



Campus Diversity Initiative Evaluation Project

Campus Guidelines For Creating an Evaluation Plan



CAMPUS GUIDELINES FOR CREATING AN EVALUATION PLAN

Introduction

Our initial experience with the first group of Irvine-funded Campus Diversity Initiatives (CDI) and the development of evaluation plans suggests that campuses would be greatly aided by having a general guide for developing their plans. This document is designed to provide such assistance.

In addition, all campuses are assigned a Liaison by the Evaluation Resource Team (ERT) and notified who that person is when the campus has completed a campus narrative and has been invited by the Foundation to submit a proposal. Campus evaluation teams are strongly encouraged to use the Liaison as a resource for clarifying the purposes of the evaluation, providing feedback and responding to questions concerning the conceptualization and development of the evaluation plan, and identifying evaluation resources.

Because the design and implementation of the evaluation plan rests with the campus, many campuses have found it important to make sure that internal campus resources exist for implementing this important aspect of the grant. An evaluation team that includes someone from institutional research, the registrar's office, faculty members who are familiar with evaluation, and/or other persons who are interested in evaluation can be important. Some campuses have included evaluation funds in their CDI grant to provide faculty or staff release time or other external assistance to help develop their evaluation plans.

The information below provides a possible guiding framework for the Evaluation Plan you are expected to submit. The sections are designed to help your evaluation team think about what institutional impact you hope to achieve through your CDI project(s) and how the evaluation will help inform and enhance your work.

The plan should be a self-contained, brief story of your project and how you expect to evaluate it. It is important that its organization is succinct and readable. It is important that the plan is manageable and that it is designed in such a way that the campus will be able to see if the progress anticipated in the grant is being made.

Evaluation Plan Outline

A. Project Overview

This section should provide a brief summary description of your institution's current diversity work, its CDI efforts, and the purpose of the evaluation plan in that work. That is, it should contain a brief summary of the grant goals specified in the proposal submitted to the Foundation. It should also include:

- ? institutional goals your CDI seeks to achieve

- ? the strategies you will use to achieve these institutional goals
- ? the institutional enhancements that are anticipated as a result of the proposed CDI activities

The evaluation plan document should stand on its own. Assume that a reader who is unfamiliar with your initiatives is reading the document, such as a prospective faculty member. This description should **summarize** what you are trying to do. Keep in mind, however, that if it is not a brief, succinct summary, it is unlikely to be read, thus defeating its purpose.

The Evaluation plan should take into account the campus context in which the CDI and its evaluation activities must be carried out. For example, in most cases the Irvine-funded activities are only a piece of an overall picture, hence the plan should briefly describe how these pieces are connected. One approach that seems to work well is to (1) describe the overall institutional goals and anticipated outcomes, and (2) indicate the role of the Irvine project and other activities in making progress toward the goals.

B. Methods and Instruments

Each proposal has described the overall institutional goals for the grant. The grant, then, articulates strategies for implementation. It may be helpful to think first about how you will evaluate and monitor progress on the overall institutional purposes or goals and then think through how one will evaluate the effectiveness of the particular strategies. The Evaluation Resource Kit that has been provided to the campus (and available on line at www.aacu-edu.org/irvineeval/index.cfm) gives descriptions of survey instruments, templates for thinking about evaluation, and many resources for both quantitative and qualitative evaluations. In addition, attachment 1 provides a list of possible indicators that will be useful in thinking about indicators of change and attachment 2 outlines some principles for campus evaluation designs. Finally, the template provided as attachment 3 illustrates a format for describing the means by which an evaluation will be conducted and some additional examples.

In most cases, your Irvine CDI is only a part of many strategies you have developed to achieve your institutional goals related to diversity. Keeping all of your strategies in mind as you develop your plan is important because they may influence how you evaluate achievement of your overall goals. Remember to always keep your larger institutional goal(s) in mind as you think about question: How will you know that you have succeeded in achieving your educational goal(s)?

Goals

Your campus-specific goals should be stated in your proposal and in the letter from the James Irvine Foundation that spells out the terms of your grant. How will you evaluate the overall goals? How will your progress toward the goal be evaluated? For each of these goals, your evaluation team will want to identify how you will collect information and the means that will be used (e.g., standardized or campus-developed instruments, focus groups). For example, a common goal is to improve graduation rates for

underrepresented students of color. Since graduation rates are usually studied over a 4-6 year time frame, monitoring graduation rates for some student cohorts will need to continue after the grant. Nevertheless, progress toward improved graduation rates for particular groups of students can be evaluated by studying students' persistence from year to year. These data are available from institutional sources and appropriate baselines can be articulated at the beginning of the grant period and progress monitored annually.

If your aim is to improve campus climate, indicate *how* climate will be measured (the indicators of success), the *means* that will be used to collect climate information (the instruments), *who* is included in the study (the students, staff, and/or faculty), and *when* will the information be collected (the timeframe). Using campus studies that already exist and disaggregating the responses by gender and race/ethnicity can be an important resource. It is not always necessary to have specific questions or surveys to look at issues of diversity. A general climate or satisfaction survey can be quite revealing when the results are disaggregated. For each indicator, you should identify the baseline (where you are now) from which any change will be judged. For example, if you hope to increase faculty diversity, how many faculty from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds do you have currently (or from your pre-grant starting point)?

Where it is appropriate, you should offer some examples of what level of increase you would consider success and why (benchmarks). In most cases it will be important to indicate what level of increase would be ideal. For example, you have identified a large gap between underrepresented and majority students' perception of the campus racial climate so you set as your goal to improve the campus climate for diversity. You might set as your ideal to close the gap by 33% for each of the three years of the grant such that there is no difference in students' perception of the campus racial climate by the end of the grant period.

Strategies

After using this approach to indicate how you will evaluate your overall institutional goals, the same approach can be applied to the specific strategies you will use to accomplish your goals. For example, you have indicated that your goal is to increase the success of underrepresented students in science. You decide to develop and implement a new teaching approach to achieve your goal. By what means will you decide if the new approach is successful? You can look at reduced drop out rates in key courses, increased persistence in advanced science courses, faculty perceptions of students knowledge of subject matter between those taught under the new approach compared to those taught under the old approach, or other key indicators of success. Again, the evaluation plan template given as attachment 3 suggests a format for developing the evaluation of strategies as well.

Below are questions you might consider as you attempt to identify the information, methods, means, and instruments that will indicate your progress toward achieving the institutional goals articulated in your CDI proposal.

- How will your institution know if your CDI is successful (i.e., that the overall goals of the effort are being met)? How will you measure its impact on the campus? What changes might you expect to see on campus as a result of the CDI? How will the impact on the campus be determined, including who will participate in making the decision? What methods and data will be used?
- What will indicate success for each strategy? What information do you need to evaluate success? Who has, or where, is the information you need and? How, and when, in the process will you get the information and instruments/tools you need?
- How will progress on achieving institutional diversity goals and outcomes be evaluated on an interim basis as well as at the end? What methods and data will be used?
- What is the current state of affairs regarding the institutional goals you hope to achieve (i.e., beginning baselines where data are being used)?

In designing this section of the evaluation plan, it is critically important that the team think about ways to evaluate that are relevant, manageable, and focused (see attachment 1). The approach can be both qualitative and quantitative as appropriate. However, its purpose should be to construct a way to determine if your efforts are accomplishing the purposes for which they were intended. In other words, how will you know that you have succeeded in achieving your goals?

C. Process

Developing processes for the creation of the plan, implementing it, and sharing the preliminary and final results of the evaluation efforts (e.g., the 6 month report to the Foundation) are very important to managing the evaluation and using the process itself to advance institutional goals. While the reports to the Foundation provide a structure for evaluating and reporting on progress, an equally important audience for the report is the campus community. The following questions outline some of the process issues to be described in the evaluation plan:

- Who will carry out the evaluation plan (all of the actors from development to implementation should be indicated)? Are the relevant voices represented in the various parts of the plan? For instance, who will be responsible for the data collection report?
- How will information be shared with the campus evaluation team, the larger campus community, the Irvine Foundation, and the Evaluation Resource Team (ERT) Liaison?
- Who will be involved in sharing the results with various campus constituencies?
- How will the evaluation results be used to improve the likelihood of achieving your institutional goals?
- If other related evaluations are being conducted, how might they be used to inform your CDI evaluation?
- How will the lessons learned be used to increase institutional level success potential?

Tools

We have identified some tools that may be helpful in identifying the appropriate methods and instruments for your specific project. They include:

- Possible indicators of institutional change (attachment 1)
- Principles for campus evaluation designs (attachment 2)
- Sample evaluation template for goals and for strategies (attachment 3)
- CDI Evaluation Resource Kit provided to the campus in hard copy and available online at www.aacu-edu.org/irvine/evaluation/index.cfm
- Other campus plans (shared during the annual evaluation seminars hosted by the ERT)
- Evidence Guide, developed by WASC for evaluation efforts

INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS

à in bold indicates readily available data

Dimension One --Access and Success

- ◊Diversity of the undergraduate population, graduate population in fields and levels
- à**Progress over time**
- à**Success of students in terms of graduation, persistence, fields, honors, performance**
- à**Transfer among fields (particularly SMET fields)**
- à**Pursuit of advanced degrees**

Dimension Two-- climate and intergroup relations

- ◊Levels and quality of interaction among groups
- à**Perceptions of the institutional (climate, commitment, engagement)**
- ◊Membership in diverse organizations and multiple memberships
- ◊Quality of experience for diverse groups on campus, in residential life
- ◊Levels of use and engagement in a variety of activities, offices and resources

Dimension Three-- Education and Scholarship

- à**Presence of diversity related courses, requirements**
- ◊Degree to which courses include diversity issues and the location of such courses (general education, and major fields.)
- à**Level of faculty expertise on issues related to diversity**
- ◊Level of faculty participation in diversity related efforts, diversity of faculty participating in curriculum transformation
- ◊How much actual exposure do students have to diversity courses, to diverse faculty
- ◊How much and what have students learned about diversity and about their increased capacity to work in diverse settings

Dimension Four -- Institutional Viability and Vitality

- à**Institutional history with respect to diversity, issues and incidents**
- à**Institutional strategies, resources dedicated to the strategy**
- à**Diversity of faculty and staff by level**
- à**Progress over time**
- à**Perceptions of access, equity and inclusion from all constituencies**
- ◊Perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity by all constituencies
- ◊Public perception of the institution
- ◊Alumni views from diverse groups of alumni
- ◊Minority community views of the institution
- ◊External constituents views of the institution and diversity
- ◊Economic issues for the institution
- à**Visibility of diversity in publications**
- ◊How is diversity represented with respect to excellence, quality, and academic performance
- à**Centrality of diversity in the planning process, mission statements**
- ◊Hate crimes, grievances

PRINCIPLES FOR CAMPUS EVALUATION DESIGNS

1. APPROACHES EVALUATION FROM AN ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING POINT OF VIEW
2. MANAGEABLE FOR THE CAMPUS AND CAPABLE OF BEING MAINTAINED
3. MONITORS KEY GOALS AND ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL
4. FOCUSES ON INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES/CHANGE, NOT SIMPLY PROJECT-SPECIFIC ISSUES.
5. WILL REVEAL SUCCESS AND PROBLEMS ALONG THE WAY IN BOTH RESULTS AND PROCESSES
6. WILL GUIDE THE 6 MONTH REPORTS TO THE FOUNDATION
7. TAKES INTO ACCOUNT:
 - INSTITUTIONAL DIFFERENCES AND STAGES WITH RESPECT TO DIVERSITY
 - THAT INSTITUTIONS VARY IN MISSION, NEEDS, GOALS AND CULTURE
 - DIFFERENTIAL INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES
 - THAT STRATEGIES, GOALS, AND EMPHASIS WILL DIFFER
 - THE POSSIBILITY OF TAKING SOME RISKS AND LEARNING FROM THEM
 - WITHIN INSTITUTIONAL DIFFERENCES (DISAGGREGATION OF INFORMATION)
8. ENCOURAGES INSTITUTIONAL SHARING
9. THE PROJECT, AND LIAISON PERSON, TAKE AN ADVISORY ROLE

SAMPLE EVALUATION TEMPLATE

Goal/Intended Outcome	Measures	Data Collection, Mechanisms & Instruments ¹	Who will be responsible	Baseline (if applicable)	Benchmarks	Timeframe for review
Increase retention and success of underrepresented students (URS)	GPA of URS Persistence toward graduation year by year Percent achieving honors	URS' GPAs and institutional graduation data (4-6yrs) and annual persistence by entering cohort Percent receiving honors	Registrar	Current GPA and retention rates	URS' success rates mirror those of other student groups	Annually
	In-class experiences, out of class interactions w/faculty and utilization of academic support resources	CSEQ survey items on academic engagement	Survey administrator	Initial levels of engagement	URS' engagement mirrors and/or exceeds that of other student groups	
	Information about URS from students' academic advisors	Focus groups/interviews of a sample of academic advisors	Evaluation team leader or member	Advisors' initial perceptions of URS' experiences		

Strategies

Strategy X	Measures	Data Collection, Mechanisms & Instruments	Who will be responsible	Baseline (if applicable)	Benchmarks	Timeframe for review
New advising effort	Student/faculty satisfaction with frequency of contact between advisors and students	Faculty and student advising surveys	Survey administrator	Faculty and students' current views on advising		Annually
	Student course taking patterns Attrition from individual courses	Transcript review that tracks students' performance	Assigned advisor		Reduced attrition in courses by URS	
	Views of students and faculty about the advising system	Focus groups/interviews of a sample of faculty and students	Evaluation team leader or member			Each semester/qtr. with different sample group

Goal/Intended Outcome	Measures	Data Collection, Mechanisms & Instruments	Who will be responsible	Baseline (if applicable)	Benchmarks	Timeframe for review
Increase representation of underrepresented racial/ethnic groups on the faculty ²	Racial/ethnic representation of full-time faculty overall, applicant pool for new hires, and faculty attrition	Institutional data ³	Human resources manager and assigned evaluation team member	Current racial/ethnic representation of the faculty	Significant increase (e.g., 50%) in the number of applicants from underrepresented racial/ethnic candidate pools	Annually at the conclusion of the hiring cycle
	Faculty search committee process	Interviews with a sample of each of the search committees	Assigned evaluation team member			

Strategies

Strategy X	Measures	Data Collection, Mechanisms & Instruments	Who will be responsible	Baseline (if applicable)	Benchmarks	Timeframe for review
Establish a new recruitment program to attract faculty from underrepresented groups	Racial/ethnic representation of potential applicants, applicant pool, and candidates identified at each phase of the hiring process.	Departmental data	Search committee members and assigned evaluation team member	Current racial/ethnic representation of faculty search pool	Significant increase (e.g., 50%) in the number of applicants from underrepresented racial/ethnic candidate pools	Gathered throughout the hiring processes (formative evaluation)

Goal/Intended Outcome	Measures	Data Collection, Mechanisms & Instruments	Who will be responsible	Baseline (if applicable)	Benchmarks	Timeframe for review
Increase recruitment of underrepresented students	Number of inquiries, applications, offers and yield for students from underrepresented groups	Institutional data	Admissions officer and assigned evaluation team member	Current recruitment rates	Significant increase (e.g., 50%) in the numbers of inquiries, applications, and offers of admission/yield to students from underrepresented groups	Annually
	Feedback from underrepresented students who do not accept offers of admission	Survey questionnaire			Applicants from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups are responsive to expanded outreach efforts ⁴	

Strategies

Strategy X	Measures	Data Collection, Mechanisms & Instruments	Who will be responsible	Baseline (if applicable)	Benchmarks	Timeframe for review
Establish /deepen community outreach efforts targeting underrepresented racial/ethnic groups	Number of collaborative relationships established with community colleges, community agencies, and high schools	Institutional records	Admissions office and assigned evaluation team member	Current number of collaborative relationships	Significant increase (e.g., 50%) in the number of applications from students from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups	Quarterly
	Applications stemming from collaborative efforts	Applications coded to identify students applying as a result of collaborative relationship established	Admissions office	Current number of applications resulting from collaborative efforts		

¹ In most cases data should be disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender, and field of study.

² When tracking the diversity of new hires and attrition, the information gathered should be disaggregated by tenure and non-tenure track status and by discipline.

³ This information is often collected by an institution's human resources office for federal reporting of affirmative action efforts.

⁴ This can be addressed through specific questions on the questionnaire developed.