The Pilot Study Evaluation Survey
Summary of Findings

The Pilot Study Evaluation Survey was designed to capture institutional experiences and holistically assess the various components and stages of the pilot study.

N= 40
Response rate: 59%

Project Participation, Benefits and Challenges

The President and Provosts/Vice Presidents were the main drivers behind the decision for an institution’s participation in the Multistate Collaborative Pilot Study with input primarily coming from campus assessment administrators and state-level leaders. 80% of the responding institutions indicated that the major reason their institution chose to join the MSC project was to support institution level assessment, while 73% indicated that being part of a national initiative was a significant reason for joining the MSC. Other major reasons for participation included advancement of institutional goals for student learning, and engagement of faculty in the assessment process.

Benefits from participation were numerous and varied. The most commonly noted benefits included moving campus-level assessment initiatives forward and informing sampling processes for future assessment projects. Additionally, institution respondents believed participation was a means to respond to accountability expectations. Approximately 63% of the respondents noted that the opportunity for faculty and professional staff to participate in a national rubric training event was a benefit from participation. Other reported benefits included increasing the number of faculty either actively engaged in the assessment of student learning (45%) or drawn in to discussions and/or collaborations around the assessment of student learning (55%), raising faculty and administrative awareness of student learning outcomes (38%), informing campus-level calibration and scoring practices (38%), informing faculty practice around intentional assignment design (48%). Receipt of actual scores for ‘my’ institution and affirmation of the aspiration to improve the quality of student learning were noted by 23% and 35% of the institutions respectively.
Figure 1: The below graph depicts the primary benefits of respondent’s participation in the pilot study. Respondents were asked to check all that apply.

- There were no benefits of participation: 5%
- Receiving actual scoring results for my institution: 23%
- Participation in a national rubric training event: 63%
- Increased faculty and administrative awareness of student learning outcomes: 38%
- Informed faculty practice around intentional assignment design: 48%
- Informed campus-level calibration and scoring practices: 38%
- Informed sampling process(es) for future campus-level assessment initiatives: 63%
- Fostered faculty discussion and/or collaboration around assessment of learning: 55%
- Increased the number of faculty actively engaged in assessment of student learning: 45%
- Moved campus-level assessment initiatives forward: 75%
- Responded to accountability expectations with assessments based on student work: 53%
- Affirmed the aspiration to improve the quality of student learning: 35%
Equally numerous and varied were the challenges encountered by campuses participating in the MSC project. On the whole, institutions encountered four main challenges: obstacles related to the collection of student artifacts from faculty, ability to collect as many work samples as desired/envisioned, the recruitment of faculty participants, and difficulties in uploading student work and related documents. To a lesser extent, challenges related to the de-identification of student work and the creation of the CSV demographic file were cited. 13% of the institutions indicated financing pilot study relative activities was a challenge and 23% found communicating with faculty about the project challenging. Very few institutions reported faculty governance concerns, IRB or student consent challenges.

MSC Funding and Project Time Costs
Responding institutions used MSC funds predominately to support faculty development workshops or to stipend faculty. 60% of the responding institutions awarded faculty stipends for contributing student artifacts or for engaging in faculty development workshops. This aligns with the challenges noted in this survey and in the sampling development evaluation of engaging faculty in the project. The other predominant use of funds was to finance administrative costs.

Figure 2: The below graph depicts how respondents used or will use their MSC funds.

For 60% of responding institutions, no additional funds over and above those provided by the MSC were contributed to finance professional development activities on campus or to finance the collection, de-identification and uploading of artifacts and related documents; 28% contributed up to $3,000 and 13% contributed over $3,000 to finance professional development activities.
Figure 3: The below graph depicts how much additional funding (actual monetary contributions) responding institutions contributed over and above the funding provided by the MSC to finance professional development activities.

66% of responding institutions did not contribute additional funding, over and above the funding provided by the MSC, to finance the collection, de-identification and uploading of artifacts and related documents. 18% contributed up to $2000 to finance the collection, de-identification and uploading of artifacts and related documents while 16% contributed over $3,000 to finance the collection, de-identification and uploading of artifacts and related documents.

Figure 4: The below graph depicts how much additional funding (actual monetary contributions) responding institutions contributed over and above the funding provided by the MSC to finance the collection, de-identification and uploading of artifacts and related documents.
73% of institution leads - during an average month - allocated anywhere from 6 to 20 hours to the administration of the MSC pilot study. This excludes time allocated to the collection, de-identification and uploading of artifacts. 20% of institution leads indicated less than 5 hours on average per month was allocated to pilot study administration activities and 7.5% of responding leads indicated s/he allocated more than 20 hours to administrative activities.

**Figure 5:** The below graph depicts the average amount of time per month respondents devoted to administering the pilot study on their campus, excluding the time allocated to collecting, de-identifying and uploading artifacts.

Once institutions reached the data collection and uploading stage, the number of hours allocated to this work increased as shown below.

**Figure 6: Amount of Time Spent Collecting Student Work and Related Documents**
Professional Development Opportunities Project-level and Campus-level

60% of institutions sponsored or participated in an assignment design workshop and approximately 58% facilitated discussions with groups of faculty and/or staff. 28% of the institutions facilitated or participated in an orientation to the MSC pilot project while another 60% participated in or sponsored a rubric calibration session. Lastly, 40% of institutions had a session on the design and use of the VALUE Rubrics. Of these noted professional development activities, 54% found the assignment design workshop to be the most useful and 72% indicated it would have been helpful to have offered more of these workshops. Additionally, 36% of the institutions indicated having more calibration or rubric training sessions would have been helpful while 15% indicated it would have been helpful to have an orientation session.
SHEEO sponsored 7 project webinars; 90% of respondents viewed one or more of these webinars and overall found them to be useful. 79% indicated additional webinars would not be helpful. Additionally, 3 assignment design YouTubes were created with 40% of the respondents or others on the respondent’s campus viewed one or more of the presentations. Of those who viewed the YouTube presentations, over 87% found them helpful.

SHEEO also sponsored the development of a pilot study FAQ document. Overall respondents found this document helpful.

**Procedures and Guidelines for IRB Approval**
Institutions indicated they did not face any challenges with respect to IRB procedures. 38% went through a campus-level review, 25% went through a state-level review, and 43% did not apply for IRB approval. Of those institutions that applied for IRB approval, 22% went through an expedited review, 9% went through a full-board review, 30% were given exemption status, and 40% did not know what type of review they received. 70% of responding institutions did not obtain written student consent, 23% notified students and gave them the option to opt-out, and 8% obtained student consent.

**Communication**
Respondents located project documents and other project information from multiple sources including the SHEEO Website, a campus or state website and/or their state lead. This speaks to the importance of having multiple venues by which information can be disseminated.

Respondents regularly interacted with their state lead, upper-level administration, and faculty project participants on a monthly basis. They had weekly communications with their staff project participants. Respondents did not have any suggestions for improvements in communication indicating communication between them and other campus and non-campus constituencies were problem free.