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1. Get the right information into the report
2. Make it inviting and easy to use
3. Get the word out

[Reporting Basics] [Design & Formatting] [Beyond Reporting]
Reporting BASICS

annual report VS evaluation report
NSF ANNUAL REPORT

- Report on results and outcomes
- Upload evaluation report

EVALUATION REPORT

- Explanation of what was evaluated
- Data
- Conclusions
ANATOMY OF AN EVALUATION REPORT

FRONT MATTER
This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant numbers 1204683 and 1600992. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.
TABLE OF CONTENTS
so readers can find what they need to know

TABLES AND FIGURES
helpful if you have several

www.evalu-ate.org
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

may be the only part some stakeholders read

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank those involved
The PI and co-PI met with the project’s ATE NSF PO to discuss their NVC’s feedback on their DACUM process.

The evaluation included both RCT and QED methods and was informed by UFE, CIPP, as well as the PES and AEA Guiding Principles.
**INTRODUCTION**

orients reader to what is in the report and how the information is organized

---

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

so the reader knows what was evaluated
Evaluation background
so the reader understands factors that influenced the planning and conduct of the evaluation

Evaluation design
describes how the evaluation was implemented and how results were obtained
### Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REACH</strong></td>
<td>Number of webinar participants and their characteristics</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of participants who attend more than one event</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of active grants represented among webinar participants</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Users’ frequency of engagement with Evaluate resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents’ reports of sharing information from Evaluate with others</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REACTION</strong></td>
<td>Respondents’ ratings of their satisfaction with specific events</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents’ descriptions of the strengths and weaknesses of events</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings of Evaluate’s overall quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING</strong></td>
<td>Respondents’ self-assessments of how much they learned Evaluate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEHAVIOR</strong></td>
<td>Respondents’ ratings of their intent to use what they learned from events</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents’ ratings of the extent to which information they obtained from Evaluate promoted them to take actions related to their evaluation practice</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACT</strong></td>
<td>Respondents’ ratings of the extent to which information they obtained from Evaluate led to improvements in the quality of their evaluations</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents’ descriptions of how information they obtained from Evaluate helped them improve their evaluations</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Results

What was learned from the evaluation.
Findings organized by evaluation questions

Evidence-based suggestions for future actions

Recommendations
Use appendices to enhance the report’s credibility and transparency

APPENDICES

A. Author Biographies
B. Webinar Evaluation Survey Example
C. External Evaluation Survey Instrument
D. Employment Areas of External Evaluation Survey Respondents
E. Results of Bivariate and Multivariate Statistical Analyses
F. Interpretation Rubrics
G. Response Frequencies Split by ATE and Non-ATE respondents
H. Coded Responses to Open-ended External Evaluation Survey Questions
### PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>The utility standards are intended to increase the extent to which program stakeholders find evaluation processes and products valuable in meeting their needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>The feasibility standards are intended to increase evaluation effectiveness and efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
<td>The propriety standards support what is proper, fair, legal, right and just in evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>The accuracy standards are intended to increase the dependability and truthfulness of evaluation representations, propositions, and findings, especially those that support interpretations and judgments about quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Accountability</td>
<td>The evaluation accountability standards encourage adequate documentation of evaluations and a metaevaluative perspective focused on improvement and accountability for evaluation processes and products.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design & FORMATTING

WHY BOTHER?

The report itself is the product of the evaluation. The report is the evaluation. It is the document that communicates the findings of the evaluation to the intended audience. The report is not an afterthought but a central component of the evaluation process.

**Why bother?**

- The report is the deliverable of the evaluation. It is the document that communicates the findings of the evaluation to the intended audience.
- The report is not an afterthought but a central component of the evaluation process.

---

**About EvaluATE**

EvaluATE is the national center for the improvement of evaluation in STEM education. We believe that evaluation is essential for ensuring that educational programs and policies are effective. We work to improve the quality and impact of evaluation through research, resources, and professional development.

---

**Tables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluating the Impact of the Program on Student Outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY BOTHER?

It’s not about making the document pretty.

It’s about increasing ENGAGEMENT, UNDERSTANDING, and USE.
### ENGAGEMENT

**Evaluation of EvaluATE, 2012-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Percentage of active grants represented among webinar participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Database</td>
<td>Number of webinar participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Database</td>
<td>Percentage of participants who attend more than 1 event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location and Organizational Affiliations</td>
<td>Geographic location and organizational affiliations of webinar participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents’ Reports of Frequency of Seeking Information from EvaluATE</td>
<td>Respondents’ reports of frequency of seeking information from EvaluATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluation Survey</td>
<td>Respondents’ reports of sharing information from EvaluATE with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Participants’ ratings of their satisfaction with events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Participants’ self-assessments of how much they learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Participants’ reports of the extent to which information they obtained from EvaluATE contributed to their knowledge about various aspects of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Participants’ ratings of their intent to use what they learned from events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Participants’ ratings of the extent to which information they obtained from EvaluATE led to improvements in their evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Participants’ description of how information they obtained from EvaluATE helped them improve their evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNDERSTANDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of online resources and among webinar participants</td>
<td>Knowledge of online resources and among webinar participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Personal experience of using information from EvaluATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Capacity</td>
<td>Increased evaluation capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Action plans related to evaluation practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Use</td>
<td>Information use and decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Increased confidence in evaluation practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Information obtained from EvaluATE and its impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant numbers 1204683 and 1600992. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.
### USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PI's/Co-PI's</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation plans</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project logic models</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection instruments</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection methods</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis or interpretation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data visualization</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation reports</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation budgets</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of results for project improvement or expansion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PI's/Co-PI's</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis or interpretation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data visualization</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation reports</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation budgets</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes all respondents who had sought out information from EvaluATE in the past year.
*Includes ATE respondents if “evaluator” is not primary role on largest.

In terms of differences across the three groupings of ATE respondent roles (i.e., investigators (PI’s/Co-PI’s), evaluators, and others), the mean responses from both investigators and others were higher than the mean from evaluators regarding the extent to which information from EvaluATE has led to improvements in their evaluation plans, project logic models, and data collection methods. Details regarding these statistical analyses are in Appendix D.

### BASIC PRINCIPLES
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Consistency
In this section, we provide key information related to factors that influenced the evaluation’s planning and implementation.

**Purpose**
NSF requires all ATE projects and centers to be evaluated. The main purposes of these evaluations are to enhance grantees’ accountability to NSF, determine effectiveness provide evidence of quality and impact, and provide useful information for project and center personnel that can be used for improvement. EvaluATE’s evaluation serves these three main purposes, in addition to modeling evaluation for other ATE projects and centers.

EvaluATE has been continuously evaluated since it began in 2008 through both internal and external evaluation activities. Three sets of external evaluators have been involved. The Rucks Group, an evaluation firm located in Dayton, Ohio, has been working with EvaluATE since 2012. The Rucks Group conducted surveys of EvaluATE’s audience in 2012, 2014, and 2016. Prior to that, a similar survey was conducted by the previous external evaluators. The Rucks Group and EvaluATE personnel worked closely to revise the external evaluation survey for administration in 2016. The Rucks Group had sole responsibility for the external evaluation survey’s administration and analysis. EvaluATE personnel have primary responsibility for tracking EvaluATE’s reach and participation and obtaining immediate feedback on webinars and workshops. Bios for...
EVALUATION BACKGROUND
In this section, we provide key information related to factors that influenced the evaluation's planning and implementation.

PURPOSE
NSF requires all ATE projects and centers to be evaluated. The main purposes of these evaluations are to enhance grantees' accountability to NSF, determine effectiveness provide evidence of quality and impact, and provide useful information for project and center personnel that can be used for improvement. EvaluATE's evaluation serves these three main purposes, in addition to modeling evaluation for other ATE projects and centers.

RESOURCES
EvaluATE has been continuously evaluated since it began in 2008 through both internal and external evaluation activities. Three sets of external evaluators have been involved. The Rucks Group, an evaluation firm located in Dayton, Ohio, has been working with EvaluATE since 2012.

Personnel
The Rucks Group conducted surveys of EvaluATE's audience in 2012, 2014, and 2016. Prior to that, a similar survey was conducted by the previous external evaluator. The Rucks Group and EvaluATE personnel...
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HEADING 2
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Utilize your TOC
Number your pages
Number tables & figures
Use icons
Choose fonts wisely

 DIFFICULT TO READ.  
Easier to read.  
Even easier.
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Number tables & figures
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YOUR TURN
The evaluation work is conducted by the evaluation team led by the Project Director, who is responsible for overseeing the evaluation effort. The evaluation team includes experts in evaluation methodology, data analysis, and reporting. The evaluation findings are reported to the project stakeholders and are used to inform decision-making.

To ensure the integrity of the evaluation results, the evaluation team follows strict ethical and confidentiality protocols. The evaluation team is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of all participant data and ensuring that the evaluation results are used only for the purpose of improving the project's outcomes.

The evaluation team reports to the project stakeholders on a regular basis, providing updates on the evaluation progress and findings. The evaluation reports are shared with key stakeholders, including project partners, funders, and policymakers. The evaluations are conducted in close collaboration with the project partners and stakeholders, ensuring that the evaluation results are relevant and actionable.

The evaluation findings are used to inform the project's implementation and are integrated into the project's reporting. The evaluation team works closely with the project team to ensure that the evaluation findings are disseminated to the appropriate audiences and are used to inform decision-making.

To ensure accountability and transparency, the evaluation team is committed to conducting evaluations in a rigorous and transparent manner. The evaluation team follows established ethical and confidentiality protocols and is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of all participant data.

The evaluation findings are shared with key stakeholders, including project partners, funders, and policymakers. The evaluations are conducted in close collaboration with the project partners and stakeholders, ensuring that the evaluation results are relevant and actionable.

The evaluation findings are used to inform the project's implementation and are integrated into the project's reporting. The evaluation team works closely with the project team to ensure that the evaluation findings are disseminated to the appropriate audiences and are used to inform decision-making.
BEYOND Reports

Will the project evaluation inform others through the communication of results?*

*ATE-specific merit review criterion
Traditional evaluation report

AUDIENCE?
SOCIAL MEDIA POST

WEBINAR ATTENDANCE TRIpled
attendance increased by 900 participants from 2014-15 to 2015-16


Canva.com
SOCIAL MEDIA POST

Canva.com

ONE-PAGE SUMMARY
RESEARCH ARTICLE

- Introduction
- Literature Review
- Methods
- Results
- Discussion

EVALUATION REPORT

+ why topic is important for the field
+ details on method (probably)
- recommendations for project
+ implications for the field
All-ATE issue edited by ATE Researcher Brian Horvitz

Online Career and Technical Education in the Community College
Teaching Teamwork: Electronics Instruction in a Collaborative Environment
Incorporating Blended Format Cybersecurity Education into a Community College Information Technology Program
Regional Photonics Initiative at the College of Lake County
Online and Hybrid Water Industry Courses for Community College Students
Technological Education for the Rural Community (TERC) Project: Technical Mathematics for the Advanced Manufacturing Technician
Delivering Advanced Technical Education Using Online, Immersive Classroom Technology
Teaching Building Science with Simulations
Development of Hybrid Courses Utilizing Modules as an Objective in ATE Projects
Dissemination of Research Results
(n=59 ATE PIs who indicated they projects were engaged in research)

- No response: 48%
- Not ready to share yet: 12%
- Project website: 26%
- Peer-reviewed journal: 5%
- Unpublished conference presentation: 5%
- Published conference proceedings: 3%
Journals about Community College Education & Administration

promotes an increased awareness of community college issues by providing an exchange of ideas, research, and empirically tested educational innovations

Journals about Community College Education & Administration

publishes articles on all aspects of community college administration, education, and policy
topics include but are not limited to the following subject areas: access and equity, community colleges, junior colleges, two-year colleges, adult education, historically underrepresented students, student success, leadership and mission, higher education and education policy.

Journals about Community College Education & Administration publishes articles relating to such issues as detailing the objectives, methods, and findings of studies conducted to assess student outcomes, evaluating programs and services, and projecting the impacts of proposed legislation.
WRAP-UP

- Feedback survey
- Final questions and comments
- Thank you!
- Visit us at Booth #3