Program Evaluation Training Needs and Expertise at MSU

Laurie A. Van Egeren
Director

Miles McNall
Assistant Director

Celeste Sturdevant Reed
Evaluator

Yan Zheng
Graduate Research Assistant

Meenal Rana
Graduate Research Assistant

Community Evaluation and Research Collaborative
University Outreach & Engagement
Michigan State University

MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

University Outreach
& Engagement
Michigan State University
East Lansing

APRIL 2010

Copies of this report are available from:

University Outreach and Engagement
Michigan State University
Kellogg Center, Garden Level
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
Phone: (517) 353-8977
Fax: (517) 432-9541
E-mail: outreach@msu.edu
Web: http://outreach.msu.edu

The views expressed are solely those of the authors. For more information about this report, contact Laurie Van Egeren at the above address or phone number, or e-mail: vanegere@msu.edu.

Michigan State University is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity employer.

Contents

Executive Summary

The Community Evaluation and Research Collaborative (CERC) was initiated in 2008 to provide a networking, training, and learning hub for MSU faculty, staff, and graduate students and existing or potential community partners working together on program evaluations and community-based research. To facilitate this work, CERC coordinates communication vehicles such as mailing lists and speaker events and conducts program evaluation training workshops on evaluation independently and in partnership with the Michigan Association for Evaluation. In July 2008, to assess the status of program evaluation-focused work among faculty/staff and to inform the development of training opportunities among faculty, staff, and graduate students, CERC conducted two surveys. One survey focused on faculty/staff interests and experiences in program evaluation and solicited perceived needs for graduate student training (N = 126 respondents who develop and supervise evaluations), while the other asked graduate students to report on the availability of and interests in expanded program evaluation training (N = 577 with interests in evaluation).

Answers to three major questions were sought:

1. What is the range and variety of program evaluation experience, issues, scope, and methodological knowledge among MSU faculty/staff?

2. How can CERC support MSU faculty/staff with program evaluation interests?

3. To what extent and in what areas do MSU faculty/staff perceive a need for more evaluation training and support for graduate students? For the third question, both faculty (N=126) and graduate students (N=577) perspectives were sought.

Faculty/Staff Evaluation Capacity and Expertise

Experience

- Few faculty/staff had a formal degree in program evaluation; most respondents reported being self-taught and learning through the experience of conducting evaluation (60%).

- About half of respondents (51%) had at least 10 years of experience conducting evaluations.

Intersection Between Evaluation and Other Work

- Most faculty/staff (78%) reported that their evaluation work fit somewhat into their main area of research.

Scope

- Most evaluations conducted by MSU faculty/staff were for local or state organizations and initiatives.

- Federal government was the most common listed funding source, which contributed little less than half. Other common sources of funding included State government, local foundations, non-profit organizations, and internal MSU sources.

- Health and PreK-12 Education were the most common areas in which respondents conducted evaluations.

- Over two-thirds of faculty/staff conducted evaluations to assess program outcomes. Other common purposes of participants' evaluation projects included program improvement, evaluation of program processes, and needs assessments.

Supports for Faculty/Staff with Evaluation Interests

- More than half were interested in being on a mailing list that provides information related to evaluation or in participating in collaborative evaluation projects.

- Approximately 45% expressed interest in group activities such as attending learning groups on specific evaluation topics, attending evaluation-focused brown bags, or attending networking events.

- Faculty/staff indicated that they would like to receive information from CERC both on-line and in-person. Overall, they would like CERC to be an "information warehouse," and they would like the "warehouse" to include both reference information they can use to build their evaluation capacity, and information they can use while writing grants. Most respondents would like to access this type of information online.

- Some faculty/staff expressed interest in having CERC provide them with direct technical assistance on their projects. Many stated a need for data management and analysis assistance. Others noted that they would like CERC to help build their staff's evaluation capacity and provide general evaluation technical assistance, such as answering evaluation-related questions.

Graduate Student Evaluation Training Needs

- Most faculty/staff and graduate students felt that their disciplines had job opportunities that require expertise in program evaluation, but few graduate student had received formal training in evaluation

- The majority of faculty thought that graduate students in their departments would benefit from a specialization focused on program evaluation and particularly on community collaboration around research and evaluation. Graduate students had somewhat higher perceptions of the benefits of specialization in program evaluation in each area. Both groups expressed concern about students being able to make time to meet additional requirements.

- Fifty-six percent (N=324) of the graduate students said that they might be interested in participating in a specialization in program evaluation with 17% (N=95) stated that they were definitely interested.

- A little over half of both groups thought that "evaluation theories" was an important area for training.

- While design and methods that apply to evaluation were more available in existing programs than other areas we asked about, large numbers of students reported needing more training opportunities in methodology. Both groups reported high training needs in critiquing evaluation designs and analysis, social network analysis, and qualitative methods.

- The majority of both groups indicated training needs in every aspect of evaluation/project management that we asked about.

Introduction

In 2005, Michigan State University was classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as one of the first Community-Engaged Universities. As defined by the Provost's Committee on University Outreach (1993), outreach and engagement is "a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. Outreach and engagement involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions" (p. 2). As this definition implies, engaged scholarship can take a variety of forms; for many faculty/staff, the evaluation of programs, initiatives, and activities constitutes a primary vehicle through which their research activity intersects with community needs.

The Community Evaluation and Research Collaborative (CERC; "Community Evaluation and Research Center" until December 2009), within the Office of University Outreach and Engagement, was created in July 2007 through funding from the Provost to provide a networking, training, and learning hub for MSU faculty, staff, and graduate students and existing or potential community partners working together on program evaluations and community-based research. To facilitate this work, CERC coordinates communication vehicles such as mailing lists and speaker events and conducts program evaluation training workshops on evaluation independently and in partnership with the Michigan Association for Evaluation. In July 2008, to assess the status of program evaluation-focused work among faculty/staff and to inform the development of training opportunities among faculty, staff, and graduate students, CERC conducted two surveys. One survey focused on faculty/staff interests and experiences in program evaluation and solicited perceived needs for graduate student training, while the other asked graduate students to report on the availability of and interests in expanded program evaluation training.

Methods

Surveys

Faculty/staff survey. In July 2008, the Community Evaluation and Research Center (CERC) conducted an online survey (Appendix A) of Michigan State University (MSU) faculty/staff to assess their involvement in program evaluation projects and their perceptions of the interests and needs of graduate students around program evaluation training. The survey was developed by CERC staff based on previous literature (e.g., Stevahn, King, Ghere, & Minnema, 2005) to answer three questions:

1. What constitutes the core of evaluation expertise at MSU? That is, what is the range and variety of program evaluation experience, issues, scope, and methodological knowledge among MSU faculty/staff?

2. How can CERC support MSU faculty/staff with program evaluation interests?

3. To what extent and in what areas do MSU faculty/staff perceive a need for more evaluation training and support for graduate students?

Graduate student survey. In July 2008, the Community Evaluation and Research Center (CERC) conducted a survey of Michigan State University (MSU) graduate students to assess their involvement in program evaluation activity and their perceptions of the interests in and needs of graduate students around program evaluation training. The survey is included in Appendix B.

Both surveys were then reviewed by CERC's advisory board members, who include faculty with extensive program evaluation experience from a number of MSU departments, including Psychology, Family and Child Ecology, Community Agriculture Recreation and Resource Studies (CARRS), and Communication, and revised to incorporate their feedback. The final survey was submitted to the MSU Institutional Review Board and determined to be exempt. It was administered online and was not anonymous.

Participant Selection Procedure

The results of the present evaluation study are based on 126 faculty/staff and 577 graduate students. The following two subsections will deal with the recruitment procedure of the participants.

Faculty/staff. The target sample was identified from the following sources: departmental websites; the Community of Science website; MSU's Contracts and Grants website; and the Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument administered by MSU University Outreach and Engagement. Any faculty or staff member at the level of research associates and specialists who appeared to have conducted or been associated with an evaluation or community-based research project were included in the survey sample. This process identified 552 faculty/staff for surveying. A recruitment email was sent to potential respondents asking them to participate in the survey. Participants were asked to proceed to the online survey only if they had any interest or experience in program evaluation.

After removing eight respondents who proceeded to the survey but answered only a few questions before exiting, 177 respondents completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 32% of the surveys sent. However, this response rate may be an underestimate of the population of MSU program evaluators, as the method of selecting the initial sample was likely to have included faculty/staff who did not have

particular interests in program evaluation, but were associated in some other capacity with projects that had an evaluation component. Additionally, 51 respondents (29%) reported that they were associated with evaluation projects, but did not directly conduct and supervise evaluations themselves. In this report, we focus on the 126 respondents who indicated that they conduct evaluations.

Graduate students. The list of graduate students in various departments and colleges at Michigan State University was procured by contacting the registrar's office and requesting email addresses for students in the following departments with the assumption that they were most likely to conduct evaluation: psychology; social work; community, agriculture, recreation, and resource sciences; nursing; counseling, educational psychology and special education; criminal justice; communication; medicine; agricultural economics; family and child ecology; fisheries and wildlife; food science and human nutrition; hospitality and business; writing rhetoric and American culture; family medicine; journalism; labor and industrial relations; management; osteopathic medicine; pediatrics and human development; teacher education. The survey, conducted online, was sent to 4,878 graduate students. Out of those, 211 were returned as undeliverable email addresses. The survey received 782 responses, for a return rate of 16% out of those with valid email addresses; however, it should be noted that students were asked only to respond if interested in program evaluation. Mostly complete data were available from 577 (n = 74% of the respondents) students. This group constituted the sample used in analyses.

Characteristics of Participants

Faculty/Staff

Position. The majority of the sample was tenure-track faculty, with over a third of the sample full professors (Table 1). Specialists were also well represented.

Table 1. Faculty/Staff by Position

Position	N	Percent
Professor	47	37%
Associate professor	27	21%
Assistant professor	19	15%
Specialist	25	20%
Research associate	2	2%
Instructor	2	2%
Other	4	3%

Note. *N* = 126.

College/Unit. Respondents came from 12 colleges around campus; respondents from the Honors College, UOE, MSU Extension, support services and other Institutes and Centers also participated in the study (Table 2). The College of Social Science and the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources had the most respondents. Respondents from other colleges and units each represented 7% or less of the sample.

Table 2. Faculty/Staff by College

College/Unit	N	Percent
Social Science	29	23%
Agriculture and Natural Resources	25	20%
Education	9	7%
Natural Science	8	6%
University Outreach and Engagement	8	6%
Human Medicine	7	6%
Communication Arts and Sciences	6	5%
Arts and Letters	5	4%
Business	5	4%
Other Institutes and Centers	5	4%
Osteopathic Medicine	4	3%
Nursing	4	3%
Support Services (e.g., International Studies, Student-Athlete Support Services)	4	3%
MSU Extension	4	3%
Veterinary Medicine	1	1%
Engineering	1	1%
Honors College	1	1%

Note. $N = 126$.

Graduate Students

Out of 577 participants, three quarters were female and about half of them had been in the graduate school for more than 2 years. Around half of them (58%) were pursuing a PhD and the remainder were enrolled in a masters program, with one in a certificate program (Table 3).

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Graduate Students

Characteristics	N	Percent
GENDER		
Male	143	25%
Female	431	75%
YEARS IN GRADUATE SCHOOL		
1st year	161	28%
2nd year	154	27%
3rd year	94	16%
4th year	56	10%
5th year or more	109	19%
ON GOING DEGREE LEVEL		
Masters	243	42%
PhD	333	58%

Note. $N = 577$; Missing values 0.2% to 0.5%.

Graduate students from 9 colleges and 33 departments participated in the survey. Most of them were from the College of Social Science and the College of Education (Table 4).

Table 4. Distribution of Students according to Colleges/Departments

Department /College	N	Percent
SOCIAL SCIENCE	**209**	**36%**
Social Work	72	13%
Family and Child Ecology	30	5%
Psychology	23	4%
Anthropology	15	3%
Criminal Justice	15	3%
Labor and Industrial Relations	13	2%
Sociology	13	2%
Political Science	12	2%
Geography	10	2%
History	6	1%
EDUCATION	**202**	**35%**
Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education	65	11%
Education	61	11%
Teacher Education	53	9%
Kinesiology	13	2%
Education Policy	10	2%
AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	**42**	**7%**
Community, Agriculture, Recreation, and Resource Studies	15	3%
Fisheries and Wildlife	14	2%
Food Science and Human Nutrition	7	1%
Crop and Social Science	6	1%
ARTS AND LETTERS	**28**	**5%**
Music	18	3%
Linguistic, Germanic, Slavic, Asian, and African Languages	10	2%
NURSING	**29**	**5%**
NATURAL SCIENCE	**25**	**4%**
Zoology	19	3%
Statistics and Probability	6	1%
COMMUNICATION ARTS AND SCIENCES	**18**	**3%**
Communication	17	3%
Journalism	1	0.2%
ELI BROAD COLLEGE OF BUSINESS	**12**	**2%**
Hospitality and Business	6	1%
Business	3	0.5%
Marketing and Supply Chain Management	3	0.5%
HUMAN MEDICINE	**9**	**2%**
Human Medicine	7	1%
Epidemiology	2	0.4%
OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE	**3**	**1%**
Pharmacology and Toxicology	2	0.3%
Physiology	1	0.2%

Note. N = 577

Results

This section is divided into three parts based on the three research questions. First, we present data on evaluation capacity and expertise among faculty/staff at MSU at the time of the survey. We then report on the evaluation training needs of faculty/staff. Lastly, we present both faculty and student reports of the evaluation training needs for graduate students.

Faculty/Staff Evaluation Capacity and Expertise

Here, we ask what constitutes the core of evaluation expertise at MSU? That is, what is the range and variety of program evaluation experience, issues, scope, and methodological knowledge among MSU faculty/staff?

Past Training and Experience in Program Evaluation

Training. Few respondents had a formal degree in program evaluation. Instead, most respondents reported being self-taught and learning through the experience of conducting evaluation (Table 5). Many had also received evaluation training through workshops, coursework about evaluation that was included within other courses, and courses in research design. These results are fairly representative of evaluators as a whole; most do not have formal degrees in evaluation.

Table 5. Faculty/Staff Training in Program Evaluation

Training	N	Percent
On-the-job training/self taught	75	60%
Attended evaluation workshops	67	53%
Completed research design coursework	62	49%
Completed evaluation coursework within other courses	39	31%
Earned PhD in evaluation	4	3%
Earned evaluation specialization or certificate	2	2%
Earned MA in evaluation	2	2%
Other training	7	6%
No training in evaluation	10	8%

Note. $N = 126$.

Evaluation experience. About half of respondents had at least 10 years of experience conducting evaluations (Table 6). About a quarter were in their first five years of conducting evaluations.

Table 6. Faculty/Staff Years Conducting Evaluation

Years	N	Percent
More than 20 years	39	31%
10 to 20 years	25	20%
6 to 9 years	29	23%
1 to 5 years	29	23%
1st year	4	3%

Note. $N = 126$.

The Intersection Between Program Evaluation and Other Work

Percent time. Ninety-two respondents (73%) reported on the percent of time that they spent on evaluation projects. Percent time averaged 17% (*SD* =21%), with a range of 0% to 100% time (Table 7). Most faculty/staff spent 25% or less of their time on evaluation, and very few spent the majority of their time on evaluation. This was true for both tenure-track faculty and other types of faculty/staff.

Table 7. Faculty/Staff Percent Time Spent on Evaluation

Percent time	N	Percent
0-25%	75	82%
26-50%	12	13%
51-75%	1	1%
76-100%	4	4%

Note. *N* = 92.

Fit with research. Most faculty/staff (78%) reported that their evaluation work fit somewhat into their main area of research. Ten percent of participants indicated that evaluation was their primary area of research, while 13% reported no link between their evaluation work and their research (*N* = 104).

Dissemination. Faculty/staff who conducted evaluation disseminated their evaluation findings to both academic and community audiences (Table 8). They were most likely to disseminate findings through technical reports, presentations at academic conferences, speaking engagements, publishing in peer-reviewed journals, and at conferences for practitioners. A minority created dissemination materials designed specifically for community use, such as community reports, publications in non-scholarly journals, and white papers.

Table 8. Evaluation Dissemination Approaches

College/Unit	N	Percent
Technical reports	59	47%
Academic conferences	58	46%
Speaking engagements	56	44%
Peer-reviewed journals	56	44%
Practitioner conferences	53	42%
Community reports	32	25%
Websites	29	23%
Professional/trade/practitioner journals	29	23%
White papers	18	14%

Note. *N* = 126.

Characteristics of Faculty/Staff Program Evaluations

Scope. Most evaluations conducted by MSU faculty/staff were for local or state organizations and initiatives (Table 9). However, a significant minority reported conducting evaluations that encompassed a national scope or were multiscaled.

Table 9. Evaluation Scope

Years	N	Percent
Local	62	49%
Statewide	50	40%
National	35	28%
International	16	13%
Multiple levels (e.g., local and national)	24	19%
Other	12	10%

Note. *N* = 126.

Funding. Among the funding sources for evaluation projects, the most common source of funding was federal government (Table 10). Other common sources of funding included state government, local foundations, non-profit organizations, and internal MSU sources.

Table 10. Evaluation Funding Sources

Years	N	Percent
Federal government	58	46%
State government	45	36%
Local foundations	41	33%
Non-profit organizations	40	32%
Internal MSU sources	37	29%
Local government	25	20%
Individual schools or school districts	11	9%
International non-government organizations	10	8%
International government	8	6%
For-profit organizations	7	6%
Other	8	6%

Note. *N* = 126

Evaluation topical areas. Health and preK-12 education were the most common areas in which respondents conducted evaluations. However, respondents' evaluation projects spanned a wide range of areas and interests (Table 11).

Table 11. Faculty/Staff Evaluation Topics

Evaluation Topics	N	Percent
Health	27	21%
Education (PreK-12)	26	21%
Community and economic development	22	18%
Post-secondary education	17	14%
Human services	17	14%
Agriculture	17	14%
Crime and justice	16	13%
Business and industry	15	12%
Policy change	15	12%
Youth development	15	12%
Alcohol/drug abuse or mental health	14	11%
Environmental, natural resources	14	11%
International and cross-cultural	13	10%
Research, technology, and development	13	10%
Distance education and technologies	12	10%
Systems change	12	10%
Extension education	12	10%
Nonprofit and foundations	11	9%
Comprehensive community evaluations	10	8%
Indigenous populations	7	6%
Special needs populations	6	5%
Arts and culture	5	4%
Recreation	5	4%
College access programs	4	3%
Disaster and emergency management	1	1%
Lesbian, gay, transgender issues	1	1%
Other	21	17%

Note. N = 126

Evaluation purposes. Over two-thirds of faculty/staff conducted evaluations to assess program outcomes. Other common purposes of participants' evaluation projects included program improvement, evaluation of program processes, and needs assessments (Table 12).

Table 12. Evaluation Purposes of Faculty/Staff

Purposes	N	Percent
Program outcomes evaluation	86	68%
Program improvement evaluation	76	60%
Evaluation of program processes	64	51%
Needs assessment	57	45%
Policy analysis	37	29%
Organizational capacity building	30	24%
Improving evaluation designs	24	19%
Stakeholder empowerment	22	18%
Cost-benefit analysis	21	17%
Other	5	4%

Note. N = 126

Common Methods Used in Evaluation

MSU faculty/staff reported a strong reliance on mixed methods; few respondents indicated solely using quantitative or qualitative methods in evaluation.

Designs. Mixed-method, case study, non-experimental, and quasi-experimental designs were the most commonly reported approaches. Rigorous experimental designs were reported by 26% (Table 13).

Table 13. Evaluation Designs used by Faculty/Staff

Designs	N	Percent
Mixed methods	61	48%
Case studies	53	42%
Non-experimental designs	50	40%
Quasi-experimental designs	47	37%
Experimental designs	33	26%
Cluster designs	10	8%
Other	10	8%

Note. $N = 126$

Quantitative data collection methods. The most common method of collecting quantitative data reported by the faculty/staff was survey or questionnaire. Secondary data was another important data source (Table 14).

Table 14. Methods of Quantitative Data Collection

Methods of Collection	N	Percent
Survey/questionnaire	97	77%
Secondary data	58	46%
Other	14	11%
Do not use quantitative data	1	1%

Note. $N = 126$

Data analysis approaches. The most common methods for quantitative data analysis reported in the survey were multiple regression, tests for mean differences, and correlations. Other statistical tools, such as cluster analysis, loglinear modeling, structural equation modeling, GIS mapping, multilevel modeling, and social network analysis, were also reported (Table 15).

Table 15. Methods of Quantitative Data Analysis

Methods of Analysis	N	Percent
Multiple regression	66	52%
Tests of mean differences	64	51%
Correlation	64	51%
Cluster analysis	34	27%
Loglinear modeling	26	21%
Structural equation modeling/Path analysis	22	18%
GIS mapping	18	14%
Multilevel modeling (HLM)	14	11%
Social network analysis	7	6%
Other	10	8%
Do not collect quantitative data	4	3%

Note. $N = 126$

Qualitative data collection methods. Faculty/staff reported that they collect qualitative data primarily through interviews, focus groups, observations, and document reviews (Table 16).

Table 16. Methods of Qualitative Data Collection

Methods of Collection	N	Percent
Interviews	81	64%
Focus groups	70	56%
Observations	65	52%
Document review	54	43%
Other	11	9%
Do not collect qualitative data	7	6%

Note. $N = 126$

Qualitative data analysis approaches. Content analysis was the most common method used by the faculty/staff to analyze qualitative data. Smaller number of participants used inductive analysis or grounded theoretical approaches to qualitative data analysis (Table 17).

Table 17. Methods of Qualitative Data Analysis

Methods of Analysis	N	Percent
Content analysis	64	51%
Inductive analysis	36	29%
Grounded theory	34	27%
Phenomenology	9	7%
Other	5	4%
Do not collect qualitative data	7	6%

Note. $N = 126$

Supports for Faculty/Staff with Evaluation Interests

Faculty/staff were asked about their experience conducting evaluations; only respondents who developed and conducted evaluations themselves (rather than assisting in evaluations being conducted by others) were included in this analysis ($N = 126$). Faculty/staff were asked to indicate how interested they would be in a variety of activities designed to support program evaluation activities and encourage links among faculty/staff conducting program evaluations (Table 18).

Interest in Evaluation Supports

Over half were interested in being on a mailing list that provides information related to evaluation or in participating in collaborative evaluation projects. Approximately 45% expressed interest in group activities such as attending learning groups on specific evaluation topics, attending evaluation-focused brown bags, or attending networking events. Unsurprisingly, participants were least likely to express interest in activities that would require a significant investment of time and effort such as supervising graduate students on evaluation projects (29%) or presenting at a brown bag (23%) and few were very interested; however, a number of faculty/staff did indicate that they had some interest in those activities as well.

Table 18. Percent of Faculty/staff by Interest in Potential Evaluation Support Activities

Evaluation Support Activities	Somewhat interested	Very Interested
Mailing list information on evaluation	36 (30%)	30 (25%)
Collaborative evaluation projects	43 (36%)	22(19%)
Learning groups on specific evaluation topics	37 (31%)	17 (14%)
Networking MSU program evaluation faculty/staff	33 (40%)	11 (13%)
Attending evaluation-focused brown bag	42 (34%)	11 (9%)
Supervising graduate students	24 (29%)	5 (6%)
Brown bag presentations on evaluation methods	22 (18%)	6 (5%)

Note. N = 126; Missing ranged from 3% to 6%.

Respondent Suggestions

Respondents were asked to provide suggestions about ways CERC might support faculty/staff who conduct program evaluations. Of the respondents who responded to the question, their answers can be segmented into two large overarching themes: providing more learning opportunities and resources and providing technical assistance.

Learning opportunities and resources. Faculty/staff indicated that they would like to receive information from CERC both on-line and in-person. Overall, they would like CERC to be an "information warehouse," and they would like the "warehouse" to include both reference information they can use to build their evaluation capacity, and information they can use while writing grants. Most respondents would like to access this type of information on-line. The types of evaluation capacity building information they would like CERC to provide include:

- Examples of evaluation tools and information

- An online dataset or citation catalog that could be used to search for various evaluation methods, analytic techniques and new evaluation technologies

Additionally, faculty/staff would like CERC to provide them with information they can use to increase their grant-getting opportunities. This type of information included:

- Evaluation verbiage –written templates faculty could use to place in grants.

- Evaluation opportunities –both funding opportunities and potential evaluation partnerships.

Several respondents requested more in-person learning opportunities. They suggested that CERC sponsor evaluation workshops, brownbag presentations, and additional networking opportunities so faculty/staff can increase their skills and network with faculty/staff conducting similar research at MSU.

Technical assistance. Some faculty/staff expressed interest in having CERC provide them with direct technical assistance on their projects. Many stated a need for data management and analysis assistance. Others noted that they would like CERC to help build their staff's evaluation capacity and provide general evaluation technical assistance, such as answering evaluation-related questions. One respondent stated they would like CERC to provide contact information of "experts available to do consulting." Another respondent stated they would like CERC to "provide access to people who have unique skill sets on a short term-basis," specifically for assistance with writing briefs and toolkits for lay audiences.

A few respondents wanted CERC to provide additional funding for (a) traveling to national conferences, (b) conducting evaluation studies, and (c) hiring graduate students interested in evaluation.

Graduate Student Needs

Graduate student needs for program evaluation training were reported by both faculty and graduate students. In order to obtain the perspectives of faculty responsible for graduate training, only faculty/staff survey respondents from academic units were included in these analyses (*n* = 104, 83% of all faculty/staff respondents).

Past Training and Experience of Graduate Students in Program Evaluation

Training. About half of the graduate students respondents had no training in program evaluation; about one-fifth had completed coursework in evaluation (Table 19).

Table 19. Graduate Students Training in Program Evaluation

Training	N	Percent
No training in evaluation	296	51%
Completed research design coursework	185	32%
Self-taught	112	19%
Completed evaluation coursework	101	18%
Attended evaluation workshops	82	14%
Earned evaluation specialization or certificate	4	1%
General courses	4	1%

Note. *N* = 577.

Evaluation experience. About half of the students had not conducted any evaluation work, although one third had assisted others, and one quarter had conducted their own evaluations (Table 20).

Table 20. Graduate Students Experience in Program Evaluation

Training	N	Percent
Not done any evaluation	300	52%
Assisted someone with evaluation	204	35%
Conducted own evaluation	136	24%

Note. *N* = 577.

Familiarity with program evaluation. About a third of students were not familiar with the field of program evaluation; a quarter reported being pretty to very familiar with the field (Table 21).

Table 21. Graduate Students Familiarity with Program Evaluation

Training	N	Percent
Not at all familiar	213	37%
A little familiar	223	39%
Pretty familiar	101	18%
Very familiar	40	7%

Note. *N* = 577.

Program Evaluation Opportunities

As shown in Table 22, most faculty/ staff and graduate students felt that their disciplines had job opportunities that require expertise in program evaluation. Half to two-thirds of respondents reported that students had opportunities form community partnerships, work on evaluation projects, and get hands-on experience in evaluation.

Table 22. Perceptions of Graduate Student Opportunities for Program Evaluation Experiences (Agree or Strongly Agree)

Graduate Student Needs	Faculty[1]	Students[2]
There are job opportunities that require expertise in program evaluation	81%	86%
Graduate students can form their community partners	67%	61%
Graduate students can get hands-on experience in evaluation	57%	63%
Graduate students able to work on evaluation project	51%	60%

[1]Note. *N* = 104; Missing ranged from 10% to 23%.
[2]*N*=577; Missing ranged from 0.3% to 4%.

Value of and Interest in a Program Evaluation Specialization

The majority of faculty thought that graduate students in their departments would benefit from a specialization focused on program evaluation and particularly on community collaboration around research and evaluation (Table 23). Nearly 45% of faculty/staff thought their graduate students would be interested in a specialization in program evaluation that would be recorded on their transcripts. Most of the students also indicated that they would benefit greatly or somewhat from specializations that focus on evaluating programs and initiatives, and engaging and collaborating with communities on community-based research and on program evaluation projects. Overall, graduate students had higher perception of benefits of specialization in program evaluation in each area.

Table 23. Faculty/Staff and Students Perceptions of Intensity of Benefits of Program Evaluation Training for Graduate Students

Potential Benefits of Program Evaluation Training	Faculty[1]	Students[2]
Engage and collaborate on community-based research	71%	89%
Engage and collaborate on community-based evaluation	69%	73%
Evaluate programs/initiatives	58%	72%
Getting a specialization in program evaluation	45%	NA[3]

[1]*N* = 104; Missing 14%; [2] *N*=577; [3]See the next section.

About half of the graduate students said that they might be interested in participating in a specialization in program evaluation, with 17% definitely interested (Table 24).

Table 24. Graduate Students Interest in Program Evaluation Specialization

Interest in Program Evaluation Specialization	N	Percent
Definitely interested	95	17%
Might be interested	324	56%
Not included	158	27%

Note. *N* = 577

Graduate Training Needs

The priority areas for graduate training identified by faculty/ staff and graduate students were defined within three major areas: evaluation theories and approaches, evaluation designs and methods, and evaluation management tasks.

Evaluation Theories and Approaches

In this area, faculty/staff were asked more questions about specific evaluation approaches than the graduate students. Slightly more than half of both groups thought that "evaluation theories" was an important area of emphasis for graduate training in program evaluation.

Each evaluation approach was considered by between 40% and 58% of faculty/staff to be important and in need of training opportunities (Table 25). For every approach that respondents felt was important, respondents were much more likely to report that training opportunities were needed rather than that students already could get training in that area. Students were not asked about all areas, but if they felt the area was important, were about twice as likely to indicate that training was needed

Table 25. Graduate Student Training Needs: Evaluation Theories and Approaches

Evaluation Theories and Approaches	*Faculty*[1]		*Graduate Students*[2]	
	Important, already get	Important, training needed	Important, already get	Important, training needed
Theories	21%	58%	30%	54%
Formative evaluation	25%	51%	NA	NA
Summative evaluation	26%	47%	NA	NA
Participatory /empowerment evaluation	13%	44%	NA	NA
Logic modeling	21%	44%	24%	40%
Utilization-focused evaluation	16%	40%	NA	NA
Evaluability assessment	8%	41%	NA	NA

[1]*N*= 104; Missing data,16%-20%; [2] N=577; Missing data 0.2%.
Note. NA= Not asked of graduate students.

Evaluation Designs and Methods

Respondents were asked about needs for training in evaluation design and methods. The following areas were identified as important and for which training was needed by both faculty/staff and graduate students: critiquing evaluation designs and analysis, social network analysis, and qualitative methods. One-third or fewer faculty/staff indicated a need for graduate training in experimental design, multivariate methods, quasi-experimental design, and hierarchical linear modeling (Table 26). In most areas, nearly half of faculty felt that their students already had opportunities for training. Graduate students in the study perceived higher needs in evaluation design and methods in all but one area compared to faculty/staff. In general, while in the minority in most areas, a fair number of faculty/staff and students perceived needs for training in several areas of design and methodology.

Table 26. Priority Areas for Graduate Specialization in Evaluation Design and Methods

Evaluation Designs and Methods	Faculty[1]		Graduate Students[2]	
	Important, already get	Important, training needed	Important, already get	Important, training needed
Critiquing evaluation designs and methods	14%	68%	16%	68%
Social network analysis	19%	41%	22%	55%
Qualitative methods	42%	37%	44%	43%
Experimental design	56%	29%	46%	39%
Multivariate methods	47%	24%	39%	38%
Quasi-experimental design	50%	25%	40%	35%
Hierarchical Linear Modeling	39%	30%	29%	35%

[1]Note. *N*= 104; Missing data,19% to 23%
[2] *N*= 577; Missing data, <2%.

Evaluation Management

Regarding training in tasks and procedures related to program evaluation management, the majority of respondents in both groups indicated that all listed areas were important and were not already part of students training programs (Table 27).

Table 27. Priority Areas for Graduate Specialization in Evaluation Management

Evaluation Management	Faculty[1]		Graduate Students[2]	
	Important, already get	Important, training needed	Important, already get	Important, training needed
Proposals/funding for evaluations	5%	71%	18%	67%
Managing evaluations	9%	65%	16%	65%
Creating budgets	13%	63%	21%	64%
Writing evaluation reports	23%	61%	25%	61%
Disseminating results to community	19%	58%	20%	65%
Recommendations for community partners	15%	57%	16%	65%
Writing formal agreements	9%	57%	14%	68%
Framing evaluation questions	30%	54%	30%	55%
Engaging/collaborating communities	26%	51%	23%	66%

[1]Note. *N*= 104; Missing data 21% to 22%
[2] *N*=577; Missing ranged from 0.2% to 1.6%

Comments

Faculty/staff. Faculty/staff were asked if they had any other comments about the need for graduate training in evaluation. Twenty-one respondents answered this question. Their responses can be segmented into two themes: (a) the need for graduate student evaluation training, and (b) suggestions for possible program approaches and content.

Students' need for evaluation training. Most of the respondents felt there was a need for graduate training in evaluation; while several were unsure about how many graduate students would have the time or the interest to take additional classes, many stated the information would be very valuable to the students. Several respondents felt their department already covered some aspects of evaluation in their course sequences, but thought that additional information would benefit students.

> Although many of these features are covered in our research sequences, there is the need for more depth and focus. So my indication that it is covered should not be interpreted as "covered thoroughly." There is a place for greater depth, detail and focus. *–Faculty/staff respondent*

Need for gap analysis. Several faculty/staff stated that they felt the specialization was a good idea but encouraged CERC to both conduct a Needs Assessment to determine what opportunities are already available on campus for students and to work with faculty to get more buy-in.

Graduate students. Many graduate student respondents felt the evaluation specialization would benefit them and suggested some potential ways that CERC can support them in program evaluation. It should be noted that there were quite a few respondents who stated that they would be interested in participating in an evaluation specialization, but that it would come too late in their program. Others stated that they would be interested, but were too busy to add additional requirements to their current program.

Many graduate student respondents recognized the "value-added" aspect of evaluation training and felt that both graduate students and undergraduates should take evaluation courses. They felt that evaluation training could help prepare students in key aspects of program evaluation and would be valuable to their professional careers. They suggested several ways CERC could provide training opportunities in program evaluation. These suggestions included both classroom-based training and hands-on training.

Classroom-based training. Many respondents suggested that CERC offer seminars or workshops to graduate students. Suggested topics included "integrity in research," "appreciative inquiry," and "participatory action research." Respondents suggested that students could even get credit for attending these sessions.

> Having workshops in program evaluation and community-based research would be a great opportunity that I think students would take advantage of.—*Graduate student respondent*

A few students suggested that CERC offer online or distance learning for students who do not live in the East Lansing area.

> Information and training must consider students who are not on campus and/or do not live in Lansing. Many Ph.D. students involved in state projects live outside of Lansing and are commuters.

Hands-on training. In addition to classroom-based training, graduate students asked for hands-on training. Many felt that they receive important evaluation knowledge in the classroom, but do not really know how to apply the knowledge to a real-world evaluation. When the respondents discussed hands-on training, they mentioned everything from project management to working with community stakeholders.

> …I think it is critically important that students get hands-on, "real world" experience working on evaluation projects in order to know how to work with community partners/clients. I think that much of what someone needs to know when doing evaluation is how to work through difficult situations and how to work collaboratively various stakeholders, if that is what the evaluation calls for.—*Graduate student respondent*

Additional suggestions for support included graduate assistantships in evaluation and providing students with more information about CERC and more evaluation information.

References

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). Establishing essential competencies for program evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26,* 43-59.

Appendix A: Surveys

1. Community Evaluation and Research Center at Michigan State University

MSU's Community Evaluation and Research Center (CERC) is collecting information on the program evaluation activities and interests of MSU faculty and staff and the evaluation training needs of graduate students. Your answers to this research survey will inform CERC's programs related to program evaluation research support activities for faculty, staff, and students.

Your answers will be kept confidential to the maximum extent allowable by law. No information will be reported about any individual person's responses; we will only report the responses of groups of individuals.

Your participation is voluntary—you may choose not to participate, you may refuse to answer certain questions, and you may stop at any time without penalty.

If you decide to complete the survey, please proceed by clicking on the link below. If this does not automatically take you to the location, please copy and paste or type the link into your web browser's address window. This survey should take about 15-20 minutes to complete.

If you have any questions about this evaluation, please contact the investigator, Dr. Laurie A. Van Egeren. You can contact her at 93 Kellogg Center, East Lansing, MI 48824; telephone: 517-353-8977, e-mail: vanegere@msu.edu.

2. Demographics

1. Name

2. Primary Department:

3. What is your academic rank?

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor
- Academic Specialist
- Research Associate
- Other (please specify)

4. What training, if any, have you had in program evaluation? (Check all that apply)

- Earned a Ph.D. in evaluation studies
- Earned an M.A. in evaluation studies

- ⊝ Earned an evaluation specialization/certificate
- ⊝ Completed evaluation coursework
- ⊝ Attended evaluation workshops
- ⊝ Completed coursework in research design and methods
- ⊝ Self-taught
- ⊝ None
- ⊝ Other (please specify)

[   ]

5. How many years have you been conducting evaluations

- ○ I do not conduct evaluations myself, but have been associated with them
- ○ This is my first year
- ○ 1-5 years
- ○ 6-10 years
- ○ 11-15 years
- ○ 16-20 years
- ○ More than 20 years

3. Faculty Needs

6. How interested are you in the following?

	Not at all interested	A little interested	Somewhat interested	Very interested
Participating in learning groups focused around specific evaluation topics?	○	○	○	○
Attending evaluation-focused brown bags?	○	○	○	○
Presenting at a brown bag on your evaluation experiences or methods?	○	○	○	○
Participating in gatherings of MSU faculty/staff to network with other individuals conducting program evaluation?	○	○	○	○
Being on a listserve that provides information on evaluation opportunities, communities looking to develop partnerships, and other issues related to evaluation?	○	○	○	○
Supervising graduate students conducting an evaluation to fulfill the requirements of an evaluation training program - if it is not part of your existing research/evaluation work?	○	○	○	○
Participating in collaborative evaluation projects?	○	○	○	○

7. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about potential ways CERC can support faculty and staff conducting program evaluation?

8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
In my discipline, there are job opportunities that require expertise in program evaluation.	○	○	○	○
Graduate students in my department have opportunities to get hands-on evaluation experience.	○	○	○	○
Graduate students in my department have opportunities to form their own partnerships with community partners.	○	○	○	○
Graduate students in my department are already able to fulfill their needs for working on evaluation projects.	○	○	○	○

9. In your opinion, to what extent would graduate students in your department benefit from a specialization that would address how to:

	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	A great deal
Evaluate programs/initiatives?	○	○	○	○
Engage and collaborate with communities on community-based research?	○	○	○	○
Engage and collaborate with communities on program evaluation projects?	○	○	○	○
In your opinion, to what extent would graduate students in your department be interested in getting a specialization in program evaluation (that would be recorded on their transcripts)?	○	○	○	○

10. In your opinion, how important are the following key areas for a graduate specialization in program evaluation and community-based research?

	Not important	Important; but they already get this	Important; training opportunities are needed	Don't know
Evaluation theories and approaches	○	○	○	○
Engaging/collaborating with communities	○	○	○	○
Formative evaluation	○	○	○	○
Summative evaluation	○	○	○	○
Participatory/empowerment evaluation	○	○	○	○

Utilization-focused evaluation	jn	jn	jn	jn
Evaluability assessment	jn	jn	jn	jn
Logic modeling	jn	jn	jn	jn
Framing evaluation questions	jn	jn	jn	jn
Experimental design	jn	jn	jn	jn
Quasi-experimental design	jn	jn	jn	jn
Multivariate methods	jn	jn	jn	jn
Hierarchical linear modeling	jn	jn	jn	jn
Social network analysis	jn	jn	jn	jn
Qualitative methods	jn	jn	jn	jn
Developing recommendations for community partners	jn	jn	jn	jn
Writing evaluation reports	jn	jn	jn	jn
Disseminating results to the community	jn	jn	jn	jn
Managing evaluations	jn	jn	jn	jn
Seeking funding and writing proposals for evaluations	jn	jn	jn	jn
Writing formal agreements	jn	jn	jn	jn
Creating budgets	jn	jn	jn	jn
Critiquing a proposed evaluation design and analysis	jn	jn	jn	jn

11. Do you have any other comments about needs for graduate training in program evaluation?

12. Does your department/unit/institute/program offer courses in Program Evaluation?

jn Yes

jn No

5. Department Courses

13. What are the course titles and/or numbers?

1) [   ]

2) [   ]

3) [   ]

4) [   ]

5) [   ]

14. Do you teach any of these classes?

jn Yes

jn No

15. If yes, which evaluation class do you teach?

[   ]

16. Are students outside of your department able to take this evaluation class?

jn Yes

jn No

17. Are you interested in opening the evaluation class to students outside your department?

jn Yes

jn Occasionally

jn No

6. Networking about Evaluation

The next section informs our effort to grow MSU's evaluation and community-based research network.

18. What other MSU faculty and staff should we contact to get their opinion about the need for evaluation support and training programs? Please feel free to list departments/centers/institutes if you do not have a specific name.

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

19. Within MSU, who would you most likely contact if you had a question about designing an evaluation? (list up to three INDIVIDUALS)

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

20. Within MSU, who would you most likely contact if you had a question about partnering together on an evaluation project? (list up to three INDIVIDUALS)

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

21. Within MSU, who would you most likely contact if you had a question about collaborating with community partners? (list up to three INDIVIDUALS)

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

22. Within MSU, who would you most likely contact if you had a question about using quantitative methods in an evaluation? (list up to three INDIVIDUALS)

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

23. Within MSU, who would you contact if you had a question about using qualitative methods in an evaluation? (list up to three INDIVIDUALS)

1) [   ]

2) [   ]

3) [   ]

7. Your Evaluation Work

24. How does your evaluation work fit into your area of research?

- ◯ Not at all
- ◯ Somewhat
- ◯ It is my main area of research

25. How have you disseminated your evaluation findings? (Check all that apply.)

- ◻ Peer-reviewed journals
- ◻ Trade/professional journals
- ◻ Technical reports
- ◻ Academic conferences
- ◻ Conferences for practitioners

- ◻ Speaking engagements
- ◻ Evaluation briefs
- ◻ Websites
- ◻ White papers
- ◻ Other (please specify)
  [   ]

26. What is the general scope of the evaluations you conduct? (Check all that apply.)

- ◻ Local
- ◻ State
- ◻ National
- ◻ International
- ◻ Multi-scaled (e.g. local and state; state and national, etc.)
- ◻ Other (please specify)
  [   ]

27. What sources have funded your evaluation work? (Check all that apply.)

- ◻ Local government
- ◻ State government
- ◻ Federal government
- ◻ Individual schools or school districts

- ◻ Foundations
- ◻ International government
- ◻ International, non-governmental organizations
- ◻ Internal MSU sources

- ∈ Non-profit organizations
- ∈ For-profit organizations
- ∈ Other (please specify)

[   ]

28. Overall, what percentage of your time do you spend on evaluation projects?

% [   ]

29. In what topic areas have you conducted evaluations? (Check all that apply.)

- ∈ Agriculture
- ∈ Alcohol/drug abuse or mental health
- ∈ Arts and culture
- ∈ Business and industry
- ∈ College access programs
- ∈ Community and economic development
- ∈ Comprehensive community evaluations
- ∈ Crime and justice
- ∈ Disaster and emergency management

- ∈ Distance education and other educational technologies
- ∈ Education (PreK-12)
- ∈ Environmental, natural resources
- ∈ Extension education
- ∈ Health
- ∈ Human services
- ∈ Indigenous populations
- ∈ International and cross-cultural
- ∈ Lesbian, gay, transgender issues

- ∈ Nonprofit and foundations
- ∈ Policy change
- ∈ Post-secondary education
- ∈ Recreation
- ∈ Research, technology, and development
- ∈ Special needs populations
- ∈ Systems change
- ∈ Youth development
- ∈ Other (please specify)

[   ]

30. For which of the following purposes have you conducted evaluations? (Check all that apply.)

- ∈ Policy analysis
- ∈ Needs assessment
- ∈ Stakeholder empowerment
- ∈ Evaluation of program processes
- ∈ Program improvement/formative evaluation

- ∈ Evaluation of program outcomes and impacts
- ∈ Organizational learning/capacity building
- ∈ Cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit analysis
- ∈ To improve evaluation methods and designs
- ∈ Other (please specify)

[   ]

31. Which of the following designs have you used in your evaluation work? (Check all that apply.)

- ∈ Experimental designs
- ∈ Quasi-experimental designs
- ∈ Non-experimental designs
- ∈ Case study designs

- ∈ Cluster designs
- ∈ Mixed-method designs
- ∈ Other (please specify)

[   ]

32. Which of the following methods of QUANTITATIVE data collection have you

used in your evaluation work? (Check all that apply.)

- € I do not use quantitative data
- € Survey/questionnaire/checklist
- € Secondary data (census, etc)
- € Other (please specify)

[   ]

33. Which of the following QUANTITATIVE data analysis methods have you used in your evaluation work?
(Check all that apply.)

- € I do not collect quantitative data
- € Cluster analysis
- € Correlations
- € GIS mapping
- € Multiple regression
- € Loglinear modeling

- € Multilevel modeling (HLM)
- € Structural equation modeling (SEM)/Path analysis
- € Social network analysis
- € Tests of mean differences
- € Other (please specify)

[   ]

34. Which of the following QUALITATIVE data collection methods have you used in your evaluation work? (Check all that apply.)

- € I do not collect qualitative data
- € Interviews
- € Focus groups
- € Observations
- € Document review
- € Other (please specify)

[   ]

35. Which of the following approaches to qualitative data analysis have you used in your evaluation work? (Check all that apply.)

- € I do not collect qualitative data
- € Grounded theory
- € Phenomenology
- € Content analysis
- € Inductive analysis
- € Other (please specify)

[   ]

36. Is there anything else you would like to comment on?

[text area field]

37. You may contact me with a follow-up survey in later years.

ⓙ Yes

ⓙ No

38. Send me information about upcoming CERC activities.

ⓙ Yes

ⓙ No

8. The End

Thank you for participating in this survey

Community Evaluation and Research Center at Michigan State University

MSU's Community Evaluation and Research Center (CERC) is collecting information on the program evaluation activities, interests and evaluation training needs of MSU graduate students. Your answers to this research survey will inform CERC's future programming activities for graduate students.

Individuals trained in program evaluation work with community organizations, such as schools, nonprofit organizations, and governmental organizations to assess how well programs are working and how they can be improved to meet their goals. They use a wide variety of research skills to study program effectiveness and impacts.

Your answers will be kept confidential to the maximum extent allowable by law. No information will be reported about any individual person's responses; we will only report the responses of groups of individuals.

Your participation is voluntary—you may choose not to participate, you may refuse to answer certain questions, and you may stop at any time without penalty.

If you decide to complete the survey, please proceed by answering below. This survey should take about 10 minutes to complete.

If you have any questions about this evaluation, please contact the investigator, Dr. Laurie A. Van Egeren. You can contact her at 93 Kellogg Center, East Lansing, MI 48824; telephone: 517-353-8977, e-mail: vanegere@msu.edu.

Are you interested in continuing with the survey?

○ Yes, take me to the survey
○ No, I'd like to exit

Demographics

What is your gender?

○ Female
○ Male

What year are you in graduate school?

○ 1st year
○ 2nd year
○ 3rd year
○ 4th year
○ 5th + year

What level of degree are you currently working toward?

- ◯ Masters
- ◯ Ph.D.
- ◯ MD,DO
- ◯ DSM
- ◯ JD

Other (please specify)

[   ]

In what department are you doing your graduate studies?

- ◯ Agricultural Economics
- ◯ Anthropology
- ◯ Business
- ◯ Communication
- ◯ Community, Agriculture, Recreation, and Resource Studies
- ◯ Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education
- ◯ Criminal Justice
- ◯ Crop and Soil Sciences
- ◯ Education
- ◯ Family and Child Ecology
- ◯ Fisheries and Wildlife
- ◯ Food Science and Human Nutrition
- ◯ Geography
- ◯ History
- ◯ Hospitality and Business
- ◯ Human Medicine
- ◯ Journalism
- ◯ Labor and Industrial Relations
- ◯ Linguistic, Germanic, Slavic, Asian, and African Languages
- ◯ Marketing and Supply Chain Management
- ◯ Music
- ◯ Nursing
- ◯ Osteopathic Medicine
- ◯ Political Science
- ◯ Psychology
- ◯ Social Work
- ◯ Sociology
- ◯ Statistics and Probability
- ◯ Zoology

Other (please specify)

[   ]

What will you get your degree in? (e.g., Community-Ecological Psychology, Educational Administration, Agricultural Economic Development)

[   ]

Experience with Program Evaluation

How familiar are you with the field of program evaluation?

- jn Not at all familiar
- jn A little familiar
- jn Pretty familiar
- jn Very familiar

What training, if any, have you had in program evaluation? (Check all that apply)

- ∊ None
- ∊ Earned an evaluation specialization/certificate
- ∊ Completed evaluation coursework
- ∊ Attended evaluation workshops
- ∊ Completed coursework in research design and methods
- ∊ Self-taught
- ∊ Other (please specify)

[   ]

Have you ever conducted your own evaluation or assisted with an evaluation? (check all that apply)

- ∊ I have conducted my own evaluation
- ∊ I have assisted with an evaluation
- ∊ I have not done any evaluation work

Send me information about upcoming CERC activities.

- jn Yes
- jn No

Graduate Student Needs

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
In my discipline, there are job opportunities that require expertise in program evaluation.	○	○	○	○
I have opportunities to get hands-on evaluation experience.	○	○	○	○
I have opportunities to form my own partnerships with community partners.	○	○	○	○
I am able to fulfill my need for working on evaluation projects.	○	○	○	○

In your opinion, to what extent would you benefit from a specialization that would address how to:

	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	A great deal
Evaluate programs/initiatives?	○	○	○	○
Engage and collaborate with communities on community-based research?	○	○	○	○
Engage and collaborate with communities on program evaluation projects?	○	○	○	○

How interested would you be in participating in a specialization in program evaluation (that would be recorded on your transcript)?

○ Not interested

○ I might be interested; I'd like to hear more

○ Definitely interested

Do you have any other comments or suggestions about potential ways CERC can support graduate students interested in program evaluation?

In your opinion, how important are the following key areas for a graduate specialization in program evaluation and community-based research?

	Not important	Important; but I can already get this	Important; training opportunities are needed	Don't know
Evaluation theories and approaches	◯	◯	◯	◯
Engaging/collaborating with communities	◯	◯	◯	◯
Logic modeling	◯	◯	◯	◯
Framing evaluation questions	◯	◯	◯	◯
Experimental design	◯	◯	◯	◯
Quasi-experimental design	◯	◯	◯	◯
Multivariate methods	◯	◯	◯	◯
Hierarchical linear modeling	◯	◯	◯	◯
Social network analysis	◯	◯	◯	◯
Qualitative methods	◯	◯	◯	◯
Developing recommendations for community partners	◯	◯	◯	◯
Writing evaluation reports	◯	◯	◯	◯
Disseminating results to the community	◯	◯	◯	◯
Managing evaluations	◯	◯	◯	◯
Seeking funding and writing proposals for evaluations	◯	◯	◯	◯
Writing formal agreements	◯	◯	◯	◯
Creating budgets	◯	◯	◯	◯
Critiquing a proposed evaluation design and analysis	◯	◯	◯	◯

Do you have any other comments about needs for graduate training in program evaluation?

Is there anything else you would like to comment on?

The End

Thank you!