# Friday, November 3, 11:10 A.M. to 11:55 A.M.

**SESSION 420: Presidential Strand Tech Talk**                                                          **Room:** Lanai
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Computer Use in Evaluation
**Building Evaluation Capacity Byte by Byte: More Computer-based and On-line Resources for Evaluators**
Chair:          Catherine Callow Elwell, Utah State University
Presenters:  Catherine Callow Elwell, Utah State University
                   Daniel J Robertson, Utah State University

The volume of digital resources available on the Internet and through electronic communications is overwhelming. Searching for appropriate electronic resources requires time and savvy search strategies.  At AEA '98 and '99, Catherine Elwell presented lists of electronic resources for evaluators that included links to employment and funding opportunities, conference and course information, evaluation tools and instruments, evaluation reports and how-to manuals, and information about evaluation theories, models, and practical advice. That list continues to evolve as new resources develop.  In this presentation we will demonstrate useful links to many electronic resources, and will focus especially on on-line instrument archives and evaluation tools.  We will demonstrate how to create on-line instruments for collecting data on-site or at a distance, and will discuss how computer-based data collection can increase evaluation capacity, improve data quality, and streamline analysis and reporting.  We will also discuss problematic issues arising from technology use in data collection.

**SESSION 421: Tech Talk**                                                                                            **Room:** Akaka
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Computer Use in Evaluation
**Casting the Net on New Possibilities in Data Collection and Reporting**
Chair:          Daniel J Heck, Horizon Research Inc
Presenter:   Daniel J Heck, Horizon Research Inc

The growing prevalence of electronic communication opens numerous possibilities for evaluation. In addition to the ease with which data can be collected, the use of electronic forms of communication for data collection and reporting, particularly Web-based forms, permits innovative item construction, automated quality control mechanisms, and rapid feedback and reporting. Horizon Research, Inc. is currently involved in evaluating several mathematics and science education projects using electronic data collection and reporting. Several innovations will be demonstrated-such as the reporting of qualitative and quantitative information from remote sites to HRI, the nearly instantaneous analysis of data available to sites, and the use of automated scripts that tailor instruments to respondents and that assure data quality in order to maximize the efficiency of data collection. A clear limitation of Web-based data collection and reporting is that it demands that respondents not only have to the Internet, but also expertise in using Web technologies.

**SESSION 422: Business Meeting and Presentation**                                               **Room:** Koko
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Distance Education and Other Educational Technology
**The Future of Educational Technology**
TIG Chair:   Mark Hawkes, Dakota State University
Presenter:   Dennis Gooler, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning

**SESSION 423: Alternative Format**                                                                          **Room:** Waimea
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation
**The Manifestation of the Vision: Utilizing Participatory Evaluation to Translate Organizational Values into Quality Programs and Outcomes**
Presenters:  Denise L Ferrara, National Center for Disability Services
                   Craig A Michaels, City University of New York
                   Stephen Morabito, National Center for Disability Services

This session will explore the use of a Participatory Evaluation model in non-profit organizations to translate

Vision/Mission statements into multi-strand, comprehensive evaluation models consisting of programmatic (formative), outcome (summative) and impact evaluation. Specifically, this model was developed to ensure that the values of the organization are directly translating into the services being provided and that outcomes consistent with the Vision are achieved. In addition to the development of the conceptual model and process to operationalize its many dimensions, session participants will gain an appreciation for the struggles and triumphs of nitty-gritty implementation. Also addressed will be the importance of merging group facilitation and traditional evaluation skills to actively engage service providers in the process to ensure that evaluation findings truly influence practice. Ultimately, it is the interpersonal skills and human contact that serve as the link between the products of evaluation and the informational needs of practitioners and service providers.

## SESSION 424: Demonstration                                        Room: Niihau

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Program Theory and Theory-driven Evaluation
**Emerging Program Models - Developing and Testing Fidelity Criteria**
Chair:       Carol T Mowbray, University of Michigan
Presenters:  Carol T Mowbray, University of Michigan
             Mark Holter, University of Michigan

Fidelity criteria, derived from a model based on program theory, are increasingly used in sophisticated evaluation practice. Assessing whether the program demonstrates model fidelity, the evaluator can better determine whether poor outcomes reflect failure of the model, or failure to implement the model. This approach is difficult to apply to emerging models--not based on theory or empirical research, e.g., self-help or grass-roots community programs. We describe a method to develop, operationalize, test, and refine fidelity criteria in consumer-operated mental health services: (1)articulating and operationalizing criteria for the model, based on published literature and judgements of consumer experts; (2)data collection directly from participants, as well as from records and staff; (3)assessing discriminant validity through comparisons with a matched sample of structurally similar, non-consumer-operated programs; (4)using participant reports to establish the appropriateness of the proposed criteria; (5)assessing validity of records and staff reports(more readily available sources) by comparing them to consumer reports.

## SESSION 425: Think Tank                                           Room: Hilo

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Non-profit and Foundations Evaluation
**"Capacity Building" for Capacity Building's Sake?  The Role of Evaluation in Capacity Building Projects**
Facilitators: Sally R Durgan, The California Endowment
             Pauline E Brooks, The California Endowment
             Tenzing Donyo. The California Endowment
             Ruth E Forman, The California Endowment
             Carol Richardson, The California Endowment

Increasingly, foundations and other funders are providing grants and technical assistance to increase the capacity of non-profit organizations.  Capacity building includes a wide range of activities from training staff in strategic planning and evaluation to providing computer hardware and software.  When a capacity building project is funded and implemented, program funders, managers and evaluators must decide what to measure and evaluate.  Is it adequate to monitor the number of new staff added, the number of technical assistance sessions provided and new equipment purchased?  Does increased capacity lead to improvement in services provided to the target community?  Does the nature of the organization change as a result of capacity building efforts?  This Think Tank session explores these and related questions to try to identify some practical, effective ways to evaluate diverse links between 'capacity building' in organizations and improved outcomes for individuals and communities.

## SESSION 426: Tech Talk                                            Room: Puna

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Quantitative Methods: Theory and Design
**Use of Multi-Sample, Multivariate Latent Growth Curve Modeling To Examine Cross-program Dose and Intervention Effects in Prevention Research**
Chair:       Charles W Turner, Caliber Associates
Presenters:  Timothy J Ozechowski, Caliber Associates

Charles W Turner, Caliber Associates
Kate Wilson, Caliber Associates
Sanjeev Sridharan, Caliber Associates
J Fred Springer, Evaluation Management and Training Associates Inc

Prevention scientists have begun to express the need for sophisticated methodologies to evaluate longitudinal changes in key intervention targets within drug use prevention programs (Bryant, Windle, & West, 1997). This presentation will demonstrate the application of multi-sample, or hierarchical, latent growth curve modeling (LGM) for studying the longitudinal effects of prevention interventions. The approach extends previous applications of LGM (e.g., Duncan, Duncan, Biglan, & Ary, 1998; McArdle & Hamagami, 1996) to the evaluation of cross-site or cross-program prevention effects. In particular, we emphasize the modeling of site- and program-specific variables (i.e., intervention dosage) to explain individual differences in prevention outcomes over time. The presenters' demonstration of LGM is derived from their analysis of a large scale multi-site and multi-program longitudinal outcome data set. The presentation will provide step-by-step instructions for arranging cross-site/cross-program data, specifying the analytical models, programming the software, and interpreting the output. This presentation addresses the critical need for methodological frameworks for establishing empirical linkages between longitudinal prevention outcomes and specific dimensions of intervention delivery within and across prevention programs.

## SESSION 427: Alternative Format                                                          Room: Kohala
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Collaborative, Participatory & Empowerment Evaluation
**Creating Professional Communities through Reflective Self-assessment: Report of a Three-year Study To Create a Self-Assessment System**
Presenters:  Gwen M Willems, University of Minnesota
Rob Shumer, University of Minnesota

As the potential grows for self-assessment methodologies to significantly increase evaluation capacity within a variety of diverse settings, a theory of self-assessment is called for.  To what extent and in which ways can self-assessment tools be helpful to individuals?  What is the connection between assessment instruments and discussion groups?  Are there ways to validate self-assessments?  These questions will be explored by the presenters using the case study of a recently developed and piloted international self-assessment system for service-learning, as well as highlights of literature on the topic.  The assessment system, which includes instruments and discussion groups, is the result of a three-year study.  In this interactive session, participants will have an opportunity to fill out the first short instrument of a two-part self-assessment; discuss their views on self-assessments and the feedback of educators who piloted the tool; and consider a new way of looking at self-assessment practitioners as members of a creative, critical, and reflective professional community.

## SESSION 428: Alternative Format                                                          Room: Kona
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Business and Industry
**Evaluation that Counts: Winning the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT)/USA Today Quality Cup**
Chair:        Emmalou Norland, The Ohio State University
Presenters:  Susan M Missler, The Ohio State University
D Michael Krabill, The Ohio State University

The presenters will discuss the process of competing for the RIT/USA Today Quality Cup, using the applied example of the Transit Service Improvement Team of The Ohio State University's Department of Transportation and Parking Services (a Finalist in the 2000 RIT/USA Today Quality Cup competition). Presenters will review the process characteristics for judging the RIT/USA Today Quality Cup competition based upon the Transit Service Improvement Team's nomination.  Characteristics such as level of empowerment, customer-driven goals, reproducibility, use of appropriate data and appropriate measurement methods, impact on the organization and exemplary value will be examined. The welcomed, but unexpected, benefit of this process, building evaluation capacity, will also be addressed.

## SESSION 429: Tech Talk                                                                    Room: Ewa

Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Health Evaluation
**Using Hand-held Computers to Increase the Validity of Activity Analysis: The Case of Resident Physicians in Ambulatory Settings**
Presenters:   James R Boex, Northeastern Ohio Universities

Advances in technology have recently allowed for innovation with work sampling as hand-held computers or personal digital assistants (PDAs) can be programmed to not only prompt the user at random times, but to allow for data collection, downloading, and analysis to occur with less effort, in less time, and with less error and greater accuracy than other data collection systems.  The use of PDAs offer the advantages of:
*ease of operation
*lack of obtrusiveness in the patient interaction
*known interval between stimulus and response
*ability to complete response quickly
*automatically formatted and transferable data
*structured questions and responses (with branching logic)
Concerned with controversies over such issues as access to, and productivity of, teaching sites, we capitalized on this technology to survey ambulatory-based clinicians and residents in order to learn more about education's effects on their clinical activities.  We will present this as a case study in the use of this innovative technology.

## SESSION 430: Demonstration                                                   Room: Honolulu
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Needs Assessment
**Workforce Development Needs Assessment:Advancing Shared Direction in a Labor-Management Setting**
Chair:         Doug Leigh, Pepperdine University
Presenters:   Doug Leigh, Pepperdine University
              Ryan Watkins, Nova Southeastern University

In 1999, the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association union and the Ohio Department of Administrative Services contracted a needs assessment of Ohio's joint labor-management Workforce Development program, whose aim is enhancing the employability of civil servants through professional development. Completed last August, this project served to identify gaps between the program's current and required results, and to suggest recommendations for achieving those results required by and for internal and external contributing stakeholders. This session will discuss the framework, focus, and design of this study, along with the procedures for collecting, analyzing, and reporting needs data to a labor-management steering committee for their use in collective bargaining. Implications of this research will be discussed in terms of balancing the representation and confidentiality of labor and management participants, soliciting and triangulating qualitative and quantitative data, while institutionalizing buy-in and internal capacity for integrating recurrent needs assessment into evaluation and continuous improvement.

## SESSION 431: Roundtables                                                      Room: Kahuku
**Evaluating Collaboratives and Collaborative Evaluation: Do Too Many Cooks Spoil the Broth?**
Host:          Vanessa McKendall, FaceValu Consulting

**Roundtable A: Evaluation Educational Collaboratives**
Presenters:   *SUCCESS - Suburban-Urban Collaborative for Classroom Educators in a Study Group Setting for Teachers of Mathematics*, Monica Schaffner & Daniel Brahier, Bowling Green State University

SUCCESS in Mathematics, is an innovative program designed for K-12 teachers of mathematics with the purpose to promote the sharing of ideas and experiences of classroom teachers across culturally diverse settings, from inner-city to suburban and from public to private, for improving mathematics instruction.  Through reflection and hands-on explorations of the spirit and intent of current reforms in mathematics, participants broaden their vision of what it means to teach and learn mathematics.  A mixed-method evaluation approach is used to analyze videotaped inquiry-based teaching units, a website for teachers of mathematics created by the participants, and changes in attitudes and content knowledge, using criteria such as practicality and alignment with reform Standards documents.  Results of the

evaluation will be used to inform other regional and national initiatives for teachers of mathematics and science.

*Fresno Reads: An Evaluation of a Collaborative Initiative To Raise the Reading Levels of Elementary School Children in the San Joaquin Valley*, Sharon Brown-Welty, California State University at Fresno

The benefits of conducting formative and summative program evaluation for federal or state funded programs are widely acknowledged and well known.  This paper and presentation discusses the advantages of having the evaluator work directly with the project director in developing the evaluation process during the grant writing stage as well as in conducting the evaluation throughout the life of the program.  This type of relationship was established during the grant writing stages of the Fresno Reads Program in Fresno, California.  This relationship allowed programmatic changes to be made during the year as well as at the beginning of the 2nd and third year of operation. There is a two fold purpose to this presentation:  1) to discuss the ways in which the program director and the evaluator can work together including how this particular program was implemented; and, 2) to discuss the evaluation results of a collaborative literacy effort that extended over a 3 year period. This presentation embodies the conference theme "Increasing Evaluation Capacity" in that it demonstrates how early, long term, and interactive participation by the evaluator positively affects program results.

**Roundtable B: Stakeholder-based Evaluation**
Presenters:   *A Stakeholder-based Approach to Evaluating a Water Quality Self-assessment Pilot Project: Ohio Farm\*A\*Syst*, Gina E Zwerling & Eric R Norland, The Ohio State University

This presentation focuses on the use of a stakeholder-based approach to evaluation as applied to an Ohio State University Extension pilot project, in which participants voluntarily utilize worksheets to assess water quality risks on their farmsteads. The initial evaluation focused on the different ways used to disseminate the worksheets during the pilot project, as well as the utility of the worksheets themselves. The Ohio Farm\*A\*Syst Advisory Committee also served as the pilot project evaluation's stakeholder group, guiding the evaluation with their questions and interests. An evaluation component was added to the long-term Ohio Farm\*A\*Syst plan to ensure continuous program improvement.

*Evaluating a Collaboration Outcome: The Southern Ohio Forestry Initiative Workgroup*, Claudia Figueiredo, Eric R Norland & Emmalou Norland, The Ohio State University

Changing logging practices is the main objective of the Southern Ohio Forestry Initiative Workgroup. This group, a collaboration between university, private industry, local, state and federal government, private and public landowners, designed and produced a unique process to promote best logging practices. In this presentation, the stakeholder process utilized to evaluate the programs developed by the group will be described. The evaluation process counted on the already established collaboration to produce evaluation questions, data collection methods and instruments, as well as the use of the information collected. Some of the major challenges of this evaluation process were determined by the diversity of interests represented, the behavioral change to be measured, as well as the fact that the evaluation component of the program was added only at a mid way point (not from the early stages of program design) and the participants were not necessarily acquainted with evaluation techniques.

**Roundtable C: Evaluating Collaboratives and Collaborative Evaluation: Challenges to the Process**
Presenters:   *Evaluation Noncompliance as an Early Warning Sign of Larger Problems*, Alexandria Sobolew-Shubin & Joni Radio Gaynor, WestEd

In evaluating the Families and Communities Together (FaCT) program, evaluation noncompliance served as an early warning sign of larger problems.  FaCT  consisted of seven community-based collaboratives, ranging in size from five to thirty-five agencies.  The collaboratives were charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing an integrated, collaborative service delivery system to serve as a safety net for multi-need families in targeted communities.  Early in the five-year funding cycle, several collaboratives were unable to provide outcome data for their programs and services.  The inability to comply with evaluation requirements served as a powerful diagnostic regarding collaborative functioning such as the lack of an effective governance structure and the capacity to outreach

and engage the target population. Evaluators assisted funding agencies in identifying problems and provided technical assistance and support to build each collaborative's capacity to implement programs and participate in evaluation activities. The end product was greatly enhanced collaborative functioning.

*Some Hidden Costs of Collaboration with Community-based Organizations*, Russell G Schuh & Vaughn Stagg, University of Pittsburgh; and Laura C Leviton, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Collaboration has become accepted as an almost universal requirement for community-based organizations (CBOs) seeking funds from both public and private sources. While collaboration has become a requirement for CBOs to receive funding, few funders provide adequate support to ensure that such efforts are meaningful or successful. Evaluations of collaborations are highly mixed. The authors, working with a variety of CBOs have observed that the effort required for establishing and maintaining successful collaborations is much greater than is generally described in the literature. Data describing a substantial under-reporting of the number of clients served as well as the services provided in one successful collaboration will be presented. The mechanisms contributing to this condition were discovered through the use of information system techniques supporting formative evaluation of the collaboration. The author's assert that successful collaborations pass through a developmental cycle and that different levels of effort are required for each stage.

## Roundtable D: Examining The Relationship between Collaborative Evaluation and Increased Evaluation Capacity
Presenters:   *Enhancing Evaluation Capacity in Projects: Implications of Collaborative Evaluation*, Vathsala I Stone, New York University at Buffalo

Practice has pointed out that collaborative evaluation enhances both the use and validity of evaluations (Brandon, 1998). This presentation highlights the implications of collaboration for also enhancing the evaluation capacity of projects. It describes a project under way at the University at Buffalo's Center for Assistive Technology, which applies an innovative model (Lane, 1999) to transfer technology and products into the market place for persons with disabilities. We present the model and describe the project's unique, evaluation-driven processes. Its methods evaluate the technologies and products in transfer, the program outcomes and impacts and the models in validation. Stakeholder involvement is an integral part of its participatory process (Cousins and Whitmore, 1998). Program staff shares decision-making, while industry, academic and consumer experts drive the processes through systematic input and feedback. The paper presents the project's findings, highlights its use in performance monitoring and examines growth of its evaluation capacity in light of participation.

*A Shared Evaluation Process Results in Increased Evaluation Capacity: Client Mission, Leadership, and Evaluation Need Combined with Practitioner Resources and Tools*, Maryann Durland, Rockman ET AL; and Charlene B Ceci, Sherry Faust & Darryl L Jinkerson, Arthur Andersen

Evaluators are often faced with designing and budgeting projects which clients have defined in champagne terms but for which they have available only a beer budget. Additionally, clients may not be clear on the evaluation results that will be most useful to them and therefore ask for more detailed or complex analysis and reporting than really needed or useful. Third, clients may ask for a large variety of data collection items, and may not clearly know how the combinations of data - through analysis and discussion - provide answers to their questions. Evaluators take this complex client package of wants, needs, perceptions, levels of knowledge and resources and create a product, in the form of an evaluation design from beginning to report, which will answer clients questions, provides direction, or maybe identifies issues. This paper describes a complex customer satisfaction based evaluation, with multiple clients, each having multiple products, processes or services, yet all wanting a tight, client controlled, collaborative evaluation, utilizing electronic surveying and increased evaluation empowerment through understanding the process. Through very specific processes, techniques and tools the evaluators were able to increase the capacity of the current and future evaluations for both the clients and the evaluators. This paper describes and provides the process, techniques and tools.

## Roundtable E: Universities as Stakeholders
Presenters:   *Increasing Evaluation Capacity for a Multi-university Federal Grant: Problems, Issues, and Possibilities*, Valerie J

Janesick & David Campos, Roosevelt University

In this session, both presenters will describe and explain, the problems, issues, and possibilities for increasing evaluation capacity among members of a five university partnership for a Teacher Quality Enhancement, TQE, Federal grant, for the state of Illinois. The grant was awarded as a Partnership Grant to Five Universities: Illinois State University, Roosevelt University, Loyola of Chicago, Northeastern Illinois University, and the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign. The presenters will discuss the complexities of designing, implementing, and reporting on a series of evaluation strategies to document and evaluate the five year, five university project. To add another layer of complexity, the five universities are involved in partnerships with various school districts in the state. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected with an emphasis on empowerment evaluation strategies to increase the capacity for an involvement in the evaluation process.

*Evaluation of International Institutional Partnership Projects*, Alexey I Kuzmin, Process Consulting Company

Establishment and further development of partnership relationships between foreign and Russian organizations is an important step in the transition towards a democratic society and an open market economy in Russia. Today, hundreds of foreign and Russian organizations are working together in partnerships in Russia to address many of the issues facing Russian society. How can donors select effective partnerships? What challenges do international partnerships confront? What is partnership sustainability and which partnerships become sustainable? Evaluation may give the answers and help to establish and develop true partnerships. Presentation is built on the experience of 20 British-Russian and more than 30 American-Russian partnerships. The presenter shares approaches to partnership projects monitoring and evaluation and most important evaluation findings.

**SESSION 432: Demonstration     Room:** Oahu
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Independent Consulting
**Write Home When You Find Work!**
Presenters: Donna Blair, Camp Blair Consulting Inc

One of the constant worries of most independent consultants is "Will I have enough work next month (or week or year)?". This session presents some techniques for attracting new and repeat customers.

**SESSION 433: Think Tank**       **Room:** Waialua
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Pre-K-12 Educational Evaluation
**Does It Work and Is It Better? Strategies for Designing Convincing Evaluations without Contrast Groups**
Facilitator: John R Mergendoller, Buck Institute for Education

Educational evaluators are frequently asked if a new program works and whether it is more effective than the program it has superceded. The context of these evaluation efforts often do not: 1) allow for the collection of effectiveness data on the "old" program; 2) allow for the random assignment of participants to the new program; and 3) allow selection of contrast groups not participating in the program. While these factors prevent a repeated measures, treatment/contrast group evaluation design, it is just the sorts of information provided by such a design that is generally sought by those requesting the evaluation. How is an evaluator to respond in this situation? Should s/he brandish an evaluability assessment and decline to conduct the evaluation? Try to educate stakeholders about basic evaluation design? Rely on current participants' perceptions of program success? The think tank will address these issues, and attendees are encouraged to participate fully.

**SESSION 434: Panel**       **Room:** Waianae
**Preparing Mathematics, Science and Technology Education Evaluators: The National Science Foundation Experience**
Chair: Conrad G Katzenmeyer, National Science Foundation

The National Science Foundation represents a potential source of resources for many evaluators. With over 2000 active education projects at any time, plus the increased pressure for data to meet requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and increasing general interest in evaluation, there is need for more evaluators

with mathematics and science interests and background.  NSF Project Directors commonly complain that they are unable to find an appropriate evaluator. Responding to this need, NSF is supporting a number of evaluation training activities, from awareness workshops to summer institutes to doctoral level training programs.  In addition to describing these training activities, panelists will emphasize what evaluation has found about their effectiveness and discuss with the audience what follow-on activities or alternative approaches might be pursued.  The individuals responsible for conducting the training activities and NSF staff members will make the presentation.

Presenters:  *Awareness Workshops for NSF Project Directors and Evaluators*, Joy Frechtling, Westat

Westat, Inc. has conducted over 30 evaluation workshops for NSF Project Directors and evaluators.  Based on the popular User Friendly Guides to Program Evaluation that Westat had prepared for NSF, these 2-day awareness workshops introduced basic concepts of evaluation and provided an opportunity for hands-on experience with evaluation planning.  Participants also were able to share ideas regarding evaluation of their own projects with workshop leaders and others attending the workshop.  Project Directors were encouraged to attend with their project evaluators, focusing on enhancing the communication within the individual project. Westat conducted an immediate evaluation of the impact of the workshop that yielded highly favorable results, and is now surveying a sample of the 900 plus participants to determine what longer-term impacts can be attributed to the workshops.

*Summer Evaluation Institutes for Faculty and Graduate Students*, Arlen R Gullickson, Western Michigan University

The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University has been running summer institutes on evaluation of science, mathematics and technology projects for the past 4 years.  Modeled on the NSF teacher institutes, 18 faculty and advanced graduate students have been coming to Kalamazoo each year for three weeks in June to take part in an intensive evaluation experience that includes lectures and discussion on basic and advanced evaluation topics, hands-on work on projects that the individual participants select, and intensive interactions throughout the day and evening with other participants and workshop staff and consultants.  After the summer institute, approximately half of the participants engage in internships on NSF projects that are electronically monitored by Evaluation Center staff.  Each institute has an internal and an external evaluator.  In addition, the Evaluation Center is now collecting extensive follow-up data on all participants.

*Doctoral Program for Educational Evaluators in Mathematics, Science*, and Technology Education, Frances P
    Lawrenz, University of Minnesota

The American Evaluation Research Association has organized and overseen grants to four universities to provide Ph.D. programs in educational evaluation focusing on students with strong mathematics, science and technology backgrounds.  The institutions offering these programs are University of California-Berkeley, Leslie College, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, and Utah State University.  Each institution receives support for two cohorts of two students each for three years; a 3rd student in each cohort is provided by the institution.  Students go through the regular academic evaluation program but heavily participate on evaluation projects with increasing responsibilities as they advance through their Ph.D. program.  Since the program began only three years ago, most of the students have not yet completed their doctorate.  However, the progress of the students through their academic program and their plans for future employment upon completion will be reported on.

Discussant:  Elmima C Johnson, National Science Foundation

## SESSION 435: Demonstration                                                                    Room: Molokai
Sponsored by the Topical Interest Group on Human Services Evaluation
**Annual Impact Monitoring and Evaluation System (AIMES) - A Tool for Human Services Evaluation**
Chair:          Naval Shanker Dave, Christian Children's Fund Inc
Presenters:  Naval Shanker Dave, Christian Children's Fund Inc
                   Dolamani Mohapatra, Christian Children's Fund Inc

Christian Children's Fund works to promote the well being of children in some of the poor and disadvantaged

communities in the developing world. AIMES is a system for monitoring and evaluation of program impact. It is designed to show if the interventions are making a positive difference in the lives of children and communities served by CCF projects. The system is based on a core set of standardized indicators that fall into Health and Education, the sectors so critical for children's growth and development. The purpose of this presentation is to share the concept and the experience of using this tool with the practitioners and professionals in the field of Human Services Evaluation and to gain further insight. A large number of International NGOs are working to impact the lives of children in disadvantaged communities and wanting to know if their efforts are leading to positive results. AIMES presents a method of knowing this and at the same time prioritizing critical needs in a given community.

## SESSION 436: Demonstration                                                                 Room: Kauai
**Protecting Research Subjects: Successfully Negotiating the Maze of Rules and Regulations**
Presenter:    Brian L Arthur, University of Arizona

Many evaluators and community groups face significant challenges in obtaining the necessary approvals in a timely and efficient manner from local Institutional Review Boards (IRB) and the Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR).  The goal for the session is to increase the evaluation capacity of community groups and evaluators by successfully negotiating the maze of rules and regulations protecting research subjects.  This demonstration will outline a thorough and step-by-step flowchart methodology for developing subject consent forms, IRB summary materials, applications for Certificates of Confidentiality (CC), and letters of assurances of compliance. Using examples from current research, the challenges to timely and efficient approvals in multi-agency projects will be explicated, along with solutions.  Examples of concise subject consent forms, CC applications, and assurances will be provided.  The role of vulnerable populations, such as children, prisoners and persons with mental disabilities, will be addressed. Participants will receive a technical workbook, bibliography, and comprehensive contact list.