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Webinar Overview

1. essential elements of an ATE proposal evaluation plan
2. integrating evaluation throughout a proposal
3. question and answer panel
**Evaluation Plan Checklist for ATE Proposals**

This checklist provides information on what should be included in evaluation plans for proposals to the National Science Foundation’s (NSF) Advanced Technological Education (ATE) program. Grant seekers should carefully read the most recent ATE program solicitation [http://bit.ly/nsf-ate] for details about the program and proposal submission requirements.

**Evaluation Plan**

ATE proposals must include a subsection titled “Evaluation Plan” within the 15-page project description. EvaluATE recommends dedicating one to two pages to the evaluation plan and including the following five elements:

1. **Evaluator**
   - Identify the project’s evaluator by name and organization.
   - Briefly describe the evaluator’s qualifications, including their experience evaluating STEM education programs.
   - Refer to the evaluator’s biosketch and letter of collaboration and include these as supplementary documents.
   - If the evaluator is an employee of the project’s host institution, explain how the evaluator is independent from the project (they should not work in the same department or be a supervisor or supervisee of project personnel).
   - If the project’s host institution has a policy that prohibits selecting an evaluator at the proposal stage:
     - Explain the institutional policy that does not allow for selection of an evaluator prior to funding.
     - Describe how an evaluator will be selected after the award is made.

2. **Evaluation Questions**
   - List key questions—ideally, about three to seven—that the evaluation will address.
   - Include questions about both project implementation (what the project does) and outcomes (what changes it brings about).
   - Ensure that the questions align with the project’s goals and activities as described in the proposal.
   - Ensure that the questions address the project’s intellectual merit (contributions to advancing knowledge) and broader impact (contributions to the betterment of society).

3. **Data**
   - **Indicators**
     - Identify what information will be used to answer each evaluation question (i.e., what will be measured).
   - **Data Collection Methods and Sources**
     - Identify how the information will be gathered and from what sources.
     - If relevant, explain sampling and use of comparison or control groups.
     - If using existing data collection instruments, include citations and justify their use.
   - **Analysis**
     - Identify the procedures that will be used to summarize quantitative and qualitative data (e.g., descriptive statistics, inferential tests, regression, deductive or inductive coding).
   - **Interpretation**
     - Explain how findings will be interpreted to answer the evaluation questions (e.g., compare results, with baseline or needs assessment data, with targets/benchmarks, or between groups; use rubrics; engage stakeholders).
Evaluation
Evaluation
A systematic determination of a project’s quality and effectiveness.
“if you don’t evaluate and assess your activities and outcomes you can’t know if the project was successful.”
“if you don’t evaluate and assess your activities and outcomes you can’t know if the project was successful. It also provides the project team with data to convince others of the success of the project as well as contributing to the body of knowledge in that particular area of STEM.”

Celeste Carter
ATE Program Director
“if you don’t evaluate and assess your activities and outcomes you can’t know if the project was successful. It also provides the project team with data to convince others of the success of the project as well as contributing to the body of knowledge in that particular area of STEM.”
1 Essential Elements of an ATE Proposal Evaluation Plan
**Broader Impacts of the Proposed Project**

The ATE program is focused on tangible, broad impacts in terms of making the United States more globally competitive through improved technological education. EvaluateATE’s purpose is to support ATE program grantees in conducting high-quality evaluation that can be used to improve individual projects and the program overall. EvaluateATE’s expanded work will directly contribute to developing the capacity of institutions to conduct evaluation—within ATE and beyond. Our research on measuring equity, diversity, and inclusion will generate actionable findings that can be applied to institutions and assess progress toward broadening participation in STEM, an NSF priority (NSF, 2018).

**Logic Model**

As shown in the logic model (Figure 2), EvaluateATE’s research on evaluation, training, and technical assistance, and evaluation network facilitation activities are oriented toward enhancing the capacity of ATE program community members to conduct and use high-quality evaluation in the interest of advancing the goals of the ATE program.

**Evaluation Plan**

EvaluateATE’s outcomes and implementation will be assessed through a combination of external and internal evaluation. The internal component primarily serves accountability and formative evaluation purposes—documenting our processes and outputs and answering questions regarding user engagement, satisfaction, and immediate learning. The external component is outcome-oriented, addressing questions regarding sustained learning, use, and impact. The external portion of the evaluation will be led by Dr. Luna Barks of The Racks Group.
Evaluation Plan (1-2 pages)
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BROADER IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The ATE program is focused on tangible, broader impacts in terms of making the United States more globally competitive through improved technological education. EvaluateATE’s purpose is to support ATE program grantee’s conduct high-quality evaluation that can be used to improve individual projects and the program overall. EvaluateATE’s expanded work will directly contribute to developing the capacity of institutions to conduct evaluation within ATE and beyond. Our research on measuring equity, diversity, and inclusion will generate actionable findings that can be applied at institutions to assess progress toward broadening participation in STEM, an NSF priority (NSF, 2018a).

Logic Model

As shown in our logic model (Figure 2), EvaluateATE’s research on evaluation, training, and technical assistance, and evaluation network facilitation activities are oriented toward enhancing the capacity of ATE program community members to conduct and use high-quality evaluation in the interest of advancing the goals of the ATE program.

Figure 2. EvaluateATE’s logic model

Table 1. EvaluateATE’s logic model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Mid-term Outcomes</th>
<th>Long-term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSF Funding</td>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>ATE community members increase their awareness of the evidence base for effective ATE evaluation (Result of Goal 1)</td>
<td>ATE evaluation improves their knowledge and skills (Result of Goal 2)</td>
<td>ATE evaluation improves their ability to conduct high-quality and impact of guided hands-on projects (Result of Goal 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, experts, and stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating and Supporting Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATE Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Learning and Assessment Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina Greensboro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Administrative Support at WMU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Vice President for Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Plan

EvaluateATE’s outcomes and implementation will be assessed through a combination of external and internal evaluation. The internal component primarily serves accountability and formative evaluation purposes—documenting our processes and outputs and answering questions regarding user engagement, satisfaction, and immediate learning. The external component is more outcome-oriented, addressing questions regarding sustained learning, use, and impact. The external portion of the evaluation will be led by Dr. Lara Rucks of The Rucks Group.
Evaluation Plan (1-2 pages)
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BROADER IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The ATE program is focused on tangible, broad impacts in terms of making the United States more globally competitive through technological innovation as well as the development of highly trained and knowledgeable participants and the program overall. EvaluateATE is responsible for ensuring outcomes and in turn the capacity of ATE institutions to conduct evaluation within ATE and beyond. Our research on measuring equity, diversity, and inclusion will generate actionable findings that can be applied to institutions to assess progress toward broadening participation in STEM, an NSF priority (NSF, 2018).

Logic Model

As shown in our logic model (Figure 2), EvaluateATE’s research on evaluation, training and technical assistance, and evaluation network facilitation activities are oriented toward enhancing the capacity of ATE program community members to conduct and use high-quality evaluation in the interest of advancing the goals of the ATE program.

Figure 2. EvaluateATE’s logic model

Evaluation Plan

EvaluateATE’s outcomes and implementation will be assessed through a combination of external and internal evaluation. The internal component primarily serves accountability and formative evaluation purposes, documenting our progress and outputs and answering questions regarding user engagement, satisfaction, and immediate learning. The external component is more outcome-oriented, addressing questions regarding sustained learning, use, and impact. The external portion of the evaluation will be led by Dr. Lara Ranks of The Ranks Group.
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BROADER IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The ATE program is focused on broader impacts in terms of making the United States more globally competitive through improved technological education. EvaluATE’s purpose is to support ATE program grantees to conduct high-quality evaluation that can be used to improve individual projects and the ATE program overall. EvaluATE’s expanded work will directly contribute to developing the capacity of institutions to conduct evaluation within ATE and beyond. Our research on measuring equity, diversity, and inclusion will generate actionable findings that can be applied to institutions to assist in progress toward broadening participation in STEM, an NSF priority (NSF, 2018).

Logic Model

As shown in our logic model (Figure 2), EvaluATE’s research on evaluation, training and technical assistance, and evaluation network facilitation activities are oriented toward enhancing the capacity of ATE program community members to conduct and use high-quality evaluation in the interest of advancing the goals of the ATE program.

Figure 2. EvaluATE’s logic model
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EvaluATE’s evaluation is driven by six overarching evaluation questions. Table 2 presents these questions, along with the key indicators that will be used to answer each question, data sources and methods, and whether responsibility for data collection and analysis lies with the internal (I) or external (E) evaluation teams. The indicators are based on a body of research on evaluation capacity building (Labin, 2014; Labin, Duffy, Meyers, Wandersman & Lessore, 2014; Leviton, 2013; Preskill & Boyle, 2008) and evaluation of training and community practice (Guskey, 1999; Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016; Wagner, Traupman, & de la Mota, 2011), which conveys the importance of measuring not only individual changes in attitude, knowledge, and practice, but also organizational changes, such as the degree to which evaluation is reflected in an organization’s culture and the daily work of personnel.

Table 2. Evaluation Plan Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Methods and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent did EvaluATE engage its intended and other audiences? (Engagement)</td>
<td>- Webinar attendance and participant characteristics</td>
<td>Participation records (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent were EvaluATE’s users satisfied with EvaluATE’s activities and resources? (Satisfaction)</td>
<td>- Users’ ratings and descriptions of satisfaction with EvaluATE’s activities and resources</td>
<td>Event feedback surveys (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent has EvaluATE contributed to improvements in users’ knowledge of and attitudes toward evaluation? (Learning)</td>
<td>- Users’ ratings and descriptions of how much they learned from EvaluATE</td>
<td>Event feedback surveys (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent has EvaluATE’s work prompted users to modify their evaluation practices and extend their network of evaluation colleagues? (Application)</td>
<td>- Users’ ratings and descriptions of changes in their evaluations attributable to EvaluATE’s influence</td>
<td>Event feedback surveys (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent has EvaluATE contributed to improvements in evaluation capacity? (Impact)</td>
<td>- Changes in organizational processes and practices related to evaluation</td>
<td>Event feedback surveys (I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative data will be analyzed by a two-member team working collaboratively to identify themes. Quantitative survey data will be analyzed using mainly descriptive, inferential tests will be performed to compare results for different types of EvaluATE users (e.g., evaluators, project staff). Baseline external evaluation survey findings will be compared against baseline results and interpretative rubrics developed jointly by The Rucks Group and EvaluATE. Because of the extensive dataset across multiple years, biannual external evaluation survey results can be compared against previous iterations. To augment self-reported data, the external evaluation team will compare TA recipients’ evaluation materials pre- and post-technical assistance to assess the degree of improvement. Conference calls between the external evaluators and EvaluATE staff will keep all parties apprised of the evaluation’s progress and results. Reports will be prepared in accordance with the schedule indicated in the project timeline (Table 3). Results will be shared with the broader evaluation community via conferences and publications.
Evaluation Plan (1-2 pages)
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BROADER IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The ATE program is focused on tangible, broader impacts in terms of making the United States more globally competitive through improved technological education. EvaluateATE’s purpose is to support ATE program grantees to conduct high-quality evaluation that can be used to improve individual projects and programs overall. EvaluateATE’s expanded work will directly contribute to developing the capacity of institutions to conduct evaluation within ATE and beyond. Our research on measuring equity, diversity, and inclusion will generate actionable findings that can be applied to institutions at sites to assess progress toward broadening participation in STEM, an NSF priority (NSF, 2018).

Logic Model

As shown in our logic model (Figure 2), EvaluateATE’s research on evaluation, training, and technical assistance, and evaluation network facilitation activities are oriented toward enhancing the capacity of ATE program community members to conduct and use high-quality evaluation in the interest of advancing the goals of the ATE program.

Figure 2. EvaluateATE’s logic model

Inputs

- NSF funding
- Human resources
- Equipment
- Travel
- Collaborating and supporting organizations
- ATE Central
- Interdisciplinary PhD Program in Information Sciences
- Undergraduate and graduate students
- Networking support at WPI
- Tech Innovation Center
- The Evaluation Center
- Office of the Vice President for Research
- Grants and Contracts Office

Activities

- Research and Evaluation
- Task Forces/Workshops
- Evaluation Training and Technical Assistance
- Evaluation Network Facilitation
- Site Evaluation
- Conference funding for Evaluation & Networking
- Capacity Building
- Monthly Webinars

Short-term Outcomes

- ATE evaluation procedures and tools
- ATE evaluation personnel
- ATE evaluation skills

Mid-term Outcomes

- ATE evaluation improves their evaluation and learning capabilities
- ATE conference funding is used to enhance evaluation

Long-term Outcomes

- ATE evaluation is used to enhance evaluation
- ATE program is used to enhance evaluation
- ATE conference funding is used to enhance evaluation
- ATE conference evaluation is used to enhance evaluation

Evaluation Plan

EvaluateATE’s outcomes and implementation will be assessed through a combination of external and internal evaluation. The internal component primarily serves accountability and formative evaluation purposes—documenting our progress and making necessary adjustments regarding engagement and addressing evaluation sustainability concerns. Implementation evaluation will be led by Dr. Lisa Rucks of The Rucks Group.
### Timeline

The timing of key tasks and deliverables is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Project Timeline (shown in quarter-year increments)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1: Evaluation Task Framework Validation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize design and recruit study participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2: Evaluator Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize design and recruit committee members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3: Strategies for Measuring EOT in ATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize design and recruit participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 4: Evaluation Use in the ATE Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize study design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site selection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Technical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Conduct webinars per quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Develop FAQs and TRPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Conduct workshops at ATE PI Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance materials for coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse coaches for orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATE Evaluation Network Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund ATE evaluators to attend ATE PI conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host networking reception at ATE PI conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select and coordinate ATE evaluation following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host monthly webinars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host biannual ATE Evaluation Summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize detailed evaluation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct biannual survey of EvalATE’s audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct interviews with coaches and TA recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports completed (TA survey, research impact, final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish quarterly newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Experience evaluating STEM education projects
- Strong research and evaluation skills
- Strong communication skills and a service orientation
- Understanding of NSF and 2-year-college contexts
The funds to support an evaluator independent of the project or center must be requested ...
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“How did you identify your ATE project's current external evaluator?”
How did you identify your ATE project’s current external evaluator?

Colleague, 66%

(n=236)

2019 ATE ANNUAL SURVEY
How did you identify your ATE project’s current external evaluator?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Office</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=236)

2019 ATE ANNUAL SURVEY
How did you identify your ATE project’s current external evaluator?

| Colleague, 66% | Grants Office, 15% | RFP, 9% |

(n=236) 2019 ATE ANNUAL SURVEY
How did you identify your ATE project’s current external evaluator?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Office</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=236)

2019 ATE ANNUAL SURVEY
How did you identify your ATE project’s current external evaluator?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleague, 66%</th>
<th>Grants Office, 15%</th>
<th>RFP, 9%</th>
<th>Other, 9%</th>
<th>Eval Directory, 1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(n=236)

2019 ATE ANNUAL SURVEY
Over 70% of the respondents used a colleague or their grants office to identify their evaluator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleague, 66%</th>
<th>Grants Office, 15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(n=236)

2019 ATE ANNUAL SURVEY
Evaluation Plan → ① Evaluator

- Identify the project’s evaluator
- Describe the evaluator’s qualifications
- Refer to the evaluator’s biosketch and letter of collaboration
Proposal A
Delores Stormborn will lead the project’s external evaluation. She is the CEO at The Stormborn Evaluation Group. She has conducted 20 STEM education evaluations, including several in the ATE program. Her biosketch and commitment letter are included in the supplementary documents section of this proposal which document her qualifications and experience.

Proposal B
Lannister University’s Center for Evaluation will conduct the project’s evaluation. This Center has been a leading evaluation service provider since 1975 and has several prominent evaluators on its staff, as well as a cadre of capable graduate students. When the project is funded, we will work with the evaluators there to further develop and implement the project’s evaluation plan.

Proposal C
Julia Snow will serve as this project’s external evaluator. She leads the college’s faculty development center, providing guidance to instruction and assessment. She serves as chair of the college’s Student Success Committee, and has coordinated data collection for several federal grants.
Finding and Selecting an Evaluator for Advanced Technological Education (ATE) Proposals

ATE PROPOSERS SHOULD CAREFULLY READ THE ATE PROGRAM SOLICITATION: [Link]

All ATE proposals are required to request “funds to support an evaluator independent of the project.” Ideally, this external evaluator should be identified in the project proposal. The information in this guide is for individuals who are able to select and work with an external evaluator at the proposal stage. However, some institutions prohibit selecting an evaluator on a noncompetitive basis in advance of an award being made. Advice for individuals in that situation is provided in an EvaluATE blog [Link] and newsletter article [Link].

This guide includes advice on how to locate and select an external evaluator. It is not intended as a guide for developing an evaluation plan or contracting with an evaluator.

1. **What is an external evaluator?**
   
   An external evaluator is the person who will lead the design and implementation of the evaluation of your ATE project. The evaluation will include systematic collection and analysis of evidence related to the quality, effectiveness, and impact of the project. To be external, the evaluator must be independent of the project (see Question 3).

2. **When should I start working with an evaluator?**
   
   Proposal developers should contact an evaluator at least one month in advance of the proposal’s due date—earlier if possible. A good evaluation plan should be closely aligned with the project’s goals and activities. To achieve good alignment, the evaluator needs time to review a draft of the proposal, ask questions, and develop a sound evaluation plan. With short notice, some evaluators may offer to provide a generic evaluation plan. However, seasoned proposal reviewers will give your proposal a more favorable review if it has a well-integrated, tailored evaluation plan.

3. **Where should I look for an evaluator?**
   
   There is no list of vetted or approved evaluators for NSF projects. It is up to the proposal developer (which is usually the principal investigator) to locate an evaluator and determine if they are qualified and right for a project.

   Here are three sources for locating a potential evaluator:
   - Ask colleagues for recommendations. If you know someone with a grant that has an evaluation component, ask for the evaluator’s name and contact information.
   - Use the American Evaluation Association’s evaluator directory [Link]. It’s searchable by state and keyword.
   - Use ATE Central’s evaluator map [Link]. This interactive map can be used to identify evaluators by location and the types of ATE projects they evaluate.

   Most ATE projects employ evaluators based outside of their home institutions. However, program rules do allow grant recipients to contract with an evaluator who is employed by the project’s home institution, as long as the evaluator is independent of the project. That is, the evaluator should not work in the same unit.
Evaluator Biographical Sketch Template for National Science Foundation (NSF) Proposals

This template was created by EvaluATE (evalu-ate.org). It is based on the National Science Foundation’s guidelines for preparing biographical sketches for senior project personnel, which are available at bit.ly/sig-2017. The information about what evaluators should include in Products and Synergistic Activities sections are EvaluATE’s suggestions, not NSF requirements. The biosketch must not exceed two pages.

Evaluator’s Name

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION
(List academic degrees and any pertinent certificates.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Institution</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Institution</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate-Granting Institution</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPOINTMENTS
(List employment history in reverse chronological order.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Employer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PRODUCTS
(List up to ten products that demonstrate your experience and competence in evaluation and knowledge of the proposed project’s discipline. Examples may include publications, reports, and evaluation tools. All products must be citable and accessible. Include full reference information, including URL, if available.)

SYNERGISTIC ACTIVITIES
(In paragraph form, list up to five examples that demonstrate your expertise in evaluation, especially as it pertains to the proposal. Examples may include ongoing or completed evaluations; development or adaptation of evaluation tools; leadership roles in the evaluation field; and invited lectures, presentations, or workshops on evaluation. If you have prior experience working in the proposal’s discipline, describe that as well.)
Evaluation Questions
2 Evaluation Questions

- List the key questions that the evaluation will address
Evaluation Plan ➔ 2 Evaluation Questions

- List the key questions that the evaluation will address
- Include questions about both project implementation and outcomes
Evaluation Plan → 2 Evaluation Questions

☐ List the key questions that the evaluation will address

☐ Include questions about both project implementation and outcomes

☐ Ensure that questions align with the project’s goals and activities
What makes a good evaluation question?
What makes a good evaluation question?

Evaluative
What makes a good evaluation question?

Evaluative

Non-evaluative:
How many students did the project serve?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative

- Non-evaluative: How many students did the project serve?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- **Evaluative**
- **Non-evaluative:**
  - How many students did the project serve?
- **Evaluative:**
  - What was the project’s impact on program enrollment?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable

Unreasonable:
Did the project increase manufacturing employment in the state?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable

Unreasonable:
Did the project increase manufacturing employment in the state?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- **Evaluative**

- **Reasonable**

**Unreasonable:**
Did the project increase manufacturing employment in the state?

**Reasonable:**
To what extent did students served by the project find employment in the manufacturing sector?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific

Vague:
Did the project increase instructor effectiveness?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific

**Vague:**
Did the project increase instructor effectiveness?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific

Vague: 
Did the project increase instructor effectiveness?

Specific: 
To what extent did participating instructors increase their knowledge about nanotechnology?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific
- Answerable
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific
- Answerable

Unanswerable:
To what extent does the project affect long-term persistence in STEM careers?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific
- Answerable

**Unanswerable:** To what extent does the project affect long-term persistence in STEM careers?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific
- Answerable

**Unanswerable:**
To what extent does the project affect long-term persistence in STEM careers?

**Answerable:**
To what extent does the project affect students' interest in pursuing a future career in STEM?
What makes a good evaluation question?

- Evaluative
- Reasonable
- Specific
- Answerable
- Complete
Logic Models
PROJECT LOGIC MODEL

ACTIVITIES

SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

MID-TERM OUTCOMES

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES

EQ 3
Outcome

EQ 4
Outcome

EQs 1-2
Outcome

Implementation
PROJECT LOGIC MODEL

Important to include any additional questions of interest to stakeholders!

EQs 1-2
Implementation

EQ 3
Outcome

EQ 4
Outcome

ACTIVITIES

SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

MID-TERM OUTCOMES

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES
A logic model is a visual depiction of what a project does and what changes it is expected to bring about. Developing a logic model is an important first step for project design and evaluation planning. This document is intended to provide general guidance to ATE program proposers and grantees for developing their own project logic models. All ports of this document are editable. Populate the boxes in each column (adding and deleting boxes as necessary) with succinct statements that relate to the question prompts. To add text to a box, select the box and begin typing. Either delete the extra content (title, instructions, examples, etc.) from this document or copy-and-paste the logic model elements into a new document for your use. To learn more about logic models, see the University of Wisconsin-Extension’s Logic Model Resources at www.uwm.edu/ces/extension/evaluation/logicmodel.html.

Below are examples of the types of information that might appear under each header of the logic model. When developing a project logic model, be as specific as possible in articulating the components of the model. For example, a project-specific short term outcome might be phrased as

"trainees will be able to install, maintain, and troubleshoot high-vacuum systems."

**Inputs**
- NSF funding
- Faculty
- Advisory panel
- Industry partners
- In-kind contributions
- Establish regional partnerships
- Develop curriculum
- Conduct workshops
- Provide research/field experiences
- Establish articulation agreement
- Curriculum materials/developed
- Policies created
- Publications issued
- New certifications
- Tools/resources
- Faculty learns to use instructional technology
- Students gain technical skills
- Students' interest in technical careers increases
- Students participate in the program
- Faculty improves instruction
- Colleges adopt and implement project-developed curriculum
- Increased regional economic vitality
- Increased invest in the technical workforce
- A more highly skilled and adaptable workforce
RESOURCE
Logic Models: Getting Them Right and Using Them Well
(webinar recording and handouts)
Evaluation Questions Checklist for Program Evaluation
Lori Wingate and Daniela Schroeter

Evaluation questions identify what aspects of a program will be investigated. They focus on the merit, worth, or significance of a program or particular aspects of a program. Unlike survey questions, they are not intended to derive single data points. Evaluation questions help to define the boundaries of an evaluation that are consistent with evaluation users’ information needs, opportunities and constraints related to data collection, and available resources.

The purpose of this checklist is to aid in developing effective and appropriate evaluation questions and in assessing the quality of existing questions. It identifies characteristics of good evaluation questions, based on the relevant literature and our own experience with evaluation design, implementation, and use.

Evaluation questions should be...

☐ Evaluative
   - Evaluative questions call for an appraisal of a program or aspects of it based on factual and descriptive information gathered about it.
   - Questions should be framed so that they will yield answers that
     - provide determinations of merit, worth, or significance, or enable evaluation users to readily reach those determinations on their own.
     - directly inform decisions about the program (e.g., how to improve or modify it, whether to continue, discontinue, expand, or reconfigure it).

Evaluation questions should not be...

☐ Non-Evaluative
   - Non-evaluative questions call only for factual information or discrete data points that do not readily translate into determinations of program merit, worth, or significance. Answers to these types of questions have limited potential to influence decisions, because they do not provide a frame of reference in relation to merit, worth, or significance.

1 A program is an “orchestrated initiative that dedicates resources and inputs to a series of activities intended to achieve specific process, product, service, output, and outcome goals” (Farbrough, Shiu, Hoppson, & Caruthers, 2011, p. 201).

2 Merit is “the excellence of an object as assessed by its intrinsic qualities or performance” (Farbrough et al., 2011, p. 299). Worth is “the value of an object in relation to needs or identified purposes” (Farbrough et al., 2011, p. 299). Significance is “potential influence, importance, and visibility” (Steffensmeier & Corwyn, p. 13).
Data
Evaluation Plan ➔ 3 Data

☐ What information will be used to answer the evaluation questions
Evaluation Plan ➔ 3 Data

- What information will be used to answer the evaluation questions
- How the information will be obtained and from what sources
Evaluation Plan → 3 Data

- What information will be used to answer the evaluation questions
- How the information will be obtained and from what sources
- Procedures for summarizing quantitative and qualitative data
Evaluation Plan ➔ 3 Data

☐ What information will be used to answer the evaluation questions

☐ How the information will be obtained and from what sources

☐ Procedures for summarizing quantitative and qualitative data

☐ Procedures for interpreting findings to answer evaluation questions
Indicators

What will be measured in order to answer evaluation questions
Indicators: What will be measured in order to answer evaluation questions

Data Collection Methods: Obtaining information needed for the evaluation
**Indicators**

What will be measured in order to answer evaluation questions

**Data Collection**

Obtaining information needed for the evaluation

**Methods**

**Analysis**

Transforming raw data into usable information
Indicators

What will be measured in order to answer evaluation questions

Data Collection Methods

Obtaining information needed for the evaluation

Analysis

Transforming raw data into usable information

Interpretation

Translating findings into conclusions that address the evaluation questions
It’s OK to sacrifice some detail

Must convey there is a CONCRETE PLAN for collecting and using evaluation data
The evaluation will utilize a mixed-methods approach in which quantitative and qualitative measures of performance will be used in both formative and summative manner to gauge the merit and worth of the grant initiative. Methods will include surveys, interviews, and review of program records.
# Data Matrix

**Evaluation Question 3: To what extent and how are project activities impacting enrollment and persistence in the aviation program?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Methods</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in program who attended summer camp</td>
<td>Camp and admission records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students enrolled in program</td>
<td>Program records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ opinions about AV 100 course</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics Inductive coding of qualitative data</td>
<td>Compare results with rubric to judge degree of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students’ perceptions of what influenced decisions about their program of study</td>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td>Thematic coding to determine factors that increase or suppress interest in aviation program</td>
<td>Identify which, if any, factors can be influenced by the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation Question 3: To what extent and how are project activities impacting enrollment and persistence in the aviation program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Methods</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in program who attended summer camp</td>
<td>Camp and admission records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students enrolled in program</td>
<td>Program records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ opinions about AV 100 course</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Compare results with rubric to judge degree of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students’ perceptions of what influenced decisions about their program of study</td>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td>Thematic coding to determine factors that increase or suppress interest in aviation program</td>
<td>Identify which, if any, factors can be influenced by the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Matrix

**Evaluation Question 3:** To what extent and how are project activities impacting enrollment and persistence in the aviation program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Methods</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in program who attended summer camp</td>
<td>Camp and admission records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students enrolled in program</td>
<td>Program records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ opinions about AV 100 course</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Compare results with rubric to judge degree of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students’ perceptions of what influenced decisions about their program of study</td>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td>Thematic coding to determine factors that increase or suppress interest in aviation program</td>
<td>Identify which, if any, factors can be influenced by the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Matrix

### Evaluation Question 3: To what extent and how are project activities impacting enrollment and persistence in the aviation program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Methods</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in program who attended summer camp</td>
<td>Camp and admission records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students enrolled in program</td>
<td>Program records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ opinions about AV 100 course</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Compare results with rubric to judge degree of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading students’ perceptions of what influenced decisions about their program of study</td>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td>Thematic coding to determine factors that increase or suppress interest in aviation program</td>
<td>Identify which, if any, factors can be influenced by the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Data Matrix

## Evaluation Question 3: To what extent and how are project activities impacting enrollment and persistence in the aviation program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Methods</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in program who attended summer camp</td>
<td>Camp and admission records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students enrolled in program</td>
<td>Program records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ opinions about AV 100 course</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Compare results with rubric to judge degree of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students’ perceptions of what influenced decisions about their program of study</td>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td>Thematic coding to determine factors that increase or suppress interest in aviation program</td>
<td>Identify which, if any, factors can be influenced by the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Matrix

**Evaluation Question 3:** To what extent and how are project activities impacting enrollment and persistence in the aviation program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Methods</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students in program who attended summer camp</td>
<td>Camp and admission records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students enrolled in program</td>
<td>Program records</td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Compare with project target of 5 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ opinions about AV 100 course</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>Compare results with rubric to judge degree of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students’ perceptions of what influenced decisions about their program of study</td>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td>Thematic coding to determine factors that increase or suppress interest in aviation program</td>
<td>Identify which, if any, factors can be influenced by the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An evaluation plan should include a clear description of what data will be collected, from what sources and how, by whom, and when, as well as how the data will be analyzed. Placing this information in a matrix helps ensure that there is a viable plan for collecting all the data necessary to answer each evaluation question and that all collected data will serve a specific, intended purpose. The table below may be copied into another document, such as a grant proposal, and edited/expanded as needed. An example is provided on the next page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question:</th>
<th>Data Source and Methods</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Analysis Plan</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If space is limited, such as in a National Science Foundation proposal, fewer columns may be used. It is most critical to include the evaluation questions, indicators, data sources and methods, and timing.

**Definitions**

**Evaluation Questions** are overarching questions about a project’s quality or impact. The number of evaluation questions depends on the scope and purpose of the evaluation; 3 to 7 questions is typical. Questions should address both project implementation and outcomes.

**Indicators** are specific pieces of information about an aspect of a project—basically, what will be measured—in order to answer the evaluation questions. It is useful to use multiple indicators to address an evaluation question, including qualitative and quantitative data.

**Data Sources** are the entities from which data will be collected. Typical data sources for ATE evaluations include project personnel, students, graduates, faculty, project partners, business and industry representatives, institutional records, website usage statistics, and teaching and learning artifacts.

**Data Collection Methods** are the means by which information will be gathered. Typical methods include surveys, focus groups, interviews, observations, and institutional database queries.

**Responsible Parties** are the individuals or organizations tasked with collecting the needed information. In many cases, data collection requires cooperation among multiple entities. For example, an external evaluator may be responsible for an administering a survey, but a member of the project staff may need to supply the context information.

**Timing** identifies when and how frequently data will be collected (e.g., at events, quarterly, annually). It is important to identify approximately when data collection will take place to ensure the information will be obtained when needed for reporting purposes and decision making and that the data collection schedule is conducive to other things taking place in project’s context (e.g., other major data collection activities, semester schedules).

**Analysis Plan** how the quantitative and qualitative data will be summarized into meaningful, usable information.

**Interpretation** is how the analyzed data will be used to reach conclusions related to the evaluation questions.
Questions?
Communication and Use
Evaluation Plan → 4 Communication and Use

☐ Identify what evaluation reports will be prepared
Evaluation Plan ➔ **4 Communication and Use**

- Identify what evaluation reports will be prepared
- Identify the **frequency** with which the evaluator will communicate with project team
Evaluation Plan 4 Communication and Use

- Identify what evaluation reports will be prepared
- Identify the frequency with which the evaluator will communicate with project team
- Describe how evaluation results will be shared with external audiences
ATE-Specific Review Criteria Related to Evaluation

Is the evaluation likely to provide useful information to the project and others?

Will the project evaluation inform others through the communication of results?
Planning for Evaluation Communication and Use
Planning for Evaluation Communication and Use

Formal reporting should occur at least annually
Planning for Evaluation Communication and Use

Formal reporting should occur at least annually

Project team should engage with evaluator regularly
Planning for Evaluation Communication and Use

Formal reporting should occur at least annually

Project team should engage with evaluator regularly

Show commitment to using results for improvement
**CHAT: Which proposal has the best description of evaluation communication and use?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal A</th>
<th>Proposal B</th>
<th>Proposal C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evaluator will work with the project PI to prepare required annual reports submitted to NSF.</td>
<td>The evaluator will meet with the project team quarterly to share evaluation results and receive updates on the project. Interim evaluation reports will be used by project team to improve camps and courses. In the final year of the project, the project PI will collaborate with the evaluator to prepare a presentation about the project evaluation that the PI will present at national conferences.</td>
<td>The evaluator will submit annual reports to the project PI and assist the project team in preparing evaluation results for inclusion in the project’s annual report to NSF. Evaluation reports will be shared with the project’s advisory committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline
Evaluation Plan → 5 Timeline

- Identify when key evaluation activities will occur in order to produce timely information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize evaluation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and pilot surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey camp participants and parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up survey of camp participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey AV 100 and AV 150 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports completed (Annual, Final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation feedback session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td>YEAR 2</td>
<td>YEAR 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize evaluation plan</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Win.</td>
<td>Spr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and pilot surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey camp participants and parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up survey of camp participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey AV 100 and AV 150 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports completed (Annual, Final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation feedback session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major data collection events
### Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize evaluation plan</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Win.</td>
<td>Spr.</td>
<td>Sum.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Win.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and pilot surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey camp participants and parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up survey of camp participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey AV 100 and AV 150 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports completed (Annual, Final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation feedback session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting**

**Major data collection events**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize evaluation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and pilot surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey camp participants and parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up survey of camp participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey AV 100 and AV 150 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports completed (Annual, Final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation feedback session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings with evaluator

Reporting

Major data collection events
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize evaluation plan</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Win.</td>
<td>Spr.</td>
<td>Sum.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Win.</td>
<td>Spr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and pilot surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey camp participants and parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up survey of camp participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey AV 100 and AV 150 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports completed (Annual, Final)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation feedback session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include in evaluation section
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION | Evaluate**

**Timeline**

The timing of key tasks and deliverables is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3. Project Timeline (shown in quarter-year increments)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1: Evaluation Task Framework Validation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize design and recruit study participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2: Evaluator Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize design and recruit committee members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3: Strategies for Measuring UDL in ATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize design and recruit participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 4: Evaluation Use in the ATE Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize study design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site selection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING &amp; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</strong> (Some training-related activities are already funded under current grant through summer 2020, so they are not listed here until expiration of current grant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene one webinar per quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop FAQs and job aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct workshops at ATE PI Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance materials for coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a coach orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATE EVALUATION NETWORK FACILITATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help ATE evaluators to attend ATE PI conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host networking reception at ATE PI conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select and coordinate ATE evaluation fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host monthly webinars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host biannual ATE Evaluation Summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize detailed evaluation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct behavioral survey of Evaluate's audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct interviews with coaches and TA recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports completed (TA, survey, research impact, final)</td>
<td>TA S TA RI TA TA S RI TA F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISSEMINATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish quarterly newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Evaluation Plan (1-2 pages)

1. Evaluator
2. Evaluation Questions
3. Data
4. Communication and Use
5. Timeline
ATE Proposal Evaluation Plan Template

Lori A. Wingate | July 2019

This template is for use in preparing evaluation plans for inclusion in proposals to the National Science Foundation’s Advanced Technological Education (ATE) program. It is based on the ATE Evaluation Planning Checklist (see bit.ly/checklist-evalplan), also developed by EvaluATE. It is aligned with the evaluation guidance included in the 2019 ATE Program Solicitation (see bit.ly/ateinfo). All proposals and evaluators should read the solicitation in full.

How to use this template: Replace the descriptions of what should go in each section with relevant details about your proposed project’s evaluation. Copy the text into your ATE proposal. The evaluation plan should comprise one to two pages of your 15-page Project Description.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1506993. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Evaluation

Identify by name the person(s) who will lead the external evaluation of the project. Briefly describe their academic training and professional experience that qualifies them to serve as external evaluator. Refer to the evaluator’s biosketch and commitment letter and include those documents with the proposal’s Supplementary Documents.

**Evaluation Questions.** Identify the focus of the evaluation by listing the evaluation questions. These questions should align with the project’s purpose and address both implementation and outcomes. Examples of outcomes of interest to the ATE program include, but are not limited to, changes related to student learning, persistence, retention, graduation, and employment; faculty knowledge and pedagogical skills; broader participation in STEM; meeting workforce needs; enhancing institutional capacity; and advancing knowledge about technician education. If the project has a logic model, make sure the evaluation questions align with the logic model components.

**Data Collection and Analysis.** For each evaluation question, identify what will be measured, how the data will be collected and from what sources, and when. If specific published instruments will be used for data collection, describe and cite them (and include in References Cited section of proposal). Describe how data will be analyzed so that the evaluation questions can be answered. Placing this information in a table helps show linkages between the evaluation questions and the data, as shown below (see also EvaluATE’s Data Collection Planning Matrix).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source &amp; Collection Method</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[what will be measured – ideally there will be more than one indicator per evaluation question]</td>
<td>[where the data will come from and how it will be obtained]</td>
<td>[when the data will be collected]</td>
<td>[how the qualitative and quantitative data will be transformed and summarized into usable information]</td>
<td>[procedures for using findings to answer the evaluation questions and reach evaluative conclusions]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting and Use.** Identify the deliverables that will be produced by the evaluation after the project is funded, such as a detailed evaluation plan, data collection instruments, reports, etc. Define how reports will be provided to the project and how the results will be used to inform project improvement.
Questions?
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- Results from Prior NSF Support
- Budget and Budget Justification
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- Results from Prior NSF Support
- Budget and Budget Justification
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Beyond the Evaluation Plan

- Results from Prior NSF Support
- Budget and Budget Justification
- Data Management Plan
- References
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Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Results from Prior NSF Support

This subsection must contain specific outcomes and results, including metrics to demonstrate the impact of project activities.
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Results from Prior NSF Support

This subsection must contain **specific outcomes and results**, including metrics to demonstrate the impact of project activities.

- Intellectual Merit
- Broader Impacts
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Results from Prior NSF Support

This subsection must contain **specific outcomes and results**, including metrics to demonstrate the impact of project activities.
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Results from Prior NSF Support

This subsection must contain specific outcomes and results, including metrics to demonstrate the impact of project activities.

- **Intellectual Merit**: advancement of knowledge
- **Broader Impacts**: benefit to society
If a PI or co-PI for an NSF proposal has received NSF funding in the past five years, information on the results of that funding must be included in the proposal, whether it relates to the current proposal or not. This section of the proposal is called Results from Prior NSF Support; details about what should be included are provided in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide (see http://bit.ly/nsf-results). The following is a synopsis of NSF’s requirements and EvaluATE’s suggestions for this section of an ATE proposal.

REQUIREMENTS

☐ Limit to 5 pages or less

☐ Make it the first section of your proposal. If the proposal is for the renewal of an ATE center, it may be uploaded as a supplementary document rather than presented in the 15-page project description.

☐ Describe research and development products and how they have been made available to others.

☐ Clearly indicate the prior project’s
  • Title
  • NSF award number
  • Period of support

☐ Present results using these exact, distinct headings:
  • Intellectual Merit
  • Broader Impacts

☐ Provide complete bibliographic citations for all publications developed with NSF support, either in the narrative or in the separate references document. If there were no publications, state “No publications were produced under this award.”

SUGGESTIONS

☐ Provide a brief factual account of what the project did, created, and who was engaged. A list of activities or deliverables is not sufficient evidence of intellectual merit or broader impacts, but it is important for reviewers to understand the nature and scope of your prior work.

☐ Present as much hard evidence as possible in describe the project’s intellectual merit and broader impacts.

☐ Be forthright about what didn’t work and lessons learned.

☐ Describe how the current proposal is building on the prior project’s results.

☐ Describe what aspects of previously funded work are being sustained without NSF support.

www.evalu-ate.org
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Budget and Budget Justification
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Budget and Budget Justification

The **funds** to support an evaluator independent of the project or center must be requested.
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Budget and Budget Justification

The **funds** to support an evaluator independent of the project or center must be requested. **The requested funds must match the scope** of the proposed evaluative activities.
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Budget and Budget Justification

? %
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Budget and Budget Justification

? %
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Budget and Budget Justification

Chapter II - Proposal Preparation Instructions

g. Budget and Budget Justification

Each proposal must contain a budget for each year of support requested. The budget justification must be no more than five pages per proposal. The amounts for each budget line item requested must be documented and justified in the budget justification as specified below. For proposals that contain a subaward(s), each subaward must include a separate budget justification of no more than five pages. See Chapter II.C.2.g.(vi)(e) for further instructions on proposals that contain subawards.

The proposal may request funds under any of the categories listed so long as the item and amount are considered necessary, reasonable, allocable, and allowable under 2 CFR § 200, Subpart E, NSF policy, and/or the program solicitation. For-profit entities are subject to the cost principles contained in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, Part 31. Amounts and expenses budgeted also must be consistent with the proposing organization’s policies and procedures and cost accounting practices used in accumulating and reporting costs.

Proposals for major facilities also should consult NSF’s Large Facilities Manual for additional budgetary preparation guidelines.

(i) Salaries and Wages (Lines A and B on the Proposal Budget)

(a) Senior Personnel Salaries & Wages Policy

NSF regards research as one of the normal functions of faculty members at institutions of higher education. Compensation for time normally spent on research within the term of appointment is deemed to be included within the faculty member's regular organizational salary.

As a general policy, NSF limits the salary compensation requested in the proposal budget for senior personnel to no more than two months of their regular salary in any one year. (See Exhibit II-2 for the definitions of Senior Personnel.) It is the organization’s responsibility to define and consistently apply the term “year”, and to specify this definition in the budget justification. This limit includes salary compensation received
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Budget and Budget Justification

1 Identify hourly rate of pay for evaluator
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Budget and Budget Justification

1. Identify hourly rate of pay for evaluator
2. Justify time required for evaluator
Budget and Budget Justification

1. Identify hourly rate of pay for evaluator
2. Justify time required for evaluator
3. Outline their main tasks and deliverables
Beyond the Evaluation Plan
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Data Management Plan

Requirements

☐ Types of data and other materials to be produced
☐ Format of the data
☐ Policies for access and sharing data
☐ Policies for use of data by others
☐ Plans for archiving data for preserving access
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Data Management Plan

Requirements

☐ Types of data and other materials to be produced

☐ Format of the data

☐ Policies for access and sharing data

☐ Policies for use of data by others

☐ Plans for archiving data for preserving access
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

References Cited
Beyond the Evaluation Plan

Include references to evaluation literature

REFERENCES

REFERENCES


Beyond the Evaluation Plan

References Cited

Include references to evaluation literature

Justify evaluation approach

Justify use of instruments and methods

REFERENCES


Before Questions...
One-on-One Coaching for Proposal Evaluation Plans

Submit by September 6!

Do you have a question about your evaluation plan? Want someone to review your logic model? Unsure about the best data analysis to use?

Keep reading to find out how we can help!
New Opportunities from EvaluATE!

Join our Evaluation Slack Community!

Everyone who cares about evaluation is welcome!
Don't forget to take our post-webinar survey!
Q&A Panel

Mike Lesiecki  
Luka Partners

Osa Brand  
MENTOR CONNECT

Lyssa Wilson Becho  
EvaluATE

Tom Higgins  
NSF

Lori Wingate  
EvaluATE

Emma Leeburg  
EvaluATE

Write your questions in the Chat window! →
Materials

www.evalu-ate.org/webinars/aug19
Thank you!
evalu-ate.org