

Promising Evidence and Final Project Evaluations for HEP and CAMP Webinar Transcript

October 16, 2024, 5:01PM

1h 41m 29s

● **Ballard, Katrina** started transcription



Ballard, Katrina 0:14

Good morning and good afternoon everyone.

Welcome to the webinar on promising evidence and final project evaluations for HEP and CAMP.

I'm Katrina Ballard.

Data and evaluation subject matter expert for the office of Migrant Education and I am joined today by my colleagues Dr. Millie Bentley Memon, HEP and CAMP Group Leader and Program officers Dylan Hart Medina and Jessica Stein.

We're also pleased today to have several HEP and CAMP leaders presenting on this topic.

We're so grateful that they're joining and sharing about their work, and we'll have them introduce themselves in a few moments.

Here's our agenda for today. Just as a heads up, we are recording, so please let us, you know, know if you have any questions.

We are going to post the slides and share them on the listserv after this webinar today, so we'll start off by going over our goals for the webinar. We have a few HEP and CAMP evaluation reminders that I'll share.

Before we get into our panel and then we'll get to hear an overview of the HEP and CAMP project evaluations from our three panelists, and we'll have a discussion where we've got some questions prepared in advance.

But then of course, we want to leave time at the end for you all to ask your questions.

You can feel free to enter questions in the chat as we go, but we will save them for that portion at the end.

So our goals today are to provide examples from peers of HEP and CAMP evaluation designs so we can help increase understanding of how to apply the promising evidence criteria.

We also are aiming to support HEP and CAMP grantees in fulfilling the promising

evidence requirement, as described in grant applications, and a third goal is actually to identify additional areas of future technical assistance if needed.

So we would love to hear more, you know from folks about what parts of the evaluation, you know, you are really needing support with the most.

So hopefully we can answer a lot of your questions today.

We may not get to all of them, however, and if, if that's the case, we can follow up with, you know, additional technical assistance or we can follow up with some more answers.

So moving on to our reminders, some of this will look familiar if you were at the annual directors meeting, but we thought a refresher would be helpful.

So why is the Office of Migrant Education collecting the required final project evaluations?

So the evaluation requirement has been part of the HEP and CAMP selection criteria since 2016 because OME understands the importance of gathering evidence about what works for our programs.

So we're now collecting the required evaluations to better understand how our staff can support grantees in two major ways.

The first is evidence about practices that work or don't work for HEP and CAMP is actually currently lacking in the field.

There is not a lot of research currently, so any evaluations with statistically significant findings could help us provide key learnings and guidance to the field about what's working for migratory students.

Second, evaluations could also help OME understand some of the challenges that grantees might face in implementing the evaluation requirement itself, and then again help us at OME provide targeted technical assistance around evaluation.

So again, while the requirement to conduct the evaluation is not a new requirement, the HEP and CAMP final performance report will now require the submission of the final project evaluation beginning in the 2024-2025 reporting period.

So this is optional for the 23-24 reporting period for which we're currently collecting our APRs and FPRs.

This year, as you're submitting, it's optional.

Next year it's required.

So this change again is only to collect the evaluations that have been required already in the past. If you refer back to selection criteria of the funding application, you'll notice that a project evaluation is specified.

The selection criteria from the most recent notice inviting applications are linked at the bottom of the slide here, and this means that projects are already expected to conduct the evaluation that's described in their approved applications.

So that's very important. You want to make sure you're referring to your application. And then there's another reminder.

Here are key parts of the promising evidence definition on the screen.

I do want to emphasize, though again, the most important part of fulfilling the evaluation requirement is to understand what was proposed for an evaluation design in your approved application.

So if you haven't already looked at that, we definitely recommend doing so.

This table here, which we've shared previously, summarizes the difference between the final project evaluation that we're talking about today, that's the one in the selection criteria and other types of evaluations, like a performance evaluation and the final performance report.

So it's a little bit confusing so hopefully this can provide some clarity here.

The final performance report is essentially the same as your APR. It's your APR data. But there are some additional questions that summarize the project's performance, which OME uses for a variety of purposes.

Then, in addition to the FPR, we understand that projects regularly evaluate their project's overall performance.

Or they might ask a mentor to conduct an evaluation their program in the first few years of the grant to identify, you know, things to work on.

These are like performance evaluations, which are a managerial tool.

So they could include staff or student surveys or interviews, observations, descriptive data summaries, and these can be really useful for making decisions about the program overall.

However, performance type evaluations don't meet the requirements of promising evidence for the final project evaluation, so that's the important distinction to understand.

And just one quick one, other quick note on that. The evaluation that we are starting to collect, which is the final project evaluation we're talking about that today, that's designed to produce promising evidence, meaning we should be able to gain some insight about what strategies are working or not working for HEP and CAMP. So rather than kind of summarizing a project more broadly and describing how it works in the in the results, the promising evidence evaluation is examining the effects of a

project component, such as the evidence-based practice that you had in your logic model in your application.

For example, you might be using checking connect or a coaching program or something like that. Your final project evaluation would look at whether the students who received that intervention, whether that's check and connect or coaching or something else, did they perform better than students who did that?

And so the purpose of these final project evaluations are again to help create the evidence base for what's working for migratory students.

It's not just what are the results of the project, but why did we get those results?

And finally, here's an overview of how these new data elements will be implemented.

Again, for this reporting period 2023-2024 that we're currently collecting the APRs and FPRs, these new data elements, which includes the final evaluation and the instructional mode, those are optional.

If you have a final performance report, that's due on October 28th. However, if you received a no-cost extension from the department for the fifth year of your grant, the FDR would be due 120 days after the project period end date.

Again, optional for this reporting period, then for reporting period 2024-2025, this will be required.

And how to submit the final project evaluation is just to send it in an email along with your final performance report as a separate attachment.

We don't have any specific formatting or length requirements. We do recommend that you attach it as one PDF file if possible, which could include appendices, and you would email that to hepcamapr@ed.gov.

And again, we don't have a specific template or format. Really, you're looking at what's in your application. What did you say you were going to do? And that's what you should include in your report.

Our final reminder before we get to the exciting examples.

If your project is planning on a change in scope, you should make sure to be working with your program officer on a prior approval request. The slide here is listing examples of changes in scope, and that does include a change to an evaluation design. We understand some projects have had to adapt their evaluations from what was originally proposed in the approved grant application.

But please note that this does constitute a change in scope for your project. If you haven't already, please read what was proposed under the evaluation section of your application. And if your current evaluation plan is different from what was in your

application, please connect with your program officer for prior approval request. And then if you've already started conducting an evaluation under a new design, you'll likely need to request retroactive prior approval, so please again contact your program officer to discuss this further if needed.

All right, that's enough from me.

We're going to turn it over to each of our panelists now for them to introduce themselves and to hear an overview of their evaluation projects.

And we'll begin with Fabiola Hernandez, director of West Texas A and M University CAMP.

So, Fabiola, I'll turn it over to you. And don't forget to unmute.

 **Hernandez, Fabiola** 11:14

OK. Hello, good morning slash afternoon, everybody. My name is Fabio Hernandez. I am the director for the CAMP program at West Texas A and M University. So for mine, hold on. Am I in charge of my slides?

 **Ballard, Katrina** 11:35

I'll advance the slides for you.

 **Hernandez, Fabiola** 11:36

OK, perfect. For one thing, for mine to keep in mind, I did inherit the grant, but it was already established with the evaluation what we are working with. It was based off of a study, so we're doing the quasi-experimental study with the University of Texas in San Antonio, conducted of a comparison for the first-year experience course for participants and then comparison of students that aren't in that first year experience course. That helps with first year to then going on to the second year.

So that's kind of the information of our study. With us in CAMP, we do have a CAMP IDS course and our students are in that. Our university did establish learning communities, so some students' schedules didn't allow them to be in those.

So they were a lot more specific. Our engineering majors, nursing and AG had their own first year experience course. So then those students that weren't able to be enrolled in our CAMP IDS course. We're providing the services to the students, are the students that are in their first year experience in the CAMP one?

So we're gathering their information of the students that are in the CAMP course with their attendance.

How are they doing with participation? And so with all of that information that we have been able to get is the students that are in the CAMP IDS course have higher retention rates and participation in the program overall versus the ones that aren't in that first year experience.

So that's kind of like the overview of ours and the evaluation that we've had.



Ballard, Katrina 13:35

Thank you so much, Fabiola.

Can't wait to hear more about that during our discussion.

Perfect. So next we'll have Ernest Sanchez, Regents of University of Colorado, UC Boulder – BUENO HEP.

So I'll turn it over to you.

Don't forget to unmute.



Ernesto Sanchez 14:01

Good afternoon, everybody.

My name is Ernesto Sanchez and I am with the University of Colorado with the BUENO HEP program. Very briefly, our evaluation design was based on the model of Daniel Stufflebeam, you know it's got 4 components: context, input, processing product. So very briefly what that all involves it you know for purposes of the evaluation, the evaluator produces questionnaires, does personal interviews and not only with the staff, but with the students as well, to see if the students are receiving, you know for example... formative evaluation that consists of observations, interviews with staff and students, a community partners questionnaire, analysis of project documents. Then from that point we go to summative evaluation, which is analysis of data gathered during the formative stage of evaluation and it would be to answer the following questions: were project goals and objectives met, did staff benefit from professional development, were students' needs met.

So it looks at primarily those, but it other components as well.

So that that's basically a quick overview of our evaluation design.

Now for our for our evidence of promise study. That study was based on the What Works Clearinghouse standards for gaming technology.

The purpose of our evaluation was to evaluate the impact of technology in helping students to master mathematical concepts, particularly in algebra.

Now we did a lot of research. You know, we were trying to find remote games that

would be good for students. And unfortunately, what we found is that really there was nothing out there for adult learners.

The gaming components that we found were basically targeted towards 8th grade students and below.

So what we did is that we uploaded math lessons to Canvas and so we use that as our study. We had like it was like 25 lessons that we uploaded and it all it all connected you know building up towards algebra and then working with algebra, and so we populated Canvas for that purpose and gave our treatment group access to be able to go in and do that work now. When we were trying to figure out, OK, well, who we were going to target, it was actually not a difficult decision. At that time we were doing remote learning, we still are. But we had started remote learning and used Aztec, which we're using as a supplement for our English speaking students, but at that time Aztec was not in Spanish for Spanish our speakers.

So what we did is that we got our students, 24 students, and we had a meeting with them.

We explained in detail what the project was going to encompass, and so we got their buy-in, they'd be willing to participate in the study. And so once they accepted, then what we did is that we randomly divided them into two groups, the treatment group and the control group. So once we had them divided that way, the treatment group, they were responsible for continuing to attend regular sessions and engage with the class. But in addition to that, they were also required to log into Canvas and perform their work online in the Canvas in a timely manner. Now we monitor it, monitored them, we work with them. We met regularly with them. We gave real time feedback as to how they were doing, and we actually would meet with them once a week to see what problems they were having or if they had any questions and you know, so to keep them moving forward.

So the real time feedback was provided. Weekly sessions were how to discuss progress and answer, and then students from both the treatment and control group participated in the regular class sessions.

All right, I apologize. I got a little ahead of myself there. What we did is that we looked at their pre-test scores and then looked at their post-test scores to evaluate what the difference was. The treatment group benefited from the study.

Now the study was conducted throughout a 15 week period.

So what did we find?

So there was a difference. It was a slight difference. It wasn't like a humongous

difference, but there was a difference between the treatment group and the control group. So what did the study revealed was attendance and engagement in the in the treatment group was higher than the control group. The level of improvement between the pre-test and post-test scores for treatment was higher than for the control group. Overall GED completion rates for the treatment group were higher than those for the control group and during math class, students who use Canvas showed improved engagement while participating in discussions about solving algebraic problems, in other words, they're more compelled to engage in discussions and ask questions, and so you could definitely tell that that it really did help them out in in their critical thinking.

In-class instruction coupled with participation in the Canvas learning management system improves student's learning, enhanced students class attendance and contributed to improvement math skills.

What did this do? This actually did inform our practices. What we did is that we extended that to the students that were already using Aztec and we implemented a requirement where they would meet with the instructor on a one-on-one basis, twice a month for 15 minutes to get feedback and to ask questions to make sure that we were providing them with what they needed.

And we actually put a minimum requirement for students to log into Aztec.

Before it was, it was provided as a supplement for them to work on improving their skills, but we actually put in a requirement that they log in from 4:00 to 6:00 hours a week, and we followed up on that to make sure that they that they were doing it.

So really, overall, it really did help to inform services that we were providing to our students.

Now moving forward, we're in our first year of our new grant and so our promise of evidence study this time is going to be in person, but we're going to do what they call the Summer Bridge program and we're going to have a group of students, get that extra treatment of an intensive math study for three weeks, and then we're going to compare them to the students that did not get that in the regular academic school year.

That's what we plan to do. It's somewhat similar, but yet it's a new component because this one's going to be in person. This past one we were doing it with students through remote learning. And of course as you're all aware we had the pandemic. there were a lot of things going on. So we had to be creative and so that's what we did with our study.



Ballard, Katrina 23:21

Thank you, Ernesto. Appreciate that.

Can't wait to hear more.

So now I'll pass it to Michael Heim from Washington State University, HEP and CAMP. And don't forget to unmute.



Heim, Michael D 23:37

Thank you, Katrina. I just had to clear my throat before I unmuted.

My name is Michael Heim. I'm the director for migrant education student access and support, which is also a way to incorporate the HEP and CAMP grants under one umbrella here at Washington State University. And I'm going to go over a little bit of how we decided to build the foundation for an evidence of promise studies within Washington State University through data collection and analysis of that data that we've collected since 2006 for the CAMP.

These slides are just going to go over some bullet points that I hope create an outline for what could be addressed, maybe later in the question and answer section of the presentation.

But in terms of how you want to set up your study, you do want to think about the context, the background history, what elements of the programs are you collecting to essentially identify variables. So the time frame that we have is between 2006 and 2023. And to complete that data collection to cover a longitudinal set of times so we can look at trends within the data.

You have to have a way to collect that data and be diligent in collecting it.

And also storing that data, so record keeping is extremely important for our programs and being able to utilize that for more in-depth data analysis of program variables. Then we want to have a focus on accuracy because deep down, we know that these studies are important and we all want to do a good job of serving our students.

We want to maintain accurate data as we analyze data for any evidence of promise studies that we're going to undertake.

On the next slide, we'll be talking a little bit about the use of that data and how to store it. Reviewing your historical records is my first point because that's where we initially started from at Washington State University, seeing what was already collected and what we had already from each one of the cohorts from 2006 and then

what we needed to fill as a whole that would appear as a gap that would appear in the data. So we took an inventory of what we had and what the variables could be and what needed to be filled in. What we didn't have complete data entry for and then think about what other data points should be collected.

Access to data is important when we're undergoing study such as this. So really what we're looking at, at WSU, is thinking about if we want to maintain FERPA requirements and adherence should be able to see the work that we're doing and eventually also if we're going to enter into research that could be published, what are the requirements that people who are going to be accessing the data and what their focus would be based on IRB requirements within compliance of that at the university level. So all of that together really was our initial focus on how to use the data itself within Washington State University.

Next, when we're thinking about after using the data and how we're going to analyze it, I put this slide up here because this shows how we've been able to collect the data and how we've organized it into buckets.

So when we're thinking about what we're actually looking at in terms of collecting the data and then doing an analysis of it, again to reiterate, you have what we call a variable and variables need to have some type of difference within the data collection that you have.

So what we were looking at here is essentially CAMP students or non-CAMP students that were eligible to participate in CAMP for attending WSU.

So there's a variation between those the variables, you can have two values for that variable, and then we began to compare those.

And so we collected everything. You can see that I've used the old label of GPRA one for a performance measurement 1, GPRA 2 for a performance Measure 2, and then we wanted to make sure that as in the Office of Migrant Education, we're reporting out for our performance measures.

We do a snapshot of time that will be, I would say, one semester later than what institutions generally look at for raw numbers.

We follow retention and completion rates, so we start with pulling the persisters out into a separate column because they'll be included in the next year's data, right? We all know this. But then you have these buckets and you have a control group, and then we looked at what the CAMP and control two year retention would be as a raw number. And then we looked at when we include like the persisters, and everything, by year end to your control group, what that looks like compared to the control

group. And on this table at the end we have CAMP control. These are additional hanging persisters from the current years that we have that we still are going to include in the next year's data moving forward.

And then at the bottom we have used SPSS which I've learned to use over the last couple years. The initial training that I got was also from our very own Doctor Robert Garcia here at HEP and CAMP. And then from there we've built on that and how to include larger data sets and cleaned data sets into SPSS. Turn on variations and see what the different variables are doing in powerful thought and the intention to produce evidence of studying analysis on this particular data set that we have open. So at the bottom you see that with this print out with a standard deviation, that means two values, we even have the P value there at the end and this kind of demonstrates what we knew to be true and we all understand, which is if you're supporting our CAMP students, then the odds are that they're going to be able to be successful within our performance measures and compared to the control group who's not receiving assistance from us.

So when we're thinking about the context of the study, the setup, the use of the data, it's really thinking about CAMP as an entire intervention. CAMP offering a specific set of services that are that are narrow enough and used for a discrete population of students with the migratory farmworker backgrounds and then comparing the control group that doesn't see those services at the university and can't fall within those services.

The next slide I think is getting toward what are we were trying to do.

It was mentioned earlier in the presentation that OME is asking us to include the evaluation sections in our applications, but also to provide that back or the results back for what evidence of promises would be like at the end of our five year cycles. And then also kind of answer the call to what we've been able to do with performance evaluations or formative evaluations within the programs and try and think about how to elevate it a little bit higher so that we can really demonstrate how effective the programming is in CAMP.

And I think that if we're talking about the success of the studies and being able to find the results, these are what essentially we're looking at overall and thinking about.

I think that if you're collecting data like this and analyzing it and looking at different variables, it's answering a lot of questions that people already bring to the table for us.

It's actually it focuses our conversations a little bit more on the interventions that we want to look for in terms of external internal funding from our institutions or community organizations to help make that work sustainable or to increase our effectiveness.

We also end up discovering some unknowns and one of the unknowns that I kind of was able to find that I detailed as part of longitudinal data collection was that we did notice the dip in COVID and that when that started in that cohort from 2020 to 2021. And then we've seen it rebound back up a little bit afterwards as well.

So you have you have a way to think about how students are able to be resilient in a different way as well in the data. And then now you know where to improve your take on that and how is that different. I think that's the end.



Ballard, Katrina 32:52

Thank you, Michael. I'm sure we'll have lots more questions for you, but that was a great introduction.

So thank you to all three of our panelists for sharing those overviews, and I'll now turn it over to Amas, Principal Investigator, Oregon State University HEP and CAMP, to moderate our panel discussion. Amas, if you could introduce yourself, and Amas' screen is not showing, but that's totally fine. We really appreciate your joining us today.



Aduviri, Amas 33:22

Thanks, Katrina. I apologize that my camera decided not to work this morning.

I think it's fortunate for me. Thank you, Fabiola, Michael, Ernesto for sharing your findings and your designs to show promise of evidence.

We have a few questions or I have few questions for you, and question one is here on the screen.

What was your first step in beginning the promise of evidence evaluation, when in the grant did you begin planning for the evaluation? So if you can start, Michael 1st and then Ernesto.



Heim, Michael D 34:01

That's a good question because I think that when we first started, we started this collection and analysis in the previous grant cycle. So at that time we were looking at what was available and retrospectively building that control and putting it together.

And when I think about when we want to plan now, I think that this is kind of dictating the way that we move forward with how we want to evaluate the program. So now we're thinking about whether or not specific interventions would be helpful in addition to just the general CAMP. But we do want to make sure that we're moving forward to provide evidence of promise studies so that we can have something on the books so that we can refer it to saying there's performance measures one and two that we've been able to see as an initial starting point for a study with a control group.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 34:58
Ernesto?

ES **Ernesto Sanchez** 35:00

OK. So when we when we began to planning our promised evidence study, one of the one of the things that we, of course, ours was for gaming technology you know using that strategy to see if technology would actually benefit our students. One of the difficult things, that well actually first of all, one of the things that we had a difficult time with was that we were not finding anything for adult learner as far as math things online. But, but that was OK, because what we did is that we went ahead and built our own using Canvas.

Then the 2nd consideration is OK, well let me see here. How are we going to offer a service to a group of students, not offer to the other students? I mean, we needed to be equitable with that. So that was that was kind of a difficult decision. But then what we got to looking at is that we, we have our English learners and our Spanish learners, then we're like, oh, OK. Well, we have Aztec as a supplement for our English learners, but our Spanish learners, all they have is their instructional support that we provide for them remotely.

So that that's what led us to decide to work or to apply that to our Spanish students in order to make it equitable. We got all of them involved by having a meeting with them, explaining the details of our study and getting confirmation from them that they would be willing to participate in it. And of course they were.

We explained to them that we wouldn't know whether they would be in the treatment group for the control group because this would be decided randomly, OK? Now, I was pretty fortunate because I had an adjunct instructor that had a pretty good statistical background. So he took care of that and we took care of gathering

the data and then once we you know as we worked our way through the study then we can we turn that over to our evaluator and we were able to do the statistical work on that. But that's, you know, really that's the way we set up our study.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 37:35

Thank you, Ernesto. I'm going maybe have Fabiola answer the question, but also my follow up question for Fabiola would be, I know you said you inherited a grant, did you make any request to change the scope for project design or did you continue with what was written in your grant proposal for the promise of evidence.

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 37:56

No, we didn't, we continued doing the evaluation with ours, it's been a thing since even prior to when I was a mentor for the program when I was a student.

So kind of continued with the evaluation. And with ours we I mean we start off early on obviously with the registration, but since then as I mentioned like it has changed.

So now we're trying to reevaluate how to move forward with the an evaluation, because with the learning communities, the university is establishing controlled groups for every major specific, so there's like the College of Engineering, Nursing, Health Sciences, like they're doing their own intervention groups. That's challenging for us because, I mean, we have our own evaluation going on for CAMP, but now our CAMP students are being distributed into those other groups, but yeah, we've continued doing them.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 39:06

OK. Just one more follow up question for you, Fabiola, I know you presented your your study design. But anything you can share in terms of findings? You know from your treatment group and your control group.

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 39:22

Yes, the findings. So the students that were in the our group of CAMP IDS had a higher GPA rate end of the year versus the ones that didn't. And then the participation overall, so that those are our key findings of the higher GPA.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 39:43

You, Fabiola, we're going to move to the next question, #2. Again, I'm going to ask

everyone to answer this question. How and when did you set up data collection with the final project evaluation in mind? Who was responsible for tracking evaluation data? Did you work with any data sources outside data collected within your project, and if so, which ones and how did you get that data?

I know some of you probably already answered this, but again, if you can just go and answer those questions, I'm going to start with you Ernesto first and then Michael and then Fabiola.

ES **Ernesto Sanchez** 40:19

Yeah, as matter of fact, that briefly discussed it when answered the previous question, but once again we had an instructor that had a pretty good background on statistics. So we set the program up, then he became responsible for randomizing the assignment of students to the control group versus the treatment group. And he did this by way of a software program, plugged in all the names, and then it randomly divided students out. And then, of course, you know the study that it went through a 15-week period. During that time he was doing the data collection and then when we did the statistical work on it, you know we handed it over to our evaluator, and based on that, he was able to determine that the evaluation bore statistical results of our study. It was a small study, but once again, I mean we got some pretty good information from it.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 41:33

Thanks Ernesto.

ES **Ernesto Sanchez** 41:34

I do want to add one thing you know. You know for a lot of my colleagues out there that might be a little bit nervous with this evidence of study. We focused on one component you know, and it could become overwhelming, you know, but we gave it a careful thought and we're like, OK, what is one component that that we could truly evaluate? And because generally HSE students, of the four subject areas, the one that they have most difficulty with is math. So it just made sense to look at the math the component.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 42:22

No thanks for pointing out that and if you see, in What Works for Clearinghouse, you

know, studies have been done and usually they use one specific treatment to make to see if this makes a difference in this study. So thanks for adding that. Michael?

HD Heim, Michael D 42:41

Yeah, I think this is a really great question because when we first started looking at what we had collected as data within various spreadsheets and forms that we submitted with the APR for OME, we didn't know what we had, right?

We didn't really understand 100% of what we were looking at. In fact, I was just looking at having a historical account of who all was in CAMP at that university, who attended this year and who did what this year. It didn't really get to the point of well, did they meet components measure one and two. Did they graduate? Did they go to grad school? Which is kind of the breadth that we have now or like, you know all these different variables that you can think of.

I just kind of noticed that on one of the recruiting that we had, we had a list of those folks that came in to CAMP and then a list of folks that went to WCU that were recruited but didn't get into CAMP.

We basically were wait list that had attended, and that was really kind of one of those moments that Eureka moment where I was like, are we really talking about a whole bunch of CAMP students that came to WSU but didn't attend CAMP that had eligibility through MEP through a COE, which is really one of the one of the most effective ways to identify that they were in farm work at this point.

So then we said, well, let's take a deeper look at this and we started looking at it on behalf of our CAMP project and I had some student employees who had to go through extra training and went through some Citi training. So they understood how to handle data and be aligned with doing actual research studies that we wanted to move forward with any of that because it's pretty unique to see that many students as a control group that was happening over the year. It's not exact because we're not doing an experimental design so we're not like randomizing it, which I think is so cool that Ernesto is randomizing. We were able to randomize the student participants that we were serving.

So we're building a building a control group retrospectively and looking at those students and how they did. And in order to verify some of the information, the biggest thing for us, especially from Washington State, is being able to access the MEP database for our COEs that have been cleared to be viewed by HEP and CAMP projects.

So we're able to look up students within their database and just see if they had a COE or not, what the qualifying arrival date was and what the expiration date was. We started to do it that way and to echo one of Ernesto's points it was just very simply at first we were looking at who all was here and that was kind of the first stage. And then the next stage was what did they actually accomplish in terms of performance at WSU? And then we kept kind of expanding on that to see like what was CAMP even like the main service that they would have received over the course of their undergraduate career.

And that piece by piece, you kind of go year to year, if you're thinking about it as you know, just a director and a couple staff that are working, you just kind of work on it, kind of following the craze like. The problem that the best time to find a tree is 20 years ago if you want shade right. So you gotta start somewhere.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 46:17

Yep, thanks, Michael. If I understood you, what you did was a longitudinal study. You gathered data for CAMP students and similar group that are at WSU and you just compare throughout those years and that's what your results are.

Thanks for sharing that. Fabiola, anything you want to add or answer your question #2?

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 46:38

With ours and on who was responsible for setting the data collection at the time, you know, we started this one from 2021 and I've been in charge of doing the data collection and responsible for tracking the evaluation. We also... I mean, our team are the ones who are doing the data collection.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 47:02

Thank you. We're going to move on to question #3 and the question is, who are the key players at your institution or on your staff who are or were involved with evaluation?

I think some of you have answered already this and when and how did you involve them? Fabiola, I'm going to start with you then, Ernesto, and then Michael.

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 47:23

Yeah, with this one, now that we are the again, the institution moved into learning

communities, I've been reaching out to our residential office on helping us with how those students that are in CAMP and then when, because with the learning communities they're housed in within their major, so that's who I've been involved with this current year. Now that this year, we don't have the CAMP course. How they're involved within across campus, but yeah, those are ours.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 48:03

Thank you, Michael?

HD **Heim, Michael D** 48:09

Yeah, we, we started it here with us. And we did the evaluation, but we're working also with our Institutional Research Office to get accurate data for the general Latinx student population. So that again, it can go a little bit deeper into comparing results for the overall student population that has a similar profile. That's after we found all that the data.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 48:41

Thanks, Ernesto?

ES **Ernesto Sanchez** 48:43

Yeah. So you know, as I previously mentioned, we happen to have a one of our adjunct instructors was pretty, had a pretty good solid statistical background, so he was involved right from the beginning and you know, as far as deciding OK, how are we going to approach this? How are we going to put it together? We've got our evaluator involved as well, and of course the students at 24 students that were involved in study, they were involved, they were fully informed of what we were going to do. And then so that that's what we did to form the basis of our study. And then of course, you know our adjunct instructor who helped to set it up for the statistical study, gathering the data, the team looked at it together and then turned it over to evaluator to do the statistical work on it.

So I mean, I guess what I could say is that that taking advantage of the resources available to us was a big help in kinda taking away that fear factor and you know of being overwhelmed. And what are we gonna do? How are we gonna do it?

How are we gonna approach it? So it really it really helped out to have a pretty solid team for work on this study.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 50:19

Thanks, Ernesto.

For what I hear from this question is that you know staff is involved in this evaluation, the program evaluator as well, you can involve your institutional research office or other resources. So there are ways that you can involve multiple players in this evaluation for the promise of evidence.

We're going to move to the next question, Question 4. And also I'm going to ask everyone to ask to answer this question, and I think some of them probably already you have answered this question.

How did your project identify an appropriate control group, and what were your main considerations in choosing your control group?

Start with Ernesto, Fabiola and Michael.

ES **Ernesto Sanchez** 51:10

OK so to identify there again, one of our biggest contributors was being equitable. You know, we wanted to conduct a study, but at the same time we wanted to be equitable to all of our students. So by getting our 24 students involved and informing them of what studying was going to be about and getting their buy in on participating in the study. It made it easy for us to say, OK now. That we have 24 students that are willing to participate in the study, so now we can randomly divide them up into the treatment group and the control group. There again you know it was a service that we didn't have available at the time and we were barely going to implement it to see how effective it might be and so it made perfect sense to approach it that way.

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 52:09

Something that I want to share with ours that has been interesting is it's been the opposite for me of people across campus wanting to request to meet with me of like, what are we doing, like our CAMP students are the ones that are highly involved in across campus, attending events, attending class, obviously with their GPA and completion. And so they've have asked us how they can then create something for their controlled groups and setting those up. So I don't know if I'd be able to answer like how do I identify since I did inherit the grant, but we know that it's working and

the university has used CAMP to try to establish their own controlled groups across campus, so that's been really interesting and exciting for me.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 53:02
Michael?

HD **Heim, Michael D** 53:04

Yeah, that's a good question because if you're going to think about I guess not just the study on the cumulative or the comprehensive evaluation at the end of Year 5 for your grant, but think about the publication of something or actually producing a study that could lead to a publication, my initial thoughts are that you want to think about getting as close to an apples to apples comparison as possible.

So we have one level where we're looking at students that are qualified for the CAMP as migrant seasonal farm workers, so CAMP students, plus students who can identify with a COE. But then also you have to think about, are we going to study, and this was the point that Amas asked me one time, but he asked, are they do they have current students? How far back did this group engage in migrant and seasonal farmwork? Are they currently doing it in the summers while they're attending your institution or not?

Things of that nature for discussing with the variables. But then also you don't want to just include everybody who you pull. The identifier that we have is Hispanic, no details, because underneath that they can choose a lot of different things.

So at WSU it's that identifier. You don't want to just pull like whatever that is at your school and be like, look, this is going to be a control group for us.

You do want to look at different variables like possibly income. If you don't have the migrant background with a COE, but also you don't want to include like transfer students compared to your CAMP students, if you find them. And then also maybe there could be a difference between your students with running start credits as they come in? Or, first time freshman graduated from high school.

They come in and these are all types of things that can be disaggregated if you accurately collect data points that can lead to some of those discussions.

So you want to think about what it would look like for a control group?

But quite frankly, there's not a whole lot of studies out there with just a generalized control group of students who have a migratory seasonal farmworker background.

So I think that that's a good place to start for folks too.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 55:25

Just to add what Michael said.

Yeah, it's difficult to do a very good research evaluation in HEP and CAMP. However, you could mirror your treatment and control group by making sure your variables are similar. Like Michael's that you want to make sure you do apples with apples.

We did a study here at Oregon State where out of our 35 students, 27 students were not even in that in the in the treatment group because of the variables that didn't really match to the variables that of the of the control group.

So that by doing that you have a really accurate at least result and evidence or variation that shows that promise of evidence. So thanks Michael.

We're going to move to question #5 and in the question is for those institutions who require Institutional Review Board, which is known as IRB approval, for the evaluation projects, can you please share your experience with that process, if any?

What was the timeline for approval?

What advice would you give others in the webinar who need to secure IRP approval?

Let's start with Fabiola, Ernesto and Michael.

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 56:51

So my institution does not require an IRB, so I wouldn't be able to.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 56:58

Thank you. That was a quick and short answer. Ernesto?

ES **Ernesto Sanchez** 57:03

Yeah, we didn't.

We didn't actually book through IR we because we were considering this an internal study that was going to be used only for the benefit of our project and keeping in mind that we weren't actually going to publish the work. I think had it been done with the intentions of publishing the work, then yeah, I do believe we would probably have to consult with IRB, but we did not.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 57:35

Michael?



Heim, Michael D 57:38

Yeah, those two points, I think everybody will find in their home institutions.

One is that sometimes in the IRB process, you might be able to find an exempt status for the IRB based on the type of information that you're gathering and analyzing whether or not it has personally identifiable attributes to it, or you're working directly with the students or gaining maybe qualitative information that requires some additional checks and balances to ensure that the information collected and the data collected is not going to be misused.

And then also, if you're doing internal evaluation projects for your own institution that you aren't going to publish, sometimes your institutions are a little bit more forthcoming with the approval to utilize data that would normally be have to be requested by a researcher through an IRB process, and one of the things that our IRB board was doing when they were looking at it, 'cause I was like, hey, we've already got it. Like we need to do this stuff. Like, let's get done as soon as possible.

They were like, yeah, but also Michael, you need to separate yourself from the director of the program.

She's running day-to-day and getting all this data and then thinking about yourself as the researcher for the outcomes on this data because those are two separate roles that you'll have at the institution. And sometimes you're going to have to fight back a little bit on that.

I've had to go through a couple of updates and fixes for the IRB as the Review Board has said, well, are you keeping personal data and do you think you should be exempt? Is it nonexempt? They've landed on nonexempt for me a lot of times, which means I'm required to have an IRB and security procedures within holding that information. On campus, or if it's going to be longer longitudinal, maybe even off campus storage of the data so that you can have a backup to be secure and keep people's personal data away from security breaches at the institution, things of that nature, they're going to ask you. And what you do need to think about is, do you need to get Citi certification so that you can be a researcher? You have to have that to end the and the corresponding exams and certificates for that to include in your IRB and everybody else working with the data needs to also be certified to handle the data and be on board with the study, so you have to clearly define your study. What you're gonna do with the data, how you're approaching it? And how you're keeping people's data private and secure enough that it's not going to be leaked out

to the public for this any random reason.

So there's procedures that they want you to put in place to protect the public during the research study. Some institutions, though, will say would have said to me, no, Michael, it's fine. You're getting data that's old. It's not going to be personally identifiable because you also are just going to look at the data and not include any names or any qualitative stuff right now. And they would have approved that IRB quicker than my institution did because my institution's saying, well, you have a name within CAMP, right? And a student ID number, right? And a birth date, right? And a qualifying arrival date on the COE, right, and a COE number right.

And that's how we're identifying those. And I said I had to answer yes to all of those questions. And so then they said you're not exempt then because you have to make sure that you hold on to that data and keep it protected.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 1:01:16

Thanks Michael. I know most of you on the webinar probably have questions for Michael, Fabiola, Ernesto or even OME. I'm going to ask question number six. But if you start typing your questions in the chat, I hope that's OK, Katrina. So we'll move on while you're asking your questions too. Question #6 is pretty straightforward. What advice would you give the two projects that are nervous about the evaluation, specifically about the promise of evidence, any advice from you? We'll start with Fabiola, Michael and Ernesto.

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 1:01:56

I don't know what advice other than for me again, it's been normal that we've been doing it and I mean establishing that. I don't know if I have any good advice to give.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 1:02:15

OK, that's fine. Thank you, Ernesto?

ES **Ernesto Sanchez** 1:02:21

You know, at least one of the, what I have felt from a lot of my HEP colleagues is that there's a lot of nervousness out there about how to do a study like this and how to move forward with it. And as I mentioned earlier, you know, don't be too broad with what you're going to be looking at. We try to be more specific because that'll keep you focused and it'll make it easier. You know, like I said, we looked at one

component and that component was how does technology improve learning you know, with within the math component. So we were pretty specific with ours and that kind of took away a little bit of that nervousness.

The other thing too is that come on, let's face it, a lot of us are not statisticians.

So we rely on the researchers that you have. You know, whether it's your education institute, your evaluator in, in our case, our adjunct instructor, that had a pretty good statistical background. So you look for that support to help with putting a study like this together.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 1:03:45

Michael?

HD **Heim, Michael D** 1:03:49

Yeah. The hard part about this question for me is I don't think that I approach it or I approach data collection and analysis as something I'm nervous about, and I think the overarching or the overriding principle that I'm using there is that I feel like, I'm more open to feedback, but I feel like this is like the right thing to do, right?

And I feel like when everyone's in their projects working and we're all like, I know that what we're doing matters. And it works. And I think that that is what motivates me to go forward with this type of work.

It is kind of stressful sometimes when you have to look at stuff when you're busy and you're doing a lot of other things. I mean, there's so many things that we have to do honestly and, you know, putting effort into it I think is one of those things that we're planting seeds. But also I think our students deserve it because it also I think from what I'm seeing is it shifts the narrative from a lot of times, you know, we have this, this idea that this is going to be so like a roll of the dice, a gamble that whether or not like students should be funded at this level and are they successful and there's lots of detractors around the country and different states that are like why do we have these programs or what's out there? But I just, I just rest my hat on the fact that I know that when these programs are operating and we care about the students, the outcomes are positive, and the nervousness goes away.

And I lose my nerves to move forward because of the fact that I know that the results I'm going to find, especially if you're accurate, they may not be exactly what you predicted, but they're going to be positive.

And I think they're going to be out there and maybe it does make you feel like it puts

a little bit of attention on you because now you're saying like, I know what statistical certainty that this is going to work, and that's kind of scary for people to like assume that that position, but I think that that's where we kind of are in the country with our programs, where the director of these programs for migrant ed. No one's asking, I think necessarily to be the like the smartest person in the room, right?

But it's also about trying to demonstrate your worth as a program as well. It's not just about us, it's also about our students and shifting the narrative away from a fragment of our Hispanic population that may be challenged to graduate or be successful, and then saying no, on the contrary, we know that this is going to be really good.

So I would encourage folks to seriously think about it and how they can start incorporating that into their work days and thinking about the stuff that they already have. Potentially the flesh out a little bit more.

 **Aduviri, Amas** 1:06:47

Well, thanks, Michael, and thanks Fabiola, Ernesto and Michael for sharing your studies and your recommendations as well.

And also I want to thank OMI for hosting this webinar and showcasing some examples of promise of evidence and I'm hoping Katrina, I would like for you to continue with this. More examples. Maybe in the future we can see more programs showcasing their project evaluations. And also for the projects I would be go back to your proposals and read your evaluation design.

If you don't like it, or maybe it's something was completely different?

Please approach OME. Maybe you can request approval for the change of evaluation design, but I want to thank you all for listening to us.

I'm going to hand to Katrina. I look like there are no questions from my end.

So Katrina, thank you.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:07:36

Thank you all so much. Yeah. Just to echo that sentiment, we really appreciate hearing about all the designs that you all set out to conduct your evaluations with and how it went and your honesty about the challenges and also the encouragement about how impactful it can be. So thank you again.

I don't see any questions in the chat right now, but does anyone in the audience want to raise their hand or unmute and ask a question. Or you can also ask your question in the chat.

At this time, we'll give a pause just to have folks collect their thoughts and see if there are any questions.

 **Stein, Jessica** 1:08:24

Hi Katrina, I see one question in the chat from 1:30.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:08:30

OK.

 **Stein, Jessica** 1:08:32

From Galen McAllister.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:08:35

Oh, I see that. Thank you.

OK. So this question "I'm curious about how to build a statistically significant control group." So we did have the panelists already talk about their control group. So we may have answered this person's question, but I do actually want to just pause a minute to point out the difference in these two phrases.

So this is great, statistically significant and control group. These are terms that are in the promising evidence definition, but it's great to review them because we you know we don't always speak the same language when we're talking about this stuff.

So a statistically significant control group is not necessarily the way I would phrase it. What I would say is the control group is the group of students who are not getting your treatment. So that's the group that does not get the CAMP class. They don't get the online gaming system. They're the ones that you're using to compare the treatment group to, so you're kind of you've got those two groups, the ones that get the treatment and the ones that don't. The ones that don't are the control group. You can think about it like if you're testing a vaccine, your treatment group gets the vaccine. Your control group does not get the vaccine.

So that's control group and then statistically significant is actually a description of your results and it tells you whether your results were likely to happen due to chance. So is it likely that this result would have happened anyway? Or, you know, is it really the treatment that may have impacted the result.

So that's getting a little bit in the weeds about statistics. It's getting a little bit technical.

Definitely, you know, don't want to have to get too far down a rabbit hole, but does anyone on the panel or Amas, do any of you want to add anything to that or talk more about any of that topic?

 **Heim, Michael D** 1:10:36

Just whether or not that answered the question for Galen.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:10:45

Sorry. What was that, Michael? I didn't hear you.

 **Heim, Michael D** 1:10:47

Oh, I just wondered if the question was answered for Galen McAllister.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:10:50

Oh, yes, great point.

Galen, did we answer your question earlier?

Oh, OK. I see a follow up question. OK, so for HEP, we serve almost all the students we identify. So finding a similar group who can be the control group would be difficult. Holding back a key element of the project seems tricky.

We could do a look back of students who use the intervention versus those who did not and how they did, but the numbers would be small. OK, so that.

So there's a follow up to that. Does anyone want to address that?

 **Ernesto Sanchez** 1:11:25

Yeah, I think if I understand that comment, you're right. You know, with our HEP programs, it would be a small number and you know perfect example, we had 24 students participate in ours.

We had 13 in the in the treatment group and 11 in the control group and so.

So yeah, the numbers are going to be small and the statistical significance is going to be small as well. But you, you know, depending on how the study's conducted, you could you could, you could actually get some useful information from that.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:12:06

Thank you, Ernesto. Any other thoughts folks want to add to that?

AA Aduviri, Amas 1:12:12

Uh, this is Amas. I am aware that doing this promise of evidence for HEP programs is a lot more difficult than doing for CAMP projects.

Because there's not, it's it's just difficult and I think, Ernesto, I've seen one of the best approaches I've seen in HEP has been Ernesto's. In the sense of it's a smaller study within the HEP program. Didn't have to find something, a control group outside of HEP.

And now he's trying to do the summer bridge program. Which you know, it's also another evidence of promise in What Works Clearinghouse for post-secondary education as well.

So yeah, it is difficult, but I think there is ways it's not just also the quasi-experimental design, there's other different studies that you can do like Michael did longitudinal study, correlational studies that you can look and Google and then you know implement those. You need to have this type of specific study, but you know, do something that start. I think it starts a good thing and from there I think you can build that your your project evaluation.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:13:27

Thank you, Amas.

Definitely OME is not for sure prescribing any specific you know requirement in terms of other than what's you know in your application. You know what you have in your application is where you want to make sure you start and of course the goal is to produce promising evidence. And that's why we always are referring to a control group.

But how you set up your control group, you know, that's that should be either outlined in your application, or if it's not, then you know that's up to you.

We don't have a specific requirement for the size of the control group or anything like that.

It is OK if it's a small number that's, you know, that's perfectly fine. I remember when we had Erin Pollard from IES speak to us a couple times, she said I'd rather the control group be very tiny rather than there be no control group. Just wanted to reemphasize that it's OK to have a small control group and also someone asked in the chat can you use students who are outside of HEP? And yes, you can create a control group of students who are not in HEP. Again to the point of the panelists

from earlier, you want to try to make sure they're similar as much as possible, like Michael was saying, you know, apples to apples comparison.

But again, OME doesn't have specific requirements about how you set up your control group other than you know, taking a look at what's in your application and keeping us informed of changes.

But does anyone else want to add to the question about control groups, and then I see there's one more question that I can answer too.

 **Heim, Michael D** 1:15:08

I would just wanna add for the HEP, when I was the HEP director at UNM at the University of New Mexico, one of the things that we were trying to do as trying to find at that time in 2014 was what students are already attending other ABE programs that are going toward the same test that are doing the same types of thing like classes with hour limits and just different things like that, and then working on saying, well, how can we verify that they would have had a migrant or seasonal background?

Because they're already taking a similar prep course to that specific task, which was Hi-SET at the time. And then we were offering a preparation course for some other services to say this is like kind of additional to as being the HEP intervention.

So I think that where I where I would start, if I'm doing this again right is I was starting the same spot and try and find where those ABE programs close by you that might have students that could be migrant seasonal farmworkers, even if it's a small control group and there's some people there then then it can still work to demonstrate some promise, like being able to like be viable for a study.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:16:21

Thank you, Michael. I see a question in the chat. Does the control group outside of HEP have to meet the qualifications for HEP?

So I think again, as similar as you can get the two groups the better, but also you know sometimes it's not always possible to do that. I think that, you know Michael's example is, you know, trying to find that control group that might meet the qualifications or are similar. That would be, you know, definitely ideal. But again, there's no specific requirement. It's just, you know, the best that you can do and if anyone has, you know, thoughts on that too, please feel free to chime in.

AA Aduviri, Amas 1:17:08

This is Amas. There might be other variables that you can use to mirror the both groups. One of them I can think would be first generation, low income, zip code, you know are they from the same area.

For CAMP students, maybe PELL eligible, for HEP, you know by ethnicity, right?

So I mean, you can probably mirror as much as you can.

Maybe for qualifications, it might be you can't do that part, but at least you're trying to mirror as much as you can by choosing variables that that that could make comparisons apples with apples.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:17:44

Yeah, great point. That's a really good point. Thanks Amas.

Amas I was actually wondering if you know, as our moderator today, did you have any other follow up questions for any of our panelists? I know you know they all provided such great information. So we may not have more questions for them at this time, but I wanted to give you an opportunity if you had any other questions?

AA Aduviri, Amas 1:18:09

Yeah, I do have a follow up question for all of them.

And my question is, I mean, I'll start with Ernesto, you know, we do the studies with this intervention. What's the plan? Are we doing this every year or are you planning to change interventions? I know Ernesto is clear, the online there's no online outside person, so I'm going to change my intervention. But is that going to be for the next, for the duration of the grant.

Michael, I mean you will you continue with longitudinal study, and Fabiola, I mean you have that study and looks like other the university setting up a lot of control groups. Now you're having difficulties you know, so how are you going to go beyond this, this intervention that you're doing right now, what's the next plan? Or you will you continue with that?

AA Aduviri, Amas 1:19:05

So I'm going to ask Michael, Ernest and Fabiola in that order.

HD Heim, Michael D 1:19:09

OK, I'll try to be concise. What's really interesting is some of the unknown things that you'll find. Then create this moment like you're in a candy shop where you're like, oh my gosh, I could do so many things with this information. And so I think that that's one of the benefits of coming together and doing these evaluations is finding what those unknowns were that were surprises to you?

So we're going to continue doing the longitudinal aspect of collecting data, but then also, as we've found more variables that create different groups, it's going to be of interest overall to producing evidence of promise and maybe even helping other programs identify the controls or being able to produce like evidence of promise studies. For example, we have a whole group of transfer students that came into Washington State University that also came from CAMP projects from two-year institutions or from other four year institutions or universities. And as you start to disaggregate that data and see what's happening, you have a comparison within that group itself and then with other transfer students that have been similar backgrounds or other students that are moving on to other institutions.

But the idea of transfer students from another CAMP project moving in is really appealing. Also Graduate School completion.

Moving on to like seeing like, is there a way that you could track employment? Like all of these things stem from creating a base of data like a database if you will, but like a base of knowledge that you have with your shoes and seeing where those trends are going, where it takes you.

ES

Ernesto Sanchez 1:20:54

I'm actually looking forward to our evidence of promise study for this upcoming coming year, which is going to be the bridge, the Summer Bridge program.

There are, definitely because this is going to be the first year that we're doing that, there's still a lot of questions there exactly how we're going to approach it. I know that we're going to be looking at the at the same component as with our previous study, we're still focusing on math, but it's going to be significantly different because it's going to be in person, and it's going to be a three-week intensive math program, you know. I mean we're looking at doing this for the next for the next five years.

So we'll see how that, how that comes together, but we already have something to build on. So really, it's going to be an extension of what we did, but it's going to be different in the sense that this is going to be in person. We'll see how it goes.

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 1:22:07

For us, we are my biggest thing is like advocating for us to be able to keep and bring back our CAMP IDS first year course because they also have a section for the students that they have a category of "other." So we want to be able to go back 'cause I have two years of data of this, the controlled group of CAMP IDS versus not. So that's what we're going to try to do is advocate, and if not, move from there on a different controlled group and what we're doing for our evaluation.

HD **Aduviri, Amas** 1:22:42

And just briefly one more. I know we have about 7 minutes.

One more question. Are you planning to share this with your institution and it looks like Fabiola, maybe you already have or what are institutions, I mean, is this just for yourself? Or you want to plan sharing with other outside, maybe to find it more useful, what you're doing?

Oh, Michael, Ernesto, and Fabiola.

AA **Heim, Michael D** 1:23:10

Yeah, we did share it with our institution and right now.

Our Student Affairs division is like, well, how do we do evaluation on our other programs or like and you start to think about like what that would look like for other programs you don't know. But they see that one group is doing it and then they want to look at it. Another way is that just sharing our institutional stuff if you have permission to share kind of results and things like that. Like you can share them like, recently we received recognition as the Example of Excelencia, by Excellence in Education. But the reason we were able to be recognized was only because of the data that we were able to provide, like the way that we could say this is what we looked at, this is what we saw.

This is how we know it's an effective program, and that's really what I think that that was. And the interesting point about that is that we're not unique.

We're not unique as a as a CAMP project. There are so many people doing amazing work across the country, it's not like. A WSU CAMP would have been unique in in the performance area.

Yeah, but we're able to demonstrate it. And that's I think what's unique about the program right now. And so I think when we're talking about sharing and doing stuff,

if you have something great, I think it be like the equivalent of keeping your Ferrari in the garage. Like sometimes you got to whip it out and roll it around, right?

And that's where I think that each of us has that opportunity to build up something really great, but then also exhibit it to the rest of the folks at our institutions possibly provide evidence of promised study or reports or something published. Something that really bolstered the idea that, oh, we are doing great work and that this what we're doing. But yeah, I think that that's what we've been able to do. So people do know like that we're doing this work.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 1:25:06

Thanks, Michael. Ernesto?

ES **Ernesto Sanchez** 1:25:08

Yeah, you know, it would definitely be a consideration. Absolutely. You know in that there again. Our program is out of the University of Colorado and we're within the Bueno Center, which focuses on helping people, underserved populations, make it through post-secondary education and in many cases helping them with their masters and their pH.D. So you know this the idea of tying in GED program into an institution and program like the Bueno Center. I think it would be great, to share that information and be able to demonstrate that our program is actually encouraging students to move forward, you know.

AA **Aduviri, Amas** 1:26:12

Yeah. Thank you. And lastly, Fabiola.

HF **Hernandez, Fabiola** 1:26:16

Yeah. So I continuously share the information with institution, especially just recently we did have our own suite area where CAMP was and they moved us out of there. And I'm in it. We're in completely different area in on campus that is very centrally located where all of other students are, which has been great, but taking away like our space that we have has been a challenge and so continue, I'll show that like, hey, this is what we're working on. This is what we need. And this is what our grant says that we're going to provide these services. So yeah, as anytime I can, providing the information and the work that we're doing and that it is working.

 **Aduviri, Amas** 1:27:00

Thank you. I think I'm done. Thank you.

 **Ballard, Katrina** 1:27:04

Thank you, Amas for those great questions.

We really appreciate it. Wonderful.

So just in the last couple of minutes, I just want to refer everyone as well to some additional resources. These are things that we have shared previously, but just as a refresher that these are great places to go when it comes to evaluation, the HEP and CAMP websites are now updated. The Department has a new website, so if you have bookmarked any prior website pages you may want to update to these.

We have our resources of prior webinars and things posted there.

Also, we recommend checking out the What Works Clearinghouse, ERIC, where folks can even submit their work if that's something you're interested in doing. And then of course, resources from IES on evaluation. And then there's even some resources on logic models as well, which as we know is kind of the front end of the project, but could still very much be helpful.

And then like a big thank you again to all of our speakers, we appreciate you all so much. And they have graciously agreed to share their contact information here in case anyone has any follow-up questions.

You could also please feel free to reach out to me. We at OME have been meeting with folks one-on-one to answer questions about evaluation. So please don't hesitate to reach out if you are stuck or if you have a question, or again if your design has changed, reach out to your program officer. But again, we are here as a resource for you throughout this whole process. And with that, I believe we are at the end of our slides. Millie, did you want to say anything before we officially wrap up or just want to say hi briefly?

 **Bentley-Memon, Millicent** 1:29:00

Thank you again. I just want to thank very much our outstanding panel and thank you our outstanding facilitator too. And thank you, Katrina for your outstanding work as well. We really appreciate the project director's participating in this call and thank you so much for all the work that you're doing to lead the way to build evidence for

HEP and CAMP. This is unique and important for a discretionary grant program at the Department. So thank you very much.



Ballard, Katrina 1:29:26

Thanks so much, Millie. All right. Thank you everyone. Thanks for all who joined, and we look forward to talking with you all soon and have a great rest of your day.



Ballard, Katrina 1:29:40

Take care everyone.

● **Ballard, Katrina** stopped transcription