

# Smile sheets are not enough: An effective, systematic approach to program and educational evaluation using CIPP

IAACE Annual Conference  
April 27, 2017

## Introductions

- Name
- Affiliation
- What will make this a successful session for you?
- Key elements of evaluation

## Some other definitions, elements:

“Program evaluation is most often defined as a process used to determine whether the design and delivery of a program were effective and whether the proposed outcomes were met.”

Caffarella, R.S., Daffron, S. R. (2013). *Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. p. 233.

“Evaluation is the systematic assessment of the operation and/or outcome of a program.”

Milanesi, L. (2016). In *The Scholar-Practitioner’s Guide to Research Design*, G. Burkholder, K. Cox, & L. Crawford (Eds.). (p. 260). Baltimore, MD: Laureate Publishing.

“Program evaluation is the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristic, and outcomes of programs to make judgments about the program, improve program effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about future programming. . . . Evaluation research, quite broadly, can include any effort to judge or enhance human effectiveness through systematic data-based inquiry.”

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. p. 10

“I proposed that evaluation be redefined as a process of providing useful information for decision making.”

Stufflebeam, D. (1983). In *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. G. F. Madaus, M. Scriven, D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.). Hingham, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

“Evaluation – the process of delineating, obtaining, and applying descriptive and judgmental information – concerning the merit of an educational or training program’s goals, plans, processes, and products – in order to serve decision making and accountability relative to that program; using measurement data to judge the worth or merit of an object.”

Schoch, K. W. (1990). *A comparison of management development evaluation methods in selected healthcare institutions with a recognized educational evaluation model*. Doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

“The concept of evaluation underlying the CIPP Model and this checklist is that evaluations should assess and report an entity’s merit (i.e., its quality), worth (in meeting needs of targeted beneficiaries), probity (its integrity, honesty, and freedom from graft, fraud, and abuse), and significance (its importance beyond the entity’s setting or time frame), and should also present lessons learned. . . . The model’s main theme is that evaluation’s most important purpose is not to prove, but to improve.”

Stufflebeam, D. L. (March, 2007). CIPP Model Evaluation Checklist, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.  
<http://www.wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists>

Key characteristics to identify from these definitions:

---

---

## The CIPP Model

### C – Context

Intent: Assess needs, assets, and problems within a defined environment

Considerations

Outcome

### I – Input

Intent: Assess competing strategies and the work plans and budgets of the selected approach

Considerations

Outcome

### P – Process

Intent: Monitor, document, and assess program activities

Considerations

Outcome

### P – Product

Intent – see below

Considerations

Outcome

- Impact: Assess a program's reach to the target audience

- **Effectiveness:** Document and assess the quality and significance of outcomes
- **Sustainability:** Assess the extent to which a program’s contributions are institutionalized successfully and continued over time
- **Transportability:** Assess the extent to which a program has (or could be) successfully adapted and applied elsewhere

Other considerations:

- Cyclical
- Contracting
- Meta-evaluation

### Exercise:

<p>Given the CIPP principles, design an evaluation scheme for this session. What would you include in:</p> <p>C – Context</p> <p>I – Input</p> <p>P – Process</p> <p>P – Product</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact</li> <li>• Effectiveness</li> <li>• Sustainability</li> <li>• Transportability:</li> </ul>	<p>Discuss with someone a program, project, or curriculum you have in place or are considering implementing.</p> <p>What is your current evaluation strategy?</p> <p>Which elements of the CIPP model might be appropriate or useful for you to use?</p> <p>How might you go about implementing elements of CIPP with this program?</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Evaluation using the CIPP model

- Combs, K. L., Gibson, S.K., Hays, J. M., Saly, J. & Wendt, J.T. (2008). Enhancing curriculum and delivery: Linking assessment to learning objectives. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(1), 87-102.
- Felix, J. L. (1979). Research and evaluation to improve instruction: The Cincinnati strategy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1(2), 57-62.
- Matthews, J. M., & Hudson, A. M. (2001). Guidelines for evaluating parent training projects. *Family Relations*, 50(1), 77-86.
- Nicholson, T. (1989). Using the CIPP model to evaluate reading instruction. *Journal of Reading*, 32(4), 312-318.
- Schoch, K. W. (1990). *A comparison of management development evaluation methods in selected healthcare institutions with a recognized educational evaluation model*. Doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Schoch, K.W. (2004). Unpublished evaluation project: Executive Service Corps Management Assistance Program.
- Steinert, Y., Cruess, S., Cruess, R., & Snell, L. (2005). Faculty development for teaching and evaluating professionalism: From project design to curriculum change. *Medical Education*, 39(2), 127-136.
- Tokmak, H.S., Baturay, H. M., and Fadde, P. (March, 2013). Applying the context, input, process, product evaluation model for evaluation, research, and redesign of an online master's program. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 14(3), 273-293.
- Zhang, G., Zeller, N., Robin Griffith, R., Metcalf, D., Williams, J., Shea, C., and Misulis, K. (2011). Using the Context, Input, Process, and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP) as a Comprehensive Framework to Guide the Planning, Implementation, and Assessment of Service-learning Programs. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. 15(4), 57-84.

Smile sheets are not enough: An effective, systematic approach to program and educational evaluation using CIPP

April 27, 2017

Session Evaluation

Lessons learned – what might you implement next week?

Lingering questions

What went well?

Opportunities for improvement