

## FIPSE's Project Effectiveness Evidence for the Public (PEEP)



**Purpose:** To make evidence of project effectiveness available to the public in a searchable format via the FIPSE online database. FIPSE wants to enable members of the postsecondary education community and the public to find out not only what FIPSE funded, but also to what extent the projects led to improved student learning, faculty development, and/or institutional change. By making the evidence of project impact more readily accessible, FIPSE hopes to encourage the adoption of the best projects as national models.

PEEP is a pilot program and the first data on project effectiveness should begin appearing in the FIPSE database in 2013. Data will be collected from winners of FIPSE competitive grants only. Congressionally-directed grants, commonly known as earmarks, are non-competitive grants and will not be included.

### **What a competitive grantee must submit with his/her final evaluation report:**

1. The number of students and/or faculty impacted by the activities of this grant during the grant period. This must be an actual number. (If it is a grant focusing on institutional change, grantees can count the entire enrollment at the institution plus faculty.)
2. An executive summary of the evidence (two pages maximum) that the project improved student learning, increased faculty development, and/or led to institutional change.
3. A detailed explanation of the evidence that the project improved student learning, increased faculty development, and/or led to institutional change. The length should be approximately twenty pages. This is the outside evaluator's final report.

### **What the public will see at the bottom of the grant abstract page in the FIPSE database sixty days after the final report is reviewed by FIPSE's evaluator:**

- A. **A PDF of the two-page executive summary of evaluation data that the project director submitted.** The summary will include the number of students and faculty impacted by the activities of the grant. With the PDF will be a disclaimer from FIPSE that *"All data presented here were submitted by the project director and have **not** been independently verified by FIPSE or the U.S. Department of Education. Data on the number of students and faculty impacted are provided to help the public put the evaluation evidence in context. Please keep in mind that FIPSE funds innovative pilot projects and some of these are quite small by design."*
- B. **An overall score for evidence that the project improved student learning.** *For an explanation of the score categories and the negotiation process, see below.*
- C. **An overall score for evidence that the project led to faculty development.** *For an explanation of the score categories and the negotiation process, see below.*

- D. **An overall score for evidence that the project led to institutional change.** *For an explanation of the score categories and the negotiation process, see below.*
- E. **Optional. A PDF of the full evaluation report submitted with the final report.** This is optional and the decision to post rests with the project director. This would be posted with the following disclaimer *“All data presented here were submitted by the project director and have **not** been independently verified by FIPSE or the U.S. Department of Education.”*

### **How the public will find projects which are supported by strong evaluation evidence:**

The search menu in the FIPSE database will be modified to allow the public to search for projects with a particular score on items B, C, or D above. This will enable the public to search, for example, for Comprehensive Program STEM projects that address remedial mathematics learning, were awarded to community colleges, and submitted moderate or substantial evidence that they improved student learning.

### **Score Categories to be used with B, C, and D above.**

*(The example contains wording for student learning which would be changed to read faculty development or institutional change as appropriate.)*

Based on *all* evaluation data submitted to FIPSE by the end of the project, FIPSE’s evaluator rated evidence of project impact as follows:

0. N/A. Improving student learning was not a goal of the project.
1. No evidence of improved student learning was submitted. Project satisfaction data may have been submitted.
2. The evaluation data collected indicate that the activities implemented by this project **did not** improve student learning in this setting. *FIPSE funds innovative pilot projects; a certain percentage of them are not as effective as anticipated despite being implemented as proposed.*
3. Student learning improved. Evidence was slight.
4. Student learning improved. Evidence was moderate.
5. Student learning improved. Evidence was substantial.

### **Implementation Timeline and Score Negotiation:**

- This rating system will be introduced to FY 2010 grantees at the December 2010 PD Meeting. It would only be applied to FY 2010 and subsequent grantees. Note that ratings would only appear **after the project has been closed out**. This means that most ratings would not start to appear on the FIPSE database Web site until 2013 or later.
- After review of all of the final evaluation data, all project directors would be told their scores for evaluation evidence. They would then be given sixty days to submit additional evaluation data on project effectiveness to FIPSE’s evaluator, Dr. Susan Lehmann. Only after the sixty day grace period passed would scores being posted in the FIPSE database.

- The score could be upgraded at any time in the future if project directors chose to submit additional information. We expect that this will create an incentive for grantees to collect follow-on data after the project ends and to submit the data to FIPSE.
- A rating could be applied to pre-FY 2010 grantees at the project director's request. Some pre-FY 2010 grantees may want this rating. There are many pre-FY 2010 grantees who would receive high marks because they did a wonderful job of assessing the impact of their projects.