Evaluation of Documents
In general, respondents found the documents provided for the sampling plan development process both useful and clear. In the following paragraphs, open-ended feedback for each document is summarized.

Sampling Parameters and Suggested Sampling Methods
88% of respondents provided positive feedback about clarity and usefulness of the “Sampling Parameters and Suggested Sampling Methods.” One respondent commented, “The write up of sampling parameters and suggested sampling methods were clear and useful. They gave us some good ideas to start planning our own parameters and method.” Respondents also provided the following suggestions: a. place greater emphasis on creating a back-up sample and provide suggested strategies for doing so; b. include a list of both institution and student characteristics each institution will have to provide; c. streamline and simplify the document; d. provide additional clarification regarding stratified sampling; e. begin document with an introduction of how sampling process fits together with other aspects of the project i.e. gaining faculty trust and assignment design.

Sampling Planning and Evaluation Matrix
68% of respondents provided positive feedback about the clarity and usefulness of the “Sampling Planning and Evaluation Matrix.” One respondent said, “The document was laid out well and the questions made it easy to complete the sampling plan. The evaluation tool was easy to use and helped to make sure we covered the basics of a sampling plan that would meet the project goals.” Respondents provided the following recommendations for improving the document in the future: a. include descriptions of different strategies used by institutions; b. clarify language on number of artifacts per faculty member; and c. streamline or merge this document with the sampling plan document to reduce redundancies.

Frequently Asked Questions and Clarifications
68% of respondents provided positive feedback about the clarity and usefulness of the “Frequently Asked Questions and Clarifications” document. Many respondents indicated that they were not aware of this document. Respondents provided the following recommendations for improving the document in the future: a. clarify the minimum number of artifacts and b. emphasize the importance of seeking a representative sample.

Sampling Plan Review Process
74% of respondents provided positive feedback about the process for reviewing institutional sampling plans and providing feedback. Respondents commented that the feedback was helpful, clear and timely. One respondent said, “Fantastic! Our initial plan was just our best guess at what we needed to do. Having a draft to hone is critical.” Another respondent stated, “This process was efficient and allowed all parties to participate and provide feedback as needed.” 13% of respondents indicated that the sampling plan review process seemed redundant or unnecessary. One respondent indicated that the process “seemed redundant to us. But maybe it would have been more critical if we made significant errors and you caught them.”

55% of respondents provided positive feedback on the clarity and usefulness of the MSC Sampling Subgroup’s responses and feedback. One respondent stated, “This was far and away the most helpful step in the process. The feedback and subsequent revisions shaped our efforts to date in this project,” while another respondent said, “Yes, the feedback was helpful. I had skipped an important section and
feedback pointed it out. I also felt encouraged by the positive reaction to our plan.” 13% of respondents indicated that the Sampling Subgroup’s responses confirmed what they already knew, while 10% of respondents indicated that they received very little feedback.

58% of respondents indicated that they believe the MSC Sampling Development Process will prove helpful in developing sampling procedures for other assessment projects their institution is planning to undertake. One respondent stated, “Yes, definitely. The sampling procedures provide a good framework for consideration for a variety of assessment initiatives,” while another respondent said, “We hope to use lessons learned from this experience to improve our own General Ed Assessment process on campus. Already we are using the sampling method to select students/courses/faculty for our own GE assessment.” 10% of respondents said the experience will “somewhat” or “moderately” prove to be helpful, while 16% said “maybe” or “not sure.” 16% of respondents indicated this experience will not prove helpful for future projects. One respondent said, “Not at all because we are experienced with sampling procedures,” while another stated, “Not so much, just because the feedback was really specific to what we would send forward vs. what we might analyze in house.”

Figure 1: Percentage of respondents that believe the MSC Sampling Development Process will prove helpful in developing sampling procedures for other assessment projects their institution is planning to undertake.

Sampling Webinar
71% of respondents indicated that individuals on their campus viewed the Sampling Webinar, and 57% of them indicated that the individuals who viewed the webinar found it helpful. One respondent indicated “Yes, just because it was a bit different than what we currently do and also helped us understand how to keep the data confidential,” while another respondent said, “yes, it clarified some of the written directions.” Of the three respondents that did not find the webinar helpful, one had already completed his/her sampling plan, one commented that the webinar was too broad and would benefit from addressing specific sampling issues, and one found that the webinar was difficult to hear and translate electronically due to background noise. Respondents provided the following suggestions to improve the Sampling
Webinar: a. include specific examples from institutions, reduce the amount of background noise, make
the webinars more specific and focused on the details of sampling.

**Overall Recommendations to Improve Sampling Plan Development Process**
68% of respondents would not suggest the development of additional sampling plan documents. 32% of respondents suggested the development of additional sampling documents, such as: a. examples of successful plans/practices from other institutions of varying institution types, b. a variety of alternatives based on different kinds of circumstances, c. more information on stratified sampling, and d. more information on the student and institutional characteristics that will be submitted.
Respondents provided several suggestions for changes and additional steps that they would recommend for assisting other institutions in developing sampling plans, including: a. minimizing the number of steps and paperwork in the process; b. providing examples of successful sampling plans; c. providing commentary and lessons learned from institutions that participated previously; and d. providing opportunities for institutions to work with and help each other develop their sampling plans. Respondents also suggested that institutions new to the process aim for a larger sampling pool than you need and create a back up sample, meet with their state lead to better understand the process, and incentivize participation, if possible.