tools to Gather Data

Richard Riccardi
Southern Connecticut State University
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Think Before You Dig…

- Identify the problem to be addressed
  - Existence
    - Have you used the Yellow Cabs?
  - Opinion based (Satisfaction/Agreement)
    - How do you rate the ease…
  - Time based
    - How long have you used the service?
  - Combination
    - Is the service better than before?
    - What is “better?”
The Old Wheel Is Round…
The New Wheel Is Round

- Your own system (electronic, paper)
- Student Information System
  - Extracts (IT, IR, Assessment, self)
- School profiles (own, peer schools)
- State/Federal data (IPEDS, US News)
- Noel Levitz, NSSE
Collecting Data

Survey Tools
- SurveyMonkey
- Snap Survey
- Zoomerang
- Explorance
- StudentVoice
- Paper and #2 pencils
- Telephone
Issues with Survey Tools

- Ease of use
- Accessibility
- Web-based
- Audience
- Security
- Data ownership
- IT
- Survey design (reliability, validity)
Analyzing Data

Microsoft Excel
- Universal (PC, Macintosh)
- Easy to use
- Some statistical power (Pivot Tables, t-Test, z-Test, Chi-Square, Pearson correlation)

Power Tools
- Microsoft Access, Filemaker, Oracle, MySQL
- SPSS, SAS
## Outcomes for CSP 100 - Fall 1993 to Fall 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fail Students</th>
<th>Fail %</th>
<th>No Grade Students</th>
<th>No Grade %</th>
<th>Pass Students</th>
<th>Pass %</th>
<th>Withdraw Students</th>
<th>Withdraw %</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1994</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend (groupings by grade): Fail = D- or F, Incomplete = I or I+, No Grade = N or R, Pass = D or better, Withdraw = W, WP, or WF
A Picture Can Be Worth an FTE...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FT Staff</th>
<th>Students Served</th>
<th>Student Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student/FT Staff Ratio

- **2003**: 450 students served by 6 FT staff, ratio 75
- **2004**: 575 students served by 5 FT staff, ratio 115
- **2005**: 600 students served by 5 FT staff, ratio 120
- **2006**: 700 students served by 4 FT staff, ratio 175
- **2007**: 800 students served by 4 FT staff, ratio 200
Presenting Information

Know Your Audience
- “Just give me the bullets.”
- How does your data fit with the mission and vision of university?

Know Your Purpose
- Set baseline
- Improve service
- Increase funding

KISS Method
- If it needs explaining, it needs to be simplified.
The Assessment Cycle

Problem + Data + Standards = Information

Information + Context = Knowledge

Applying the Knowledge Gained = Assessment