|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Methods** | | | |
|  | **Methods** | **Data Collection Suggestions** | **Efficiency Strategies** |
| **Level I: Participation**  (Who is participating in the faculty development services?) | * Track attendance * Track job demographics * Track usage of online resources | * Who attended * What department/program * Reason for attendance * Newcomer or returning participant * Number of past attended events * Teaching load * Typical class size | * Use online registration * Develop customized databases * Google Analytics™ for website usage |
| **Level II: Satisfaction**  (What was the participant’s level of satisfaction?) | * Satisfaction surveys * Annual campus-wide satisfaction surveys * Focus groups * Advisory board reviews of resources | * Use a quantifiable Likert scale * Keep it anonymous * Try to get 100% return rate * Include an open ended comment item * Ask about the learning environment, scheduling, instruction, content relevance, & learning * Include item inquiring into overall rating of the event & suggestions for improvement & whether s/he would recommend it to others * Create 8-12 survey items | * Gather data with Student Response Devices (aka Clickers) * Create a standardized online survey through SurveyMonkey®, Qualtrics®, Google® * Create an automated system for emailing the survey link * Focus groups for select programs only |
| **Level III: Learning**  (Did the participants learn?) | * Application exercises at the event * Open-ended surveys * Post-event follow-up surveys * Pre-post assessments | * Evaluate before and after (i.e. pre-post) * Evaluate knowledge and/or attitude * Evaluate skills through performance * Try to get 100% participation * Remember, adults don’t like taking tests * Adults do like taking inventories | * Same as Level II strategies * Embed questions into satisfaction surveys |
| **Level IV: Impact on teaching**  (Did participants change their practices as a result of the program?) | * Grant reports that include changes in teaching * Presentations reporting changes in teaching for funded projects * Solicit self-reports of changes in teaching through surveys, emails, interviews, or focus groups * Student ratings * Student surveys or in-class feedback * Pre-post classroom observations * Pre-post review of teaching products * Faculty-created critical incident analysis * Teaching portfolios * Experimental studies * Standardized faculty inventories   (e.g. Teaching Goals Inventory®, Teaching Perspective Inventory®, Teaching Style Inventory®, Approach to Teaching Inventory® | * Use a control group if practical * Allow time for new behaviors to occur * Evaluate before and after event * Gather teaching products already available * Consider a variety of informative sources (e.g. students, supervisors, participants, peers) * Instead of asking, “Did you…”, ask “How did you….? When did you...? Where did you…? What did you…? With who did you…? Why did you…?” * Consider evaluating knowledge, attitude, building of new collaborations and interactions with teachers, or passing teaching ideas forward * Gather data again at a later date | * Combine satisfaction and behavior change inquiries into one online survey * Gather pre-post data for consultation services using a coding system for anonymity * Ask the faculty member to provide measures indicating a need for consultation & use it for pre-post measures * Data mine select items on student ratings * Set up blogs for faculty to record critical incident analyses or other reflective writing * Set up e-portfolios for faculty projects receiving funding * Combine survey efforts with other institutional surveys to reduce survey fatigue * Use experimental designs for only high impact or high cost programs |
| **Level V: Impact on Student Learning Outcomes**  (Did the student learning outcomes change as a result of the program?) | * Require grant reports to include changes in student learning * Require a publication or presentation reporting changes in student learning for funded projects * Solicit self-reports of changes in student learning through surveys, emails, interviews, or focus groups * Student surveys or in-class feedback * Pre-post measures of student performance * Pre-post measures of student progression * Faculty reports of student changes via focus groups or surveys * Quasi-Experimental studies * Student engagement inventories (CCSSE, NSSE, FSSE) | * Probe for types of changes (e.g. What was the result? What remained the same? How significant was the change? What are the noticeable differences? What difference did it make in the end? * Allow time for the change to occur * Focus on tangible changes such as changes in student’s approaches to learning, motivation, confidence * Focus on the changes the intervention was designed to change * Be satisfied with evidence opposed to verifiable proof * Use a control group if practical * Gather data again at a later date, if possible | * Combine behavior change and student learning outcome inquiries into one online survey * Same as Level IV strategies |
| **Level VI: Impact on the Institution**  (Was there an institutional change as a result of the program?) | * Pre-post measures of attrition, retention, or graduation rates * Quasi-experimental studies * Data mine Student Survey of Engagement inventories * Use Level 1-V aggregate data to show institutional impact | * Keep in mind any changes due to faculty development work makes an institutional impact to some degree * Tie program evaluation to the institutional strategic plan | * Work with the Office of Assessment * Use quasi-experimental designs for only high impact or high cost programs |