

2022 HEP and CAMP Evaluation Webinar Transcript

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:03.520

Toro, Sandra

Right well, we're waiting for the presentation to come up.

00:00:05.390 --> 00:00:12.280

Toro, Sandra

I'll go ahead and say that I will deliver the first part of this presentation and then turn it over to Kavita to continue.

00:00:13.750 --> 00:00:25.370

Toro, Sandra

And for the purpose of this presentation, as I mentioned Kavita is serving as a subject matter expert via the HEP and CAMP technical assistance contract with Safal Partners.

00:00:26.550 --> 00:00:27.460

Toro, Sandra

Next slide.

00:00:41.570 --> 00:00:46.040

Toro, Sandra

Jessica, I think we can still see the presenters view with the notes.

00:00:46.880 --> 00:00:47.650

Toro, Sandra

That's OK.

00:00:49.550 --> 00:00:52.270

Stein, Jessica

Let me see if I can remove that, my apologies.

00:01:01.620 --> 00:01:27.550

Toro, Sandra

Alright well, while we're waiting, I'll go ahead and tell you a little bit about myself. I joined the Office of Migrant Education in November of last year and I came to the Department of Education in early 2020. Prior to that, I was a senior program officer at the Institute of Museum and Library Services and oversaw 3 grant programs for Native American and Native Hawaiian populations as well as served as the research

00:01:28.140 --> 00:01:31.010

Toro, Sandra

expert for the Office of Library Services.

00:01:31.740 --> 00:01:45.660

Toro, Sandra

My background is in educational psychology, and I worked as a faculty member in an Ed Psych Department before working in grants administration and currently I'm the data and evaluation team lead for HEP, CAMP, and MEP.

2022 HEP and CAMP Evaluation Webinar Transcript
Office of Migrant Education, U.S. Department of Education

00:01:57.540 --> 00:02:26.010

Toro, Sandra

Ok, I'll go ahead and say in terms of logistics, please do mute your electronic devices like your phone and your computer during the webinar and if you're having a challenge connecting, please try dialing in separately on the telephone now we do have a separate line. Also, please use the chat box to pose any questions. We'll do our best to respond during the question-and-answer portions of the webinar

00:02:26.670 --> 00:02:46.650

Toro, Sandra

or if needed after the webinar, but please note that the presentation portion of the webinar will be recorded and after the webinar, we will have a breakout session discussion at the end of the presentation. Separate links will be provided to join the breakout groups.

00:02:51.870 --> 00:02:52.280

Stein, Jessica

Hi.

00:02:52.340 --> 00:03:01.120

Stein, Jessica

Hi Sandy, I just need to reload the presentation because I wasn't able to change the slides for some reason so my apologies for that.

00:03:02.360 --> 00:03:04.630

Stein, Jessica

It should hopefully work now?

00:03:07.040 --> 00:03:09.970

Toro, Sandra

Alright, do you want to start the recording over again?

00:03:12.080 --> 00:03:13.200

Stein, Jessica

Yes, I can do that.

00:03:26.000 --> 00:03:28.720

Toro, Sandra

And we can start with the presentation objectives.

00:03:37.840 --> 00:03:39.570

Stein, Jessica

Ok. How does it look on your end?

00:03:41.080 --> 00:03:41.770

Toro, Sandra

Looks great.

00:03:42.400 --> 00:03:44.630

Stein, Jessica

Ok great. Alright, we'll get started.

00:03:50.730 --> 00:04:19.320

Toro, Sandra

Thank you Jessica. So today, we'll discuss the purpose and importance of evaluation in your HEP and CAMP projects, we'll review logic models and suggestions on how to use them for evaluation, we'll review the department's evidence categories, we'll review details of promising evidence and will discuss how to plan an evaluation as part of demonstrating promising evidence as well as share resources for promising evidence.

00:04:20.580 --> 00:04:21.670

Toro, Sandra

Next slide please.

00:04:24.530 --> 00:04:53.470

Toro, Sandra

So there are statutory and regulatory requirements for your projects. For example. Section 418AD of the HEP and CAMP statute states each project application shall include a management plan which contains assurances that the grant recipient will coordinate the project to the extent feasible with other local, state, and federal programs to maximize the resources available for migrant students.

00:04:54.340 --> 00:05:04.470

Toro, Sandra

And that staff shall have a demonstrated knowledge and be sensitive to the unique characteristics and needs of the migrant and seasonal farm worker population.

00:05:05.480 --> 00:05:18.130

Toro, Sandra

And provisions for staff in service training, training and technical assistance, staff travel, student travel, interagency coordination, and an evaluation plan.

00:05:19.240 --> 00:05:30.330

Toro, Sandra

34 of the Code of Federal Regulations 75 applies to all education programs and 206 applies to HEP and CAMP specifically.

00:05:31.380 --> 00:05:52.210

Toro, Sandra

In addition, if you refer to the notice inviting applications or the NIA, you'll see that in terms of the quality of the project evaluation, the Secretary of the Department of Education considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. We'll talk more about what is meant by the quality of the evaluation.

00:05:53.150 --> 00:05:54.280

Toro, Sandra

Next slide please.

00:05:57.390 --> 00:06:05.980

Toro, Sandra

HEP and CAMP evaluations help build evidence of the extent to which HEP and CAMP projects impact student performance.

00:06:06.720 --> 00:06:20.850

Toro, Sandra

Your program evaluation work helps us inform understanding of the Government Performance and Results Act, or GPRA 1, GPRA 2, and efficiency targets.

00:06:21.880 --> 00:06:26.830

Toro, Sandra

Also, strengths and weaknesses and program implementation and program effectiveness.

00:06:27.980 --> 00:06:35.590

Toro, Sandra

As the slides to follow explain, determining overall effectiveness requires specific types of evaluation methods and design.

00:06:37.710 --> 00:06:38.760

Toro, Sandra

Next slide please.

00:06:41.130 --> 00:06:56.450

Toro, Sandra

As per the NIA, there are set requirements for evaluation for the HEP and CAMP program, including methods of evaluation that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed projects.

00:06:57.400 --> 00:07:15.640

Toro, Sandra

That will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes and that will produce promising evidence as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) about the project's effectiveness.

00:07:17.380 --> 00:07:31.540

Toro, Sandra

Ideally though, we do want to move beyond only statutory and regulatory requirements. Through program development and implementation, we have the opportunity to find what works for the unique populations we serve.

00:07:32.280 --> 00:08:02.060

Toro, Sandra

As you know, there's limited published research on effective strategies that produce positive outcomes for migratory learners. As project directors, you are all well positioned to build evidence for migratory students everywhere. So, we want to make sure that the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the proposed project's goals, objectives, and outcomes and that they will provide that performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress

00:08:02.400 --> 00:08:10.650

Toro, Sandra

towards achieving intended outcomes and if well implemented produce the promising evidence about the program's effectiveness.

00:08:12.610 --> 00:08:13.640

Toro, Sandra

Next slide please.

00:08:25.420 --> 00:08:37.650

Toro, Sandra

This slide shows definitions of evidence from EDGAR, the department's administrative regulations. For HEP and CAMP, the Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.

00:08:38.300 --> 00:08:43.780

Toro, Sandra

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

00:08:45.160 --> 00:08:54.380

Toro, Sandra

promising evidence, which Dr. Mittapalli will discuss in more depth later; means, that there is evidence of the effectiveness of a key project;

00:08:55.140 --> 00:09:01.220

Toro, Sandra

Component, improving a relevant outcome based on a relevant finding from one of the following:

00:09:02.260 --> 00:09:12.780

Toro, Sandra

a practice guide prepared by the What Works Clearinghouse reporting a strong evidence base or moderate evidence base for the corresponding practice guide recommendation;

00:09:13.990 --> 00:09:27.240

Toro, Sandra

an intervention report, prepared by the What Works Clearinghouse reporting a positive effect or potentially positive effect on their relevant outcome with no reporting of a negative effect or potentially negative effect

00:09:27.840 --> 00:09:52.870

Toro, Sandra

on a relevant outcome; or a single study assessed by the department as appropriate that is an experimental study, a quasi-experimental design study, or a well-designed and well implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias. For example, a study using regression methods to account for differences between a treatment group and a comparison group

00:09:53.900 --> 00:10:02.030

Toro, Sandra

and includes at least one statistically significant and positive, for example, favorable effect on a relevant outcome.

00:10:06.890 --> 00:10:07.980

Toro, Sandra
Next slide please.

00:10:12.890 --> 00:10:14.670

Toro, Sandra
Sorry I lost my place.

00:10:29.550 --> 00:10:30.630

Toro, Sandra
Use of evidence.

00:10:32.730 --> 00:10:49.620

Toro, Sandra
The Department of Education will require grantees to conduct or commission rigorous evaluations of their activities and report their findings to the department and the public. This includes the development of exit evidence at the conclusion of the grant period.

00:10:51.030 --> 00:11:06.490

Toro, Sandra
Exit evidence describes the theoretical and operational relationships among the key project components and relevant outcomes. This helps with making connections between the activities or strategies that you're using and the outcomes you plan to measure in your evaluation.

00:11:07.980 --> 00:11:22.340

Toro, Sandra
A good suggested starting place is the development of a logic model. A logic model, which we'll discuss further in a few slides, helps communicate the program to people outside the program in a concise and compelling way.

00:11:23.510 --> 00:11:32.190

Toro, Sandra
Another benefit of utilizing a logic model is that it sets the larger stage for understanding how the different levels are being used in this competition.

00:11:33.470 --> 00:11:43.670

Toro, Sandra
The department expects to see programs evaluate their projects such that they can build evidence around project components at the promising evidence level or exit.

00:11:46.370 --> 00:11:47.420

Toro, Sandra
Next slide please.

00:11:51.190 --> 00:12:21.120

Toro, Sandra

Logic model, also referred to as theory of action, means a well specified, conceptual framework that identifies key components of a proposed process, product, strategy, or practice. For example, the active ingredients that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving relevant outcomes and describes the relationships among the key components and outcomes theoretically and operationally.

00:12:21.990 --> 00:12:33.610

Toro, Sandra

In EDGAR, a logic model means a well specified, conceptual framework that identifies key components of the proposed process, product, strategy, or practice

00:12:34.460 --> 00:12:38.310

Toro, Sandra

and describes the relationships among the key components and outcomes.

00:12:39.800 --> 00:12:40.880

Toro, Sandra

Next slide please.

00:12:43.680 --> 00:12:46.030

Toro, Sandra

These are the basic components of a logic model.

00:12:47.120 --> 00:13:08.060

Toro, Sandra

To review, the components are inputs, or resources. These are the materials to create the program, implement its activities, and attain desired outputs and outcomes. Examples include material or non-material resources, facilities, funding, curricula, and community support in time.

00:13:09.280 --> 00:13:18.070

Toro, Sandra

Activities: these are the processes, actions, and events through which the program resources attain the intended outcomes.

00:13:19.160 --> 00:13:27.330

Toro, Sandra

In other words, there are the steps for programming implementation. Examples include conducting training and analyzing student data.

00:13:28.750 --> 00:13:44.800

Toro, Sandra

Outputs; these are process oriented results or products of the program typically expressed in numbers. For example, number of students tested, number of teachers or parents trained; they don't tell you if a change occurred from the program.

00:13:46.270 --> 00:14:01.420

Toro, Sandra

Impacts on outcomes: these include long term outcomes and represent changes in program participant's knowledge, beliefs, or behavior such as higher achievement rates, higher graduation rates, and higher college acceptance rates.

00:14:02.760 --> 00:14:03.670

Toro, Sandra

Assumptions:

00:14:04.420 --> 00:14:23.040

Toro, Sandra

The assumptions that underlie a program's theory are conditions that are necessary to program success and that you believe are true. Your program needs these conditions in order to succeed, but you believe these conditions already exist. They're not something that you need to bring about with your program activities.

00:14:24.560 --> 00:14:28.640

Toro, Sandra

External factors: programs don't occur in a vacuum.

00:14:29.270 --> 00:14:50.170

Toro, Sandra

Many factors over which you have little or no control may affect your program's outcomes. These external factors such as political or economic situations, social influences, and even weather can help or hinder a program's success. Changes in any of these contextual factors may require program adjustments.

00:14:51.690 --> 00:14:52.770

Toro, Sandra

Next slide please.

00:14:55.960 --> 00:15:02.920

Toro, Sandra

At this time, we can take a brief pause to see if there are any questions about anything that I've said before we proceed.

00:15:05.940 --> 00:15:08.280

Toro, Sandra

If you have any questions, please put them in the chat.

00:15:34.360 --> 00:15:49.080

Toro, Sandra

Alright I'm not seeing any questions or any typing come so I will go ahead and introduce Dr. Kavita Mittapalli. She is the founder and CEO of a K-20 research and evaluation firm,

00:15:50.090 --> 00:15:59.960

Toro, Sandra

MN Associates, which is based in Fairfax, Virginia with clients across the nation. AT MNA, Kavita leads a team of 5 evaluators.

00:16:00.760 --> 00:16:30.450

Toro, Sandra

Since its foundation in 2004, MNA has evaluated over 150 grants funded by multiple federal, state, and local agencies as well as private foundations. Kavita has a bachelor's degree in Agricultural Sciences with a minor in Extension Education, a master's in Applied Sociology, and a PhD in Research Design and Methodology in Education. We're very glad to have her present the next section of today's webinar on promising evidence.

00:16:30.720 --> 00:16:32.050

Toro, Sandra

So onto you, Kavita.

00:16:34.810 --> 00:17:06.270

kmittapalli

Thank you so much Sandy thanks, so glad to see your view on camera and the rest of you off camera. Well, thanks, so much for the very warm welcome. Sandy and the wonderful introduction that you have given on the grant, the evaluation requirements, important definitions, and of course, the logic model. Many thanks to the HEP and CAMP team members, Millie, and Sandy of course, and also several partners for inviting me today to present.

00:17:10.630 --> 00:17:11.820

kmittapalli

Next slide please.

00:17:14.260 --> 00:17:32.970

kmittapalli

So for this section of the webinar, there are mainly 5 topics that I will cover to address the regulatory requirement of conducting new promising evidence for your HEP and CAMP programs. So first of all, I'll talk a little bit about the overarching

00:17:34.180 --> 00:18:02.370

kmittapalli

research process that leads us to plan and develop our research design, research questions, methods, and analysis. Next, I will introduce the task of producing new promising evidence, specifically I'll talk about what really constitutes promising evidence and where does it really come from. Following that, I'll talk about some critical questions that drive the new evidence production.

00:18:03.610 --> 00:18:20.960

kmittapalli

Following that, I'll talk about some appropriate experimental and also nonexperimental designs for producing new promising evidence with some field examples from HEP and CAMP programs thanks to the project directors. I think I just saw Dr. Robert Garcia

00:18:21.580 --> 00:18:24.310

kmittapalli

who very kindly shared his work with us.

00:18:24.960 --> 00:18:37.020

kmittapalli

And finally, I'll touch upon some sample's issues with the problems with sampling reliability and also validity as they closely relate to the HEP and CAMP projects.

00:18:38.440 --> 00:18:44.240

kmittapalli

So, summing up during this time, you will have some opportunities to look at your own projects,

00:18:45.490 --> 00:18:52.560

kmittapalli

your logic model, your research design if you have one, with respect to the topics and items that I will be talking about.

00:18:56.750 --> 00:18:57.680

kmittapalli

Next slide please.

00:19:00.550 --> 00:19:21.070

kmittapalli

So let's look at this diagram for a minute or so. So, this diagram really provides a very quick overview of the research process that I mentioned about that leads us to not only plan, design, and also implement the design, the research questions, the data collection, methods, and also conduct analysis.

00:19:21.770 --> 00:19:51.880

kmittapalli

So this figure will be used as a framework when we generally talk about evidence, claim, outcomes, and for designing specifically your HEP and CAMP projects. So, one thing that I would also like to mention here before we get into the details of a research design and the implementation is that as an evaluator sometimes the project team members would also like to know the difference between research and practice and how they tend to inform each other.

00:19:52.580 --> 00:19:58.230

kmittapalli

Also, there is sometimes a conflation between research and practice.

00:19:59.100 --> 00:20:07.900

kmittapalli

So there is a knowledge and application gap between the outcomes that come from the research, and they use in turn in practice.

00:20:09.410 --> 00:20:22.960

kmittapalli

I would also like to take a moment and note here at the beginning that context really significantly matters and effects an intervention of your program and it also affects the impact and effectiveness.

00:20:23.840 --> 00:20:43.920

kmittapalli

It will seldom be possible to replicate results by moving a few components here and there and then expecting the same results in the new setting. So, if the program is to work within a context, it will have to be fitted into that context well, work within its limitations so to speak.

00:20:44.800 --> 00:20:57.610

kmittapalli

So, as someone who is trained in mixed methods and follows the philosophy of critical realism, I love to say that measure, what works for whom, and under what circumstances.

00:21:00.560 --> 00:21:01.680

kmittapalli

Next slide please.

00:21:05.370 --> 00:21:13.030

kmittapalli

So you've been hearing about building evidence with HEP and CAMP projects. So, what exactly

00:21:13.820 --> 00:21:32.820

kmittapalli

is evidence? So, for our purposes, evidence is a particular form of information. It is information for the purpose of affirming or disconfirming a claim and has the qualities of validity and reliability, which I'll talk about in some more details.

00:21:33.810 --> 00:21:42.650

kmittapalli

So, when you hear the term evidence, it means that your project is expected to make use of evidence-based practices

00:21:43.280 --> 00:21:48.300

kmittapalli

as defined by the What Works Clearinghouse or what we call as WWC.

00:21:49.100 --> 00:21:59.800

kmittapalli

Moreover, you had the opportunity to identify evidence of effectiveness regarding your innovation or your intervention to help contribute to the evidence base of your program.

00:22:00.780 --> 00:22:26.010

kmittapalli

So, using these WWC standards, the conditions of your findings really requires that you determine whether there is promising evidence from at least one component of your project that leads to an expected outcome. So, when I talk about output and outcome referred to the slide where Sandy talked about the expected outcomes and outputs from the logic model.

00:22:27.650 --> 00:22:43.770

kmittapalli

So, keep in mind that this is an important contribution for your project that can be made in building

evidence of What Works and HEP and CAMP since there is limited evidence regarding effective strategies pertaining to the populations so by HEP and CAMP projects.

00:22:46.530 --> 00:22:56.460

kmittapalli

So, this requirement also needs considerable unpacking, both in terms of what promising evidence really means and how evidence is really obtained.

00:22:59.100 --> 00:23:00.090

kmittapalli

Next slide please.

00:23:02.210 --> 00:23:08.320

kmittapalli

So, let's talk a bit about unpacking the promising evidence as it relates to HEP and CAMP projects.

00:23:09.620 --> 00:23:14.910

kmittapalli

So, we will begin with what it is that you claim your project is designed to do.

00:23:15.610 --> 00:23:25.670

kmittapalli

You want to know if something is effective, if something is working indeed, on your population. Now, you will need to do the research to find out if that evidence is there to support your claim.

00:23:26.930 --> 00:23:31.610

kmittapalli

We all understand what it means when somebody says that this is really promising.

00:23:32.470 --> 00:23:38.500

kmittapalli

And if we say something is promising, we mean that it appears that things are going to work out the way

00:23:39.240 --> 00:23:40.470

kmittapalli

that we want them to.

00:23:41.250 --> 00:23:51.150

kmittapalli

To say that your innovation is promising merely means that you have reason to expect that you will get the outcome that you intended, again going back to your logic model.

00:23:52.140 --> 00:24:05.020

kmittapalli

However, if the public is going to invest a large amount of money in your project, and if you want others to have confidence in our claims, then we need to have a basis of what is really called as a promising innovation.

00:24:06.060 --> 00:24:06.610

kmittapalli

So,

00:24:07.530 --> 00:24:31.520

kmittapalli

all this means is that we definitely need evidence, and this evidence needs to be of a certain kind. Sandra has already talked about the evidence definitions from EDGAR, so have a good quick reference to those. And when evidence really meets the standards set out by the What Works Clearinghouse, then we can say that evidence is promising, hence the phrase promising evidence.

00:24:33.090 --> 00:24:40.320

kmittapalli

So, getting to the promising evidence really begins from your logic model or the theory of action, which is also our next topic.

00:24:41.880 --> 00:24:43.140

kmittapalli

Next slide please.

00:24:46.790 --> 00:25:06.420

kmittapalli

So, again building on information that Sandra quickly introduced in terms of the logic model on slide 10-11, here's a model that shows the role of a logic model, with respect to conducting an evaluation and especially as it relates to setting up the outputs, the outcomes, and the indicators.

00:25:07.820 --> 00:25:19.930

kmittapalli

So, let's talk about an example of an activity. An example of an activity could be providing counseling, health services, even recruitment, professional development training,

00:25:20.610 --> 00:25:26.750

kmittapalli

technical assistance, workshops, and the content areas, so there's some really good examples of activities.

00:25:27.420 --> 00:25:41.460

kmittapalli

One thing of note is that for some grant programs, an output might also be a workshop or even a tutoring program if the activity is actively engaging in a very collaborative fashion.

00:25:42.710 --> 00:25:46.800

kmittapalli

Or even convening a group of experts to explore a topic,

00:25:47.590 --> 00:25:50.250

kmittapalli

or event on solving a problem.

00:25:50.970 --> 00:25:53.430

kmittapalli

But for HEP and CAMP, that is not the case.

00:25:54.480 --> 00:26:00.990

kmittapalli

I remember the claim that our project offers innovation or intervention X.

00:26:01.750 --> 00:26:16.420

kmittapalli

So if participants take part in X, then participants will accomplish Y, which is our goal. Well, innovation X and outcome Y will need to be articulated well in your logic model.

00:26:17.240 --> 00:26:23.110

kmittapalli

What do you exactly mean by X so that we produce, or we hope to see, Y happen?

00:26:23.970 --> 00:26:34.730

kmittapalli

So, not the language of the regulation, the component and the outcome really need to be evident in the logic model and they should also show how they are linked.

00:26:36.430 --> 00:26:42.150

kmittapalli

So, looking at the logic model, the component could be anything under activities.

00:26:45.210 --> 00:27:00.030

kmittapalli

So, I'm going to pause for maybe half a minute here for you to quickly look at your claim within your logic model and if there is something that you would like to share, maybe you know, right in the chat box, that we are going to take a little later.

00:27:03.590 --> 00:27:07.740

Bentley-Memon, Millicent

Thank you so much Kavita and if you wouldn't mind putting your camera on as well.

00:27:31.640 --> 00:27:35.330

kmittapalli

So, do we have any questions, any thoughts on this?

00:27:37.660 --> 00:27:38.360

kmittapalli

No pressure.

00:28:14.700 --> 00:28:27.170

kmittapalli

We have 10 more seconds and then I'll move on to the next slide and we can come back to the logic

model if you are able to find something and share, I would be more than happy to talk through that.
Next slide please Jessica thank you.

00:28:28.430 --> 00:28:37.440

kmittapalli

So, this slide shows 4 critical questions that you should ask about your activity, intervention, and or treatment.

00:28:38.410 --> 00:28:40.240

kmittapalli

So, we're talking about your claim.

00:28:40.920 --> 00:28:44.500

kmittapalli

You have made a claim about an intervention or treatment for your program.

00:28:45.270 --> 00:28:56.650

kmittapalli

They want to know how effective and Interventional treatment is at bringing about an intended outcome for the population you're in HEP and CAMP programs

00:28:57.820 --> 00:29:07.130

kmittapalli

We also want to know if the claim is just so many words or if there really is promising evidence regarding your claim.

00:29:09.040 --> 00:29:17.310

kmittapalli

And that requires an evaluation of effectiveness. In other words, an intervention or treatment study of effectiveness.

00:29:19.130 --> 00:29:36.780

kmittapalli

Hence the project team, including both the project director and the evaluator, have to ask which key components, for instance, activity, intervention, or treatment, for your project, will be an intervention foreign effectiveness study.

00:29:38.050 --> 00:29:40.410

kmittapalli

What is the outcome to be measured?

00:29:41.630 --> 00:29:46.920

kmittapalli

What is the outcome intended by this component intervention?

00:29:47.680 --> 00:29:53.910

kmittapalli

What level of outcome do I expect to achieve that this component intervention?

00:29:54.700 --> 00:29:57.500

kmittapalli

So, these are the 4 critical questions that

00:29:58.210 --> 00:30:03.230

kmittapalli

should be of prime discussion between the project director and the evaluator.

00:30:08.930 --> 00:30:09.650

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:30:12.450 --> 00:30:19.270

kmittapalli

So, let's look at the 4 questions that I mentioned just now in light of an example of a claim.

00:30:20.380 --> 00:30:22.390

kmittapalli

So for instance, this is my claim:

00:30:23.090 --> 00:30:35.530

kmittapalli

participating in grant supported academic tutoring will enable the students to improve their scores on HSE practice tests for HEP

00:30:36.930 --> 00:30:42.340

kmittapalli

or successfully complete all the first semester courses in CAMP.

00:30:43.140 --> 00:30:46.540

kmittapalli

My expected target is 95%.

00:30:48.780 --> 00:31:00.930

kmittapalli

Note that this example of claims supports achievement of a short-term outcome in the logic model template that was shared previously and also talked about by Sandra in some details.

00:31:01.620 --> 00:31:11.540

kmittapalli

The achievement of short-term outcomes leads to achievement of intermediate outcomes, especially meeting their one and or the 2 targets

00:31:12.330 --> 00:31:16.970

kmittapalli

which then will support the achievement of long-term outcomes.

00:31:17.720 --> 00:31:36.240

kmittapalli

So, when we talk about outcomes in a logic model, we are thinking about those short-term outcomes, which might be happening suppose in your 5-year program in year 3 and year 4 and the long term would be 5 and even beyond if you're able to measure those, so keep those in mind.

00:31:40.080 --> 00:31:40.860

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:31:43.740 --> 00:31:50.020

kmittapalli

So, going a little further into some more details, again this is my claim on the left side of the slide.

00:31:51.100 --> 00:31:56.780

kmittapalli

HEP or CAMP students who participate in grant supported academic tutoring

00:31:57.490 --> 00:32:01.690

kmittapalli

will improve their scores on HSE practice tests for HEP

00:32:02.430 --> 00:32:06.530

kmittapalli

or successfully complete all the first semester courses in CAMP,

00:32:07.310 --> 00:32:10.610

kmittapalli

expected target being 95%, which we already talked about.

00:32:11.380 --> 00:32:14.530

kmittapalli

However, it turns out as the claim is written,

00:32:15.910 --> 00:32:28.430

kmittapalli

I can't actually answer all the 4 critical questions that I mentioned. Information is still missing, and it has to do with what is known as operationalizing the definition.

00:32:29.440 --> 00:32:44.400

kmittapalli

So, we have to operationalize our component or activity to be tested as well as the outcomes to be measured so that we know that our terms mean and so that they are also measurable, both the short and the long terms.

00:32:46.040 --> 00:32:50.190

kmittapalli

So, here are some answers to the 4 critical questions that I talked about.

00:32:50.920 --> 00:33:07.770

kmittapalli

So, rich component of our program will be an intervention foreign effectiveness study. So, the answer here is participating in grant supported academic tutoring. However, I mentioned that we also need to operationalize the participation aspect. What does that mean?

00:33:08.680 --> 00:33:22.810

kmittapalli

So, we write participating in at least 10 hours of grant supported academic tutoring, which means that we are adding that component of specificity: how much, how often?

00:33:24.260 --> 00:33:30.900

kmittapalli

Now, the second question: what is the expected outcome intended by this component intervention?

00:33:32.130 --> 00:33:35.850

kmittapalli

That would be improving the scores on HSE practice tests.

00:33:36.500 --> 00:33:40.400

kmittapalli

Successfully, completing all the first semester courses for camp.

00:33:41.240 --> 00:33:45.200

kmittapalli

Likely you're also seeing the problem, but what do these terms mean?

00:33:46.290 --> 00:33:50.880

kmittapalli

So, we ask how are the expected or projected outcomes to be measured?

00:33:51.800 --> 00:34:00.830

kmittapalli

By percentage; we are interested to know percent of students who are improving their scores on HSE practice tests.

00:34:01.570 --> 00:34:14.490

kmittapalli

Percent of students successfully completing all the first courses so you're just looking at the final approach. We start out very broad and then we are very slowly funneling it down to extreme specificity.

00:34:16.270 --> 00:34:27.210

kmittapalli

But they're not out of the woods, yet. So, how does the percentage really matter? Does the number of students really matter? Does it really mean to successfully complete a course?

00:34:28.130 --> 00:34:33.840

kmittapalli

So, our example indicates an expected target of 95%, so let's lose that.

00:34:34.690 --> 00:34:37.200

kmittapalli

And restate the answers to question 2.

00:34:37.940 --> 00:34:42.660

kmittapalli

What is the outcome intended by this component intervention?

00:34:44.590 --> 00:34:55.570

kmittapalli

So, restating this and adding the percentage 95% of all the participants will show improvement on the HSE practice test for HEP.

00:34:56.600 --> 00:35:06.690

kmittapalli

Or 95% of the participants will complete all first semester courses for CAMP with a C grade or better.

00:35:12.510 --> 00:35:13.320

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:35:15.320 --> 00:35:34.980

kmittapalli

Therefore, the revised claim here would be 95% of HEP and CAMP students who participate in at least 10 hours of grant-supported academic tutoring will show improvement on HSE practice tests for HEP

00:35:35.790 --> 00:35:41.660

kmittapalli

or complete all first semester courses for CAMP with a C grade or better.

00:35:42.720 --> 00:35:49.500

kmittapalli

So overall, we have improved the specificity and measurability of our claim.

00:35:50.430 --> 00:36:05.280

kmittapalli

At this point, I want to make a slight change to the comment on 2 critical points that have to do with measurement tools., you know devices, which I want to talk about in a bit, so I want to pause for a hot second here

00:36:06.290 --> 00:36:14.430

kmittapalli

so that you can take a look at the slide as to how we narrowed the definition, how we brought it from a broad claim to an extremely,

00:36:15.210 --> 00:36:18.510

kmittapalli

narrow yet measurable claim

00:36:19.330 --> 00:36:21.770

kmittapalli

for your HEP and CAMP program.

00:36:33.660 --> 00:36:35.770

kmittapalli

OK next slide please Jessica.

00:36:38.350 --> 00:36:50.500

kmittapalli

So, I talked about the measurement devices, tools, and instruments so evaluators often use a wide variety of tools and instruments to conduct evaluation.

00:36:51.730 --> 00:36:59.610

kmittapalli

So, the points I want to make here are about the quality of measuring tools, devices, and for collecting baseline data.

00:37:00.500 --> 00:37:05.410

kmittapalli

So, regarding quality, collecting data requires that you have some measurement tools.

00:37:06.380 --> 00:37:16.010

kmittapalli

Such tools can be, you know, many different things such as surveys, exit surveys, pre post surveys, our review of tracking logs, tests.

00:37:18.360 --> 00:37:32.910

kmittapalli

However, all measurement devices, they need to have demonstrated some validity and reliability. So, these are 2 terms that will be often used by evaluators when they say that we conducted

00:37:33.670 --> 00:37:42.170

kmittapalli

reliability tests or we took these X, Y, and Z steps to make sure that our study was reliable.

00:37:43.060 --> 00:37:49.580

kmittapalli

So, in terms of validity. It's a device or tool that measures what it what it intends to measure.

00:37:50.410 --> 00:37:55.780

kmittapalli

And in terms of reliability, a device or a tool that is in stable responses.

00:37:56.450 --> 00:38:14.010

kmittapalli

For example, if data are collected one day from one person, a week later is assuming nothing has

happened between; that person will respond the same way then the same tool or instrument is used, so there is that level of consistency.

00:38:15.830 --> 00:38:31.430

kmittapalli

Some changes are natural, and they're also dependent on the context the data are being collected. So, as researchers and evaluators, we also believe that a researcher collecting data becomes the instrument and the conditions they are working.

00:38:32.530 --> 00:38:42.340

kmittapalli

Affective mentioned is our devices are both valid and reliable and these factors should not be overlooked both by the project director and the evaluator.

00:38:47.500 --> 00:38:48.240

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:38:50.180 --> 00:39:13.230

kmittapalli

So, in the previous slide before I started talking about reliability and validity, I mentioned about baseline data. So, every project should be paid or should have baseline data. We always need baseline data, especially in the education context. The baseline would be prior knowledge, it could be training experience,

00:39:13.960 --> 00:39:24.280

kmittapalli

prior test scores, performance data, and several other touch points that occur before the intervention, before the activities or innovation actually begins.

00:39:25.750 --> 00:39:33.210

kmittapalli

You have measuring tools and devices for measuring the outcomes, but you also need to know what the starting point is.

00:39:33.850 --> 00:39:43.150

kmittapalli

Thus, every project should be prepared to collect some baseline data and baseline data are the data about your participants at the start of your project.

00:39:44.600 --> 00:39:49.980

kmittapalli

For example, let's say you have an intervention on study skills, and you have a study skills measure.

00:39:50.800 --> 00:40:02.100

kmittapalli

Denote the effectiveness of the study skills intervention, which we can also say is the outcome of your project, you need to know the participant's study skills that is prior to the intervention.

00:40:03.260 --> 00:40:05.220

kmittapalli

That is what the baseline data is.

00:40:05.900 --> 00:40:13.920

kmittapalli

So, it doesn't measure of whether or where the participants are before receiving your projects innovative services.

00:40:17.320 --> 00:40:18.220

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:40:19.820 --> 00:40:36.420

kmittapalli

OK, so back to where we are in terms of fidelity of implementation, I'll talk briefly about what exactly fidelity of implementation means particularly the context factors that can have a heavy influence on how you run your program.

00:40:37.320 --> 00:40:39.610

kmittapalli

Remember when I said context really matters.

00:40:40.500 --> 00:40:51.880

kmittapalli

So looking at your logic model, what aspects of context could possibly influence the implementation of your project, which will in turn affect

00:40:52.520 --> 00:40:53.520

kmittapalli

the outcomes?

00:41:02.040 --> 00:41:02.770

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:41:04.900 --> 00:41:09.170

kmittapalli

So, back to our example, looking again at this

00:41:09.790 --> 00:41:33.330

kmittapalli

definition of claim and also promising evidence, so 95% of HEP and CAMP students who participate in at least 10 hours of grant supported academic training will show improvement on HSE practice test or will complete all first semester courses in CAMP with C grade or better.

00:41:34.040 --> 00:41:36.400

kmittapalli

Let's say we achieve our expectations.

00:41:37.800 --> 00:41:48.480

kmittapalli

We then have to ask how do we know that our expected outcome was achieved because the students actually participated in at least 10 hours of grant supported services?

00:41:49.570 --> 00:41:56.590

kmittapalli

Maybe other students did just as well without participating in at least 10 hours of grant supported academic tutoring.

00:41:57.570 --> 00:42:01.800

kmittapalli

Answering that question will require us to look at evidence,

00:42:02.640 --> 00:42:07.020

kmittapalli

experimental designs, and the What Works Clearinghouse standards.

00:42:09.740 --> 00:42:10.500

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:42:14.960 --> 00:42:27.570

kmittapalli

So there are several study designs that evaluators and researchers use. For the purposes of this presentation, I will mainly focus on the quasi-experimental designs, or in short, QED.

00:42:28.310 --> 00:42:37.570

kmittapalli

A QED attempts to approximate an experimental study by identifying a comparison group that is like the treatment group

00:42:38.770 --> 00:42:39.940

kmittapalli

in important respects.

00:42:41.180 --> 00:42:48.680

kmittapalli

So, what we call as a matched comparison group in a QED is an important factor and there are a few ways of doing it.

00:42:49.440 --> 00:43:00.660

kmittapalli

We could either do propensity score matching, originating matching method, which I'm going to talk about in the latter slides. However, the name of the method is not as important

00:43:01.390 --> 00:43:05.560

kmittapalli

as much as you understand the basics of creating a comparison group.

00:43:06.470 --> 00:43:13.030

kmittapalli

To create similar groups, one often matches participants on similar characteristics

00:43:13.850 --> 00:43:21.280

kmittapalli

so that the participants in both the control and the treatment conditions have very similar characteristics.

00:43:22.670 --> 00:43:27.950

kmittapalli

The better the matching, the better the design, and therefore, better the results.

00:43:29.670 --> 00:43:32.420

kmittapalli

So once again, let's look at our example claim.

00:43:33.120 --> 00:43:41.810

kmittapalli

We choose factors or characteristics on which to match the participants so that the 2 conditions are as similar as possible.

00:43:43.060 --> 00:44:11.330

kmittapalli

We might decide that both conditions should have participants who are HEP and CAMP participants, they're taking HSE practice test for HEP, or they are enrolled in the first semester of their undergraduate education for CAMP, they are first generation students seeking tertiary education, they are the similar age group and age range, they are full time students, and there is a gender balance in the 2 groups.

00:44:12.760 --> 00:44:16.180

kmittapalli

So, the first 2 are pretty obvious because we are in the HEP and CAMP grant.

00:44:16.770 --> 00:44:28.430

kmittapalli

Both conditions need to have participants who are also eligible for the program. After that, we must also consider what other characteristics might distinguish the students.

00:44:30.490 --> 00:44:52.000

kmittapalli

So, the ones I have listed are few of the possibilities. I mentioned about you know age, the demographic

characteristics. The strength of this design is critically dependent on how well the matching is accomplished. You need to know your participants extremely well to make sure that your pattern matching is effective.

00:44:53.480 --> 00:45:10.510

kmittapalli

The difference, of course, is that the treatment condition will involve the intervention of the academic tutoring while the comparison control condition does not, which also means that some students will not receive the intervention that could possibly help them.

00:45:16.330 --> 00:45:17.050

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:45:19.390 --> 00:45:35.240

kmittapalli

So, thanks to Dr. Garcia here, CAMP director come from the Bueno Center at the University of Colorado, Boulder for sharing an example from his CAMP grant. I had a very nice discussion with him the last few weeks and he talked to me about

00:45:35.580 --> 00:45:38.110

kmittapalli

the conditions,

00:45:38.180 --> 00:45:42.650

kmittapalli

the structure of his analysis, and how it worked out for him.

00:45:43.330 --> 00:45:57.350

kmittapalli

So, in a sense the sample sizes were about 30 students each year and over the years longitudinally that added up to 150 or so, so he ended up with a really good sample to conduct the longitudinal analysis

00:45:58.050 --> 00:46:00.220

kmittapalli

and track the individual student progress.

00:46:01.960 --> 00:46:14.000

kmittapalli

So the data collection: he also had a good collaboration with his IR department folks at the university who were providing him data on the GPRA measures.

00:46:15.040 --> 00:46:21.470

kmittapalli

And also, he had access to the rosters of CAMP and non-CAMP students, so that was the data collection process.

00:46:22.670 --> 00:46:33.800

kmittapalli

And in terms of the statistic, he conducted an independent T test because the 2 groups were independent which determined the significance of the effect of 2 groups' means independently.

00:46:34.620 --> 00:46:44.130

kmittapalli

And effect size will basically which determines the magnitude of the effects. I'm going to talk about this in little details. So just hold that thought in terms of Dr Garcia's project here.

00:46:49.860 --> 00:46:50.650

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:46:53.930 --> 00:47:24.870

kmittapalli

So, going back to designing and developing a quasi-experimental study and specifically your control group, so in case of Dr. Garcia 's project, all the students are enrolled in developmental courses. They are first generation college students, first year students, commuter students. They were receiving Pell Grants, or they were Pell Grant eligible, and they were full time students. Remember when I talked about having a very close matched comparison group, so he had these 2 groups with

00:47:24.930 --> 00:47:26.560

kmittapalli

all these characteristics.

00:47:28.380 --> 00:47:38.150

kmittapalli

So, one way to really work collaboratively to gather information on your 2 groups is to work with institutional research and assessment folks.

00:47:39.020 --> 00:47:51.690

kmittapalli

The other way is also by doing a statistical analysis and producing a matched comparison group by using propensity score matching and a more sophisticated method called the genetic method.

00:47:53.550 --> 00:48:09.080

kmittapalli

So, those people who are familiar with statistical techniques, such as SPSS or STATA, they can construct an artificial control group by using the PSM method or even a genetic mapping method.

00:48:09.830 --> 00:48:15.400

kmittapalli

So, under the time constraints, I don't think I can go into a lot of details as to how it works.

00:48:17.710 --> 00:48:32.690

kmittapalli

But keeping in mind that either you work with your IR people to develop a matched comparison group,

or you can do statistically by some historical data and running the information and creating an artificial matched group.

00:48:35.660 --> 00:48:36.340

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:48:39.900 --> 00:48:53.000

kmittapalli

So, I mentioned the term effect size. In statistics, effect sizes are a value that measures the strength of the relationship between 2 variables in a population or even a sample-based estimate of that quantity.

00:48:53.650 --> 00:49:23.650

kmittapalli

It can refer to the value of a statistic calculated from the sample data, the value of the parameter of the population, or to the equation that operationalizes how that parameter leads to an effect size, so, based on what Dr. Garcia studied the sample size that he had was 112 with 31 CAMP students and 81 in the comparison control. The CAMP Completers were about 87% and the controller,

00:49:23.710 --> 00:49:37.060

kmittapalli

the control complete was 57%, so he actually got a pretty high level of significance at 0.001 level and the effect size actually was pretty good 0.7, which is considered a medium effect size.

00:49:37.960 --> 00:49:44.730

kmittapalli

So, there's actually a lot of information and a lot of technical information of how to calculate effect size.

00:49:45.540 --> 00:49:51.590

kmittapalli

A technicality behind it is in the What Works Clearinghouse guidance sheet so please take a moment to check it out.

00:49:54.340 --> 00:49:55.150

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:49:58.240 --> 00:50:28.060

kmittapalli

So, let's look at what Dr. Garcia did with his grant. I mentioned that longitudinally by year 3, had a fairly large sample size, so referring to the earlier slide where CAMP students were 31 in number, that grew to 97 by year 3, and when he redid the independent analysis, independent T test again in year 3, their effect size actually grew larger from 0.07 to 2.81, which is considered very large effect size and it is positive.

00:50:35.810 --> 00:50:36.540

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:50:40.100 --> 00:50:54.770

kmittapalli

So, perhaps you may also find that your program is probably not suitable for a quasi-experimental design where you're not able to have enough sample or enough participants to actually draw a comparison or matched comparison group.

00:50:56.190 --> 00:50:57.520

kmittapalli

So, in that case,

00:50:58.190 --> 00:51:02.300

kmittapalli

the alternative is a correlational design study.

00:51:04.790 --> 00:51:21.560

kmittapalli

But when it's not even possible, the best choice is really about doing this study again, keeping in mind some of the biases, some of these statistical controls, and making sure that it is still reliably done and it is using a valid instrument.

00:51:22.970 --> 00:51:26.780

kmittapalli

So, a correlational study really investigates the relationship.

00:51:27.440 --> 00:51:32.960

kmittapalli

But it is not causal in nature, it only mainly shows a relationship between variables.

00:51:34.040 --> 00:51:45.820

kmittapalli

It will not yield in causal inferences. Evidence produced by a correlational design also does not meet the What Works Clearinghouse moderate evidence standard so please keep that in mind.

00:51:46.640 --> 00:51:51.220

kmittapalli

But graphically or visually this is what a correlational study will look like.

00:51:51.990 --> 00:51:58.110

kmittapalli

For instance, the first one is a positive correlation when the value of one

00:51:58.810 --> 00:52:01.590

kmittapalli

variable increases with respect to the other.

00:52:02.500 --> 00:52:07.640

kmittapalli

The negative correlation is the second image when the value of one variable decreases

00:52:08.440 --> 00:52:09.700

kmittapalli

with respect to another.

00:52:10.690 --> 00:52:17.500

kmittapalli

And no correlation the 3rd graph. Then there is no linear dependence or relationship between 2 variables.

00:52:19.710 --> 00:52:30.540

kmittapalli

In research and evaluation parlance, correlational designs are considered the weakest of the research designs because they don't tell us anything about causality.

00:52:31.460 --> 00:52:39.350

kmittapalli

They usually indicate whether one variable or group of variables may not be related to another variable.

00:52:39.990 --> 00:52:41.210

kmittapalli

Hence the phrase,

00:52:41.960 --> 00:52:45.560

kmittapalli

correlation does not imply causation.

00:52:48.440 --> 00:52:53.980

kmittapalli

So, one last time let's return to our example of claim about a project's outcomes.

00:52:55.550 --> 00:52:56.280

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:52:59.040 --> 00:53:07.960

kmittapalli

In this design, there are no treatment or control conditions. That's important because it's a correlational design. Everybody gets the treatment, but not everybody gets the same dose.

00:53:08.730 --> 00:53:20.490

kmittapalli

So, in our example, we want everyone to have at least 10 hours of academic tutoring, but some will have a lot more than 10 and some will have maybe only 10 or just under 10.

00:53:21.240 --> 00:53:32.550

kmittapalli

So, our hypothesis is that the more tutoring hours participants get the better they will do in their HSE practice exams for HEP or first semester courses in CAMP.

00:53:33.460 --> 00:53:47.890

kmittapalli

We also contend that participation in tutoring hours will have a positive correlation with the students' performance on the HSE practice tests or in the first semester courses; remember, I'm talking about correlation.

00:53:48.620 --> 00:54:03.290

kmittapalli

The advantages are that the basic design is less complex in a correlational design, larger numbers are not necessary, and everyone willing to participate in the treatment will have access to it, so that's the main advantage of doing a correlational study.

00:54:04.830 --> 00:54:08.810

kmittapalli

We will not, however, be able to infer any causality.

00:54:13.020 --> 00:54:13.720

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:54:15.200 --> 00:54:17.100

kmittapalli

So, one of the complications

00:54:17.310 --> 00:54:23.470

kmittapalli

is that of selection bias, more specifically self-selection bias.

00:54:24.580 --> 00:54:44.270

kmittapalli

So, what happens is the potential for self-selection is present in a correlational study. Therefore, it is important that how do we use matching techniques to help promote the selection bias? That's why it is important to have a well-designed correlation study by statistical controls for controlling the selection bias.

00:54:45.740 --> 00:54:56.030

kmittapalli

So, in other words, you need to statistically control for extraneous potential factors that could have an effect on the treatment outcome, both in the short and the long terms.

00:54:58.040 --> 00:54:58.800

kmittapalli

Next slide.

00:55:04.080 --> 00:55:05.360

kmittapalli

So, now to sum up,

00:55:08.060 --> 00:55:11.230

kmittapalli

I think we need to click Jessica for the text.

00:55:12.340 --> 00:55:14.820

kmittapalli

Yeah, you can keep clicking.

00:55:15.740 --> 00:55:36.340

kmittapalli

Yep, so user projects logic model and research process took carefully to identify study questions going back to that figure that I mentioned earlier on, the intervention that needs to be evaluated, and the relevant outcomes that you expect to be affected by that specific intervention.

00:55:37.670 --> 00:55:45.660

kmittapalli

Keep in mind the sampling issues and when possible, scope for a longitudinal study referring back to Dr. Garcia's example.

00:55:46.690 --> 00:56:00.750

kmittapalli

So, projects are expected using an appropriate quasi-experimental design to produce evidence bearing a theoretical linkage between at least one aspect of the project and at least one relevant outcome.

00:56:02.030 --> 00:56:02.860

kmittapalli

Also,

00:56:03.620 --> 00:56:10.590

kmittapalli

decide how to form a comparison group to contrast with students receiving the intervention.

00:56:12.000 --> 00:56:16.550

kmittapalli

Always make sure that you have permission and the right resources

00:56:17.380 --> 00:56:22.720

kmittapalli

to collect the baseline implementation and outcome data for your evaluation.

00:56:28.380 --> 00:56:32.580

kmittapalli

That's all folks over to Sandy.

00:56:33.710 --> 00:56:34.530

Toro, Sandra

Thank you so much.

00:56:35.890 --> 00:56:36.290

Toro, Sandra

That was a great presentation

00:56:40.650 --> 00:56:56.620

Toro, Sandra

Our next slide contains links to resources, including EDGAR definitions, some non-regulatory guidance about using evidence to strengthen education investments, EDGAR in evidence, and understanding ED evidence definitions.

00:56:57.880 --> 00:56:58.920

Toro, Sandra

Next slide please.

00:57:02.210 --> 00:57:23.110

Toro, Sandra

For more detailed information and technical assistance about designing experimental and quasi experimental studies. Please visit these websites and there are additional resources and examples of logic models and what to look for in the PowerPoint that we will be sharing with you that you can refer to after today.

00:57:25.170 --> 00:57:29.830

Toro, Sandra

And I believe you did receive a PDF if you're on the HEP CAMP Listserv.

00:57:30.510 --> 00:57:31.930

Toro, Sandra

Thank you Millie for sending that out.

00:57:33.470 --> 00:57:34.490

Toro, Sandra

Next slide please.

00:57:36.330 --> 00:57:51.230

Toro, Sandra

So any questions before we move into our breakout groups? You can ask your question in the chat box and again, if we can't get to your question right now, we will definitely follow up with you after the webinar.

00:57:51.590 --> 00:57:57.970

Toro, Sandra

But we can also use the breakout rooms to clarify all of the information that we shared today.

00:58:12.040 --> 00:58:18.650

Toro, Sandra

I think we have a very quiet group today. But if anyone has any questions. Feel free to put them into the chat.

00:58:25.180 --> 00:58:30.600

Toro, Sandra

And while you're doing that Jessica if you can go to the next slide.

00:58:32.310 --> 00:58:46.580

Toro, Sandra

Here our current HEP and CAMP contacts and you should feel free to reach out to us at any time if you have any questions about your work on an application that you're thinking about submitting, we're happy to help.

00:58:54.040 --> 00:59:00.030

Toro, Sandra

Yeah, so someone, said it's not a question, but I think it's lunchtime for people.

00:59:03.440 --> 00:59:22.430

Toro, Sandra

Alright next slide, please. I don't see anyone typing so we can transition to the breakout rooms for further discussion. And remember that evaluation questions will be shared via the chat box in the breakout rooms, and we would greatly appreciate if you can answer these questions for us.

00:59:33.220 --> 00:59:34.650

Toro, Sandra

So next slide, please.

00:59:38.890 --> 00:59:46.670

Toro, Sandra

So, if you'd like to join us for an optional breakout for a facilitated discussion with your peers as well,

00:59:48.760 --> 01:00:18.680

Toro, Sandra

we will be separating into 2 groups, and we would like you to think about these questions, so which components of developing an evaluation and building promising evidence have been most challenging for you and specifically if you address the challenges, what solutions did you use or if you haven't addressed those challenges, how can your peers help you with identifying

01:00:18.790 --> 01:00:19.570

Toro, Sandra

a solution?

01:00:21.100 --> 01:00:49.630

Toro, Sandra

So, the breakout room facilitators, Kavita and myself and we will also have some additional ED staff. We will put the discussion questions in the chat box, and you can respond orally by unmuting yourself or putting responses in the chat box and each breakout session will have staff people to assist with any technology issues that might come up.

01:00:50.930 --> 01:00:59.510

Toro, Sandra

And following, we expect about 20 minutes for the breakouts, we ask that you complete the evaluation questions.

01:01:03.470 --> 01:01:06.390

Toro, Sandra
I think the

01:01:08.180 --> 01:01:09.760

Toro, Sandra
links have been posted.

01:01:11.070 --> 01:01:17.750

Toro, Sandra
So, please join us if you can come for the breakout sessions, the 2 links are in the chat.

01:01:21.370 --> 01:01:22.410

Toro, Sandra
And

01:01:24.910 --> 01:01:28.650

Toro, Sandra
Jessica can you please scroll?

01:01:29.380 --> 01:01:32.940

Toro, Sandra
Or move to the next slide.

01:01:34.280 --> 01:01:52.370

Toro, Sandra
Yes, so I just wanted to point to the other resources that you'll see in the PowerPoint that you'll receive as a PDF if you haven't received it already so there's a logic model for HEP and CAMP, there's an example and, on the next slide,

01:01:56.650 --> 01:02:00.610

Toro, Sandra
this one is about models for evaluation planning,

01:02:01.240 --> 01:02:03.750

Toro, Sandra
And we have one more resource slide,

01:02:05.720 --> 01:02:09.060

Toro, Sandra
this one is just some questions for you to think about

01:02:09.110 --> 01:02:18.020

Toro, Sandra
in terms of developing your logic model and looking back and reflecting on your claims and logic models that you've already created.

01:02:22.070 --> 01:02:25.320

Toro, Sandra
And with that,

01:02:26.280 --> 01:02:36.160

Toro, Sandra
we hope you will join us for the breakouts and thank you so much to Dr. Kavita for all of your wonderful information that you've shared with us today.