



OSU EVALUATION CONFERENCE – FEBRUARY 2013

A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR TITLE VI CENTERS: CASE EXAMPLES FROM U OF ILLINOIS

Lizanne DeStefano, I-STEM
Elizabeth Hanauer, Center for Global Studies
Alisha Kirchoff, Russian, East European, and Eurasian Center
Matt Rosenstein, European Union Center
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Evaluating Joint Center Outreach Programs Case example: International Summer Institute (ISI)



The International Summer Institute (ISI)

The ISI is an annual outreach activity organized jointly by the Area Studies Centers at *Illinois*. The ISI targets K-12 and community college educators and aims to provide a mix of content and pedagogy on global issues. Past topics include: World Economies and Globalization, Multiple Perspectives in Teaching World History, and Global Protest Movements. Participating teachers are recruited nationwide and can earn continuing education credit.

Objectives for Evaluation of Joint Outreach Programs

1. *Content*: To what extent have Center resources, activities, and training programs had a significant impact on the university, community, region, and nation? What was the quality of these resources, activities, and training programs? How can these be improved? What additional resources are needed to support and sustain improvement?
2. *Administration*: In what ways could Centers improve the promotion and reporting of program activities and information, both individually and collectively, in order to attain the overarching NRC program goals at the university, community, region, and nation?

Evaluation Methods

- External Evaluator
- Longitudinal program evaluation (2004-present)
- Mixed-Method approach: participant surveys, interviews with participants and Center staff, and observations

Findings

- The value of using an external evaluator: objectivity, ability to use qualitative methods during the event
- Because the evaluation was developed in tandem with the program, staff have been able to shape and improve the program content and administration based on consistent feedback from evaluations: quality of presentation types, types of presenters (eg. 2 of the 3 highest rated sessions were presented by former classroom teachers) motivation for attending, promotion of the program etc.
- Challenges: measuring impact down the road – do teachers integrate what they've learned into their classroom practice

Evaluating Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships (FLAS)



For several years, the Title VI NRCs at *Illinois* have engaged in a collaborative evaluation of FLAS programming. In that time, a total of 187 fellows' experiences have been reported and assessed. Based on this feedback, *Illinois* has been able to make adjustments to administration of the program and track the progress of FLAS alumni.

Objectives for FLAS Evaluation:

1. Directly assess the experiences of students concerned from application process to award administration;
2. Gather suggestions for improving the administration of the program;
3. Determine why students are seeking FLAS support;
4. Assess career goals, professional objectives of applicants;
5. Identify the best ways to reach students with FLAS advertising materials, especially among those in professional degree programs.

Evaluation Methods

- External evaluator; evaluation instruments developed with input from Center staff;
- Single method approach: web-based evaluation form;
- Carry out evaluation at the end of each fellowship term (August-September for summer fellows, May-June for AY fellows)

Findings

- In general, the number of students who report overall satisfaction with the program has increased over time. FLAS coordinators have responded to suggestions and concerns voiced by respondents and have made concrete changes to the program as a result.
- Developed during the 2010–2011 academic year and in keeping with one of the key 2007–2010 summative evaluation report recommendations for FLAS administration, Center staff at Illinois established a “FLAS Taskforce Committee” that functions to organize administrative oversight and exchange programmatic information. The Taskforce is charged with streamlining processes such as improving the programmatic administrative oversight related to deadlines and promotion as well as coordinating communication with FLAS recipients concerning registration, payments, transcripts, and study abroad.
- The ongoing, collective evaluation procedure allows for centers to identify trends among fellows across centers and provide both a responsive reply to any matters that arise and offer timely reports to Title VI.

Illinois FLAS DATA POINTS & TRENDS 2009-2012

FY and the Corresponding FLAS Fellowships (Total N= 187)

FY 09 (N=64)	FY 10 (N=66)	FY 11 (N=57)
Academic Year 2009-2010 (N=26)	Academic Year 2010-2011 (N=45)	Academic Year 2011-2012 (N=32)
Summer 2010 (N=38)	Summer 2011 (N=21)	Summer 2012 (N=25)

1. Degrees Fellows Working Towards During Award Period

FY 09 (N=64)	FY 10 (N=66)	FY 11 (N=57)
Bachelors 9% (6)	Bachelors 9% (6)	Bachelors 18% (10)
Masters 53% (34)	Masters 44% (29)	Masters 33% (19)
Doctorate 38% (24)	Doctorate 57% (31)	Doctorate 49% (28)

2. Disciplines Represented (average based on both AY and Summer responses for each FY)

FY 09	FY 10	FY 11
16 Disciplines	20 Disciplines	20 Disciplines

3. Colleges Represented (total count for both AY and Summer responses for each FY)

FY 09	FY 10	FY 11
9 Colleges (LAS, ED, ENG, GSLIS, LAW, FAA, BUS, SLER, and AHS)	9 Colleges (LAS, FAA, ACES, GSLIS, LAW, SLER, ED, Media, and ENG)	9 Colleges (LAS, FAA, AHS, ENG, GLIS, SLER, ED, BUS, and SW)

4. Languages studied and % LCTLs

FY 09	FY 10	FY 11
Academic Year 2009-2010 16 Languages (15 of which were LCTLs—94%)	Academic Year 2010-2011 23 Languages (19 of which were LCTLs—83%)	Academic Year 2011-2012 17 Languages (13 of which were LCTLs—76%)
Summer 2010 16 Languages (15 of which were LCTLs—94%)	Summer 2011 16 Languages (14 of which were LCTLs—88%)	Summer 2012 15 Languages (11 of which were LCTLs—73%)

5. Proficiency level within language (self-rated proficiency as “mostly” or “totally”)

FY 09 (N=64)	FY 10 (N=66)	FY 11 (N=57)
19% (12 out of 64)	26% (17 out of 66)	47% (27 out of 57)

6. Language expectations met

FY 09 (N=64)	FY 10 (N=66)	FY 11 (N=57)
89% (57 out of 64 agreed)	89% (59 out of 66 agreed)	92% (52 out of 57 agreed)

7. Post-degree employment/study plans

FY 09 (N=64)		FY 10 (N=66)		FY 11 (N=57)	
Higher Ed	44% (28)	Higher Ed	39% (26)	Higher Ed	40% (23)
U.S. Gov't	16% (10)	U.S. Gov't	9% (6)	U.S. Gov't	14% (8)
Con't GS	14% (9)	Con't GS	12% (8)	Con't GS	14% (8)
PS for profit	9% (6)	PS for profit	14% (9)	PS for profit	11% (6)
PS non profit	3% (2)	PS non-profit	9% (6)	PS non profit	2% (1)
Int'l Ag out US	6% (4)	Int'l Ag in US	3% (2)	Int'l Ag out US	5% (3)
Int'l Ag in US	2% (1)	St/Local Gov't	3% (2)	Int'l Ag in US	7% (4)
Foreign Gov't	2% (1)	Elem/Sec Ed	3% (2)	Elem/Sec Ed	2% (1)
Undecided	5% (3)	Undecided	5% (3)	Undecided	5% (3)

8. FLAS influence and experience (“Strongly agreed” or “Agreed” on scaled responses)

a. Prepared me for future work/study

FY 09 (N=64)	FY 10 (N=66)	FY 11 (N=57)
83% (53 out of 64)	79% (52 out of 66)	88% (50 out of 57)

b. Enable me to pursue a professional career of my choosing

FY 09 (N=64)	FY 10 (N=66)	FY 11 (N=57)
83% (53 out of 64)	83% (55 out of 66)	82% (47 out of 57)

c. Recommend participating in FLAS to other students

FY 09 (N=64)	FY 10 (N=66)	FY 11 (N=57)
100% (64 out of 64)	100% (66 out of 66)	98% (56 out of 57)

d. Met or exceeded the expectations I held at the onset of my fellowship

FY 09 (N=64)	FY 10 (N=66)	FY 11 (N=57)
86% (55 out of 64)	91% (60 out of 66)	91% (52 out of 57)

Evaluating Academic Programs

Case Example: Master of Arts in European Union Studies Degree Program



The Master of Arts in European Union Studies (MAEUS) program

Since 2010, the European Union Center at *Illinois* has administered a 36 credit hour, two-year interdisciplinary program of language and area studies courses leading to a Master of Arts degree. The program is intended for students seeking to combine area expertise with professional training.

Besides completing two core seminars and demonstrating proficiency of a European foreign language at the advanced level, MAEUS students develop individualized plans of study in one of five possible thematic tracks. Many also pursue internship and study abroad experiences. Most MAEUS students cap the degree with a master's thesis on a topic relevant to the EU.

Objectives for Evaluation of Academic Programs – obtain data from degree program graduates about:

1. Benefits and impact of the degree program
2. Quality of the degree program as described by students pre-admission, during the program of study, and upon graduation (i.e., full “life-cycle”)
3. Suggestions for improving the degree program

Evaluation Methods

- External evaluator; evaluation instruments developed with input from Center staff
- Mixed-method approach: document review, online surveys of program graduates, interviews of program graduates
- Following pilot evaluation in May 2012, intent to carry out annual evaluation in order to develop longitudinal data

Findings

- Comprehensive joint centers evaluation framework allows for customized Center-specific evaluations, which can be replicated in other contexts
- Developing the evaluation instruments in consultation with Center staff enabled assessment of multiple aspects of the program and of resources provided by the Center: program promotion; application and admissions process; orientation materials; program of study, including foreign language training, internship and study abroad opportunities; advising services; co-curricular programming; post-degree/career preparation
- Challenges: measuring impact longer term – how will graduates perceive benefits and impact of the degree program in 2 (...5...10) years? what contributions will the program make via its graduates to broader Title VI objectives (e.g., promoting U.S. global competitiveness, etc.)?