



...Bringing the future into focus.

20/20 Consultants
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1

Annie Vadeboncoeur
MAP Program Manager
Museums Assistance Program
Department of Canadian Heritage
Heritage Policy and Research Division
15 Eddy Street, 3rd Floor
Hull, Québec K1A 0M5

February 2, 2002

Dear Ms. Vadeboncoeur,

Our team at 20/20 Consultants is pleased to respond to the Department of Canadian Heritage's request for proposals regarding its Museums Assistance Program (MAP).

Evaluation is an essential component of program and project cycles, yet it is the one that is most often neglected. It can be used to assess the results of current program activities and provides objective information on which decisions and future action can be based. MAP will benefit from such a thorough and rigorous evaluation, leading to credible results.

As requested, 20/20 Consultants has undertaken a review of the current evaluation framework for MAP and developed a concrete evaluation plan for the program. Please find attached the key results of this review and evaluation plan. If you have any questions or comments, or would like any further clarification please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Project Lead
20/20 Consultants

Evaluation Proposal for the Museums Assistance Program

Section 1: Purpose of the Evaluation

Our team at 20/20 Consultants has developed a proposal in response to the Department of Canadian Heritage's Request for Proposals (RFP) for its Museums Assistance Program (MAP). The proposed evaluation is concerned with the outcomes of changes made to MAP in 1999 as described in Section Two. It uses the evaluation framework supplied within the RFP as a starting point and alters and elaborates on it. The rationale for the alterations is included in Section 3 of this document.

The 20/20 Team has been asked to:

- Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the existing evaluation framework
- Develop a concrete evaluation plan
- Describe our data collection tools in detail
- Discuss the challenges and opportunities that our plan presents

The evaluation will address three main issues:

1. **Relevance:** Does MAP address an actual need?
 - We understand the relevance question on two levels:
 1. To refer to a need for funding on behalf of museums.
 2. To refer to a need for MAP-supported programs by museum visitors and the Canadian public.
2. **Success:** Is MAP effective in meeting its intended outcomes?
3. **Design and delivery:** Is MAP utilizing the most efficient means to achieve its outcomes?

The information resulting from this evaluation will provide evidence regarding the utility of MAP, and can be used by Canadian Heritage staff in adjusting MAP to meet its goals in an effective and efficient manner.

Section 2: Background Information

The Museums Assistance Program provides financial assistance to Canadian museums and related institutions for activities that (a) foster access by present and future generations of Canadians to their human, natural, artistic and scientific heritage as well as (b) projects that and enhance awareness, understanding and enjoyment of this heritage.

The three components of MAP are:

- **Access and National Outreach** - Financial support for travelling exhibitions which promote culture, heritage and diversity, with a specific emphasis on inter-provincial travelling exhibitions and new multimedia projects.
- **Aboriginal Museum Development** - Financial support to Aboriginal museums for the development and management of collections. This has been a key focus since 1999.
- **Organizational Development** - Professional development of museum professionals, particularly through the promotion of professional exchanges between museums.

In 1999, MAP refocused its priorities to emphasize inter-provincial travelling exhibitions, professional exchanges, new multimedia projects and an increased emphasis on Aboriginal museum development.

Funding from MAP is on a project basis, and provides up to 70% of direct costs to incorporated, non-profit Canadian museums, museum service organizations, non-profit organizations and related institutions.

Section 3: Comments on Original Evaluation Design

The evaluation design provided in the RFP consisted of a comprehensive listing of evaluation questions tied to the key issues of relevance, success, and design and delivery. Its framework has addressed the three funding components of MAP (access and national outreach, aboriginal museum development, and organizational development). It identified a variety of data sources, but did not elaborate on the details of these. Missing in this evaluation framework was an attempt to isolate the effects of changes made to MAP in 1999.

Relevance

While this section was quite strong, needs are defined solely in terms of the financial needs of the museums and aboriginal organizations rather than a broader definition that considers the needs of museum visitors and the broader public. This focus may be justified given the scope and goals of MAP.

Overview of strengths and weakness:

- The use of the term ‘current policy context’ is ambiguous, and if included, its meaning needs to be clarified.
- The use of the 1999 MAP census survey would be more useful if it can be compared with census survey data from other years (if such data is available).
- The questions ‘*Do museums across Canada continue to require financial assistance... ?*’ and ‘*Do Aboriginal heritage organizations continue to require financial support... ?*’ (CES Case Competition 2002, p. 10) require refinement. Specifically, how and why is money needed? The evaluation could consider how the money is being utilized, what alternative funding opportunities exist, and the possible impacts on self-sufficiency of the museums. A comparison of funding for museum programs in other countries might be instructive in providing context for understanding alternatives.

- Question 2, *'If MAP had not been implemented in the early '70s, to what extent would the MAP funded museum activities have been negatively impacted?'* (p.10) is interesting but is not one that it is possible to answer in a direct or definitive way, and lends itself to a high level of subjectivity. This limits the potential utility of insights resulting from pursuing this question.
- Question 3A refers to *'the current needs of Canadians in regard to their awareness and understanding of their diverse heritage'* but does not provide, through its indicators, a means of categorizing recognizing the diversity of Canadians and their respective needs now. Gender, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, immigrant status, and geographic location may all be key factors in shaping Canadians' opinions and needs, and should be explicitly addressed.

Success

This evaluation question asks whether the program is effective in meeting its intended outcomes and actual outcomes. It asks about both project effectiveness and impact. The approach of the evaluation plan is positive in that it systematically addresses the three program components.

Overview of strengths and weakness:

- Question 4A in the evaluation plan asks broader questions about impact such as, *'To what extent do Canadians know and understand more about each other because of the National Outreach and Exhibition Circulation Fund?'* This question addresses final outcomes or long term impacts of MAP. In contrast, the indicators selected in the plan measure outputs (number of travelling exhibitions, number of new media exhibits etc.) and do not reflect larger societal changes. Furthermore because this question is broad in scope and qualitative in nature it would be very difficult to isolate and measure.
- Question 4B addresses the effects of MAP on the retention, preservation, conservation and presentation on Aboriginal cultural heritage. The indicators suggested are appropriate and will provide an indication of the effectiveness of the program through the use of qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques.
- Question 4C looks at the effect of MAP on the more effective management, greater capacity and financial stability of museums in Canada. Alone, the indicators used are not an appropriate a measure of effectiveness. Although it is important to know if an activity took place, indicators that reflect the quality of the experience and effect on the organization as a whole are essential.
- Question 5A asks what monitoring mechanisms to measure MAP performance are in place. The inclusion of quality monitoring mechanisms is essential to effective program delivery.
- Although the evaluation question addresses possible negative effects of MAP this is not reflected in the framework.

Program Design and Delivery

Overview of strengths and weakness:

- In answering question 6 ‘Is the level of funding appropriate in each of the three MAP components?’ further indicators, including comparison with other, similar funding programs and comparison of funding levels with the actual cost ranges associated with the funded activities would be useful.
- In question 8 ‘Is MAP designed appropriately to reach targeted institutions and individuals?’ it is unclear who the targets are and who has designated them. Have targets and or quotas been set as part of the original MAP program?
- Question 9 regarding design and delivery elements is a strong question and the use of both survey and case study data should be sufficient to provide insight into potential biases and inefficiencies within the process. Analysis of the data specifically in regards to issues of geographical (in terms of the museums funded) and ethnic (in terms of the types of exhibits funded) equity would strengthen the interpretation of this question and also aid in answering question 8 (assuming that targets have been set on this basis).

Cost Effectiveness and Alternatives

Overview of strengths and weakness:

- This section could be greatly expanded to specify indicators of cost-effectiveness. For example: number of exhibits per dollar spent, number of exchanges per dollar spent, and number of collaborative projects undertaken per program year.
- While considering quantitative indicators, as proposed above, and comparing with other, similar programs, the specific constraints and goals of the federal Canadian program must be kept in focus. For example, on a national level, exchanging exhibits may be more expensive than for many other programs because of the size of the country and the isolation of many museum locations.

Section 4: Our Proposed Evaluation Plan

Evaluation Design and Style

The Museum Assistance Program is ongoing and evaluation findings are intended to adjust the program design to address efficiencies and impacts. This suggests a formative approach to this evaluation. A goal-based model focusing on efficiency, effectiveness and impact of MAP is the basis for addressing the issues of *success* and *design and delivery*. To evaluate the *relevance* of MAP, a goal-free approach is more appropriate since this issue is concerned with the usefulness of MAP. Both models rely on data collection, analysis and interpretation allowing this combination to proceed easily. Participation of stakeholders, grantees and museum visitors is an important component of the data to be collected and is therefore fundamental to this evaluation.

Sources of Information

Due to the large scope of the evaluation questions being addressed and the nature of recipient organizations, a sample of MAP recipients will be included as case studies to form a cluster of programs to evaluate. The recipients will be chosen to reflect a diverse group of recipients in terms of culture, geographic area and refocused priorities (traveling exhibitions, multimedia projects etc.) and will be evaluated according to the type of funding received (i.e. access and national outreach; aboriginal museum development and organization development).

Information for this evaluation will come from a variety of sources. Many of the suggested data sources in the original evaluation matrix can be associated with the methods of data collection listed in the methodology. Additional sources of data and means of collection are also included. Document review and analysis, key informant interviews, focus groups, appreciative inquiry and surveys will provide the information necessary for this evaluation.

Methodology

Data collection tools:

1. Document review of relevant background literature, including
 - MAP applications approved and rejected; MAP initiation, progress and monitoring reports for recipients;
 - museum/heritage group management plans, training records, records of partnerships and professional exchanges, list of museum/heritage group exhibitions (type, duration, resident or visiting), records of ticket sales.
2. Key informant interviews (sample provided in Appendix A)
 - with MAP regional staff responsible for applicant assistance;
 - with museum or heritage group directors of organizations identified as case studies;
 - MAP stakeholders;
 - grantee stakeholders;
 - relevant government officials.
3. Focus groups (sample provided in Appendix B)
 - with school groups identified to have visited the museum or heritage centre during a MAP funded exhibit;
 - with teachers relying on exhibits for curriculum;
 - with Aboriginal groups in areas of case study Aboriginal museums or heritage centres.
4. Appreciative inquiry
 - with communities (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) to identify themes and needs surrounding common cultural values as a relevance indicator.
5. Surveys (sample provided in Appendix C):

- visitor exit surveys for exhibits funded by MAP to determine level of understanding, enhanced awareness of Canadian and Aboriginal culture / diverse heritage, enjoyment of exhibit, frequency of museum visits, likelihood of repeat visits etc.;
- of museum or heritage group staff regarding the quality of professional development.

Analytical Techniques

The evaluation will analyse the data collected through statistical analysis, non-statistical analysis and cost-effectiveness analysis. Comparison with other programs (provincial, municipal, international) regarding success, delivery and funding or budgeting decisions will provide a degree of 'control' to the evaluation.

Statistical Analysis

Data gathered from documents and key informant interviews will be analysed statistically where possible. For example:

- A statistical profile of MAP-funded projects since the 1970s (in regard to number of traveling exhibits, new media initiatives etc.) provides an analysis of use of past funding types. This can serve as an indicator, albeit indirectly, to show that the need for MAP as alternative funding for these projects cannot be guaranteed.
- Ratios of funding for the three MAP components compared to the whole and trends over time provide indicators of MAP reach and relevance of funding as relates to needs.

Non-statistical Analysis

Key informant interviews, appreciative inquiry, focus groups and survey will provide rich qualitative data that will be analysed inductively to gain insight, identify critical issues and allow for an analysis of issues that are difficult to quantify. For example:

- Key informant interviews will provide insight into the individual projects success in terms of effective retention, preservation, conservation and presentation of Aboriginal cultural heritage.
- Focus groups of high school students and teachers visiting MAP funded exhibits or multimedia projects will allow an analysis of the current needs of Canadians in regard to their understanding of their diverse heritage; of the extent of their knowledge and understanding of each other etc.

Cost-effectiveness Analysis

Cost-effectiveness analysis will be conducted to determine the cost of delivery of each funded project, for example the cost of running an inter-provincial travelling exhibition per number of visitors and visitor satisfaction.

Evaluation Framework

The following table outlines 20/20 Consultants' proposed changes to the initial evaluation matrix. For a complete description of initial questions and indicators see the original document.

Evaluation Questions:	Indicators:	Data Sources:
A. Relevance		
Do the MAP objectives remain relevant? Are they consistent with, and supported by, current policy objectives?	As in original	As in original
Are the goals of Aboriginal heritage organizations consistent with the self-perceived needs of the public, especially Aboriginal people. Are they consistent with, and supported by, the objectives of MAP?	As in original	As in original.
What are the goals of museums across the country in regard to developing and enhance professional standards and expertise in all museum management areas, and does MAP support these goals?	As in original	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups
2. From the '70s until the present, has there been a need for MAP as a source of funding, and what were potential alternatives?	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical profile of MAP • MAP funding in all three components since the '70's 	As in original.
What are the current needs of Canadians in regard to their awareness and understanding of their diverse heritage, with specific consideration of current Canadian diversity, including the views and needs of people based upon First Nation status, ethnicity, gender, and age?	As in original.	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups
As in original.	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opinion of relevant ministers and government officials 	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups
B. Success		
As in original.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opinion of stakeholders • Opinion of visitors • Increase in understanding and awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups • Visitor exit surveys
As in original.	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opinion of stakeholders • Opinion of Aboriginal groups regarding quality of projects; sense of cultural preservation 	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups
As in original.	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal health of organizations • Quality of management initiatives and professional development 	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews with MAP staff • Survey of museum or historical group staff
As in original.	As in original.	As in original.
C. Program Design and Delivery		
As in original.	As in original, plus:	As in original.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost effectiveness analysis 	
As in original.	As in original.	As in original.
As in original.	As in original.	As in original.
As in original.	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opinion of grantees 	As in original.
D. Cost-Effectiveness and Alternatives		
As in original.	As in original, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of MAP's cost per intervention (e.g. exhibits/dollar spent) 	As in original.

Reporting

2020 consultants will provide a midterm evaluation and a final report that outlines findings, recommendation and lessons learned. These will be linked to the 1999 reoriented MAP and purpose and objectives of MAP. The following chart outlines the activities of the evaluation and the proposed timeframe.

Evaluation Timeline

	Timeline for Museums Assistance Program Evaluation Plan (February to July 2002)					
<i>Evaluation Activity</i>	Feb 2002	April 2002	April 2002	May 2002	June 2002	July 2002
1a. Finalization of evaluation framework and draft of evaluation plan	■					
1b. Establish case study participants	■					
1c. Establish monitoring schedule and reporting	■	▨	▨	▨	▨	
2. Collection of relevant documents and data		■	▨			
3. Analysis of written documents		■	▨	▨		
4. Training for interviews and focus groups			■			
5. Midterm monitoring evaluation				■		
6. Run evaluation activities				■		
7. Analysis of interview and focus group information (qualitative and quantitative)					■	
8. Prepare case study information					■	
9. Final evaluation						■

■ Intensive activity

▨ On-going, less intensive activity

Section 5: Discussion and Conclusions

Strengths of our proposed evaluation include the ability to address specific themes. It focuses on partnerships and will enhance partnerships through the evaluation. It is largely qualitative which provides insight relevant to specific projects and addresses the diversity of Canadian culture. Quantitative data and analysis is included and strengthens the evaluation. We have elaborated on the original data sources to answers such as elaborating criteria for case studies. We have also increased the capacity of the proposed evaluation to address issues of equity and reach.

A weakness of our proposed evaluation is a potential lack of universal data. The evaluation attempts to balance the trade-off between broad evaluation goals rigorously investigated and the useful insights provided by qualitative data. To address some of these weaknesses this evaluation must first clarify some of the key motivations for the MAP Program itself and seek clarification of key terms such as heritage.

Bibliography

Canadian Evaluation Society. No date. The Value in Evaluation: A Statement for Managers.

Sawadogo, J.P. and K. Dunlop. 1997. Managing for Results with a Dynamic Logical Framework Approach: From Project Design to Impact Measurement. Canadian Journal of Development Studies. 18: 597-612.

Appendix A: Interview Guide

Key Informant Interview Guide for Cluster of Recipients.

Name of Interviewee:

Type of Project:

Date of Interview:

Type of Interview:

Background Information on the Key Informants

- What is or was your position or role within the project or program?
- How, why and when did you become involved in the project or program?
- What is your current involvement in the project or program?

General Information Regarding the Project

- What did the project intend to do? Describe the community that this project or program has impacted?
- Would you say that the project or program achieved its purpose or goals? Why or why not?
- What helped or was important for the project or program to achieve its success? If it was not successful, what prevented the project or program from reaching its goals?
- How has this program impacted on enhancing the awareness, understanding or enjoyment Canadian heritage? Please site specific examples.

Outcomes and Spin-off Activities

- What would you say are the main outcomes or benefits of the project or program? Or, in what ways has the community benefited from this project or program?
- Is there anything (positive or negative) that resulted from this project or program that you did not expect?
- Have any related activities been undertaken as a result of this project or program?

Regarding Collaboration

- Who (i.e. agencies or community members, national organizations) participated in this project or program?
- What was their level of involvement? How did they participate?
- Was anyone missing around the table? What types of other organizations would your project or program have benefited involvement from? Why? Were there barriers to this? Please specify.
- Is or was collaboration important to this type of project? Why? How does the project benefit from collaboration?

Level of Participation by Aboriginal, Specific Subgroups within Canada i.e. Culturally Diverse and Youth

- How did community members or other organizations, such as other exhibitors, participate in this project or program?
- In what way did the project or program benefit from the participation of aboriginal, culturally diverse populations and the broader community?

Project Sustainability

- Has the project or program continued beyond MAP funding? What has made it possible for it to continue? Or what prevented the project or program from continuing?
- How is ownership defined? To what extent has ownership of project or program by communities been achieved?

Lessons Learned

- What was positive about this project or program that you would do again?
- What would you tell other groups who might want to do a similar project or program?
- What would you do differently next time, or what would you like to see be done differently?

Personal Rating of Project Success

- Did the project or program achieve what you expected it would? Why or why not?
- What would you have liked to see the project or program do or achieve? What do you think prevented this from happening?

For Project Coordinators or Executing Agencies regarding MAP, PCH regional staff/coordinator involvement

- What type of involvement or interaction did you have with the MAP, PHC regional museum consultants? Did you receive any advice from the Foundation?
- Were you satisfied with the support or involvement that you received from MAP/regional staff? What would you like to see again? Or how could MAP have been more helpful to your project?
- Have you used any of the information such as websites and community linkages that MAP provides? Was this useful to you?
- Is there anything that MAP/regional staff could have done differently that would have helped your project/program?

Appendix B: Focus Group

The focus groups would be designed for the assessment of needs and/or outcome awareness. These groups should target homogeneous groups and follow the guidelines for groups as cited in www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/focusgrp.htm#anchor907156.

Purpose of focus groups: to determine the perceived importance and meaning of Canadian historical heritage to different segments of the general public.

Name of Group Facilitator:

Date of Group Session:

Program or Project involved in:

Description of group members (i.e. numbers, type of community participants represent):

1) What does it mean to be a Canadian?

Probes would include:

- Does being a Canadian mean anything in particular to how you feel about yourself?
- How would you describe yourself to someone who is not from Canada?
- What sorts of things make you feel good about being a Canadian?
- What are some things that make you feel not good about being Canadian?

2) How would you describe what Canada is like to someone?

Probes would include:

- Describe what the country is like? Specific provinces? The range of the environment?
- What types of people live in Canada? i.e. ethnicity, ages, any descriptors
- What types of people live in the community that you live in?
- Do you think your community is representative of the type of people that live in Canada? Please explain why?

3) When you think of being a part of a community, what does that term mean to you?

Probes would include:

- What are the common things that people value in your community? What gives you a sense or belonging to the community in which you live?
- What may increase your feeling of being “part “ of the community?
- Are there certain community events that bring your community together? What are these and describe some of the activities that take place?
- What are some of the rituals, ceremonies, landmarks that you think are important to your community?

4) What are the values that define being a Canada?

Probes would include:

- What are some common values that are held by Canadians?
- When you see Canada focused in the light of a world event – what does it make you feel like to be Canadian?
- What are some important events, historical or current that adds to what Canada is about?

Appendix C: Survey Participants

This is only a guideline for specific types of Areas that could be utilized to Assess participants awareness of program participation include. Design of questionnaires of interactive assessment processes should include a quantifier where possible i.e. Leikert Scale:

Name of program/project:

Location:

Date of Visit:

- 1) How did you hear about this program/project?
- 2) Was this your first visit to this program/project?
- 3) What were your expectations in visiting this program/project?
- 4) How did your time today measure with these expectations?
- 5) What did you like about this program /project?
- 6) Are there suggestions for things that you would have liked to see but didn't?
- 7) How has your visit today made you more aware of being a Canadian?
- 8) How has your visit today changed how you feel about living in Canada?
- 9) Have you visited any similar program/project? Please list.
- 10) How does this program/project compare?
- 11) What part of this program/project do you think was outstanding?
- 12) Any other comments that you think would make you want to come again to this or a similar event?

Appendix D: Glossary of Terms

Accountability The responsibility for the justification of expenditures, decisions, or the results of one's own efforts.

Accuracy The extent to which an evaluation is truthful or valid in what it says about a program, project or material; often refers to a variable and precise measurement.

Attrition Loss of subjects from the defined sample during the course of a longitudinal study.

Audience(s) Consumers of the evaluation; those who will or should read or hear of the evaluation, either during or at the end of the evaluation process. Includes those persons who will be guided by the evaluation in making decisions and all others who have a stake in the evaluation (see stakeholders).

Background The contextual information that describes the reasons for the project, its goals, objectives, and stakeholders' information needs.

Baseline Facts about the condition or performance of subjects and regions or areas in which they reside, prior to treatment or intervention.

Behavioral objectives Specifically stated terms of attainment to be checked by observation, or test/measurement.

Client The person or group or agency that commissioned the evaluation.

Coding To translate a given set of data or items into machine-readable categories; or to label data according to chosen themes or ideas

Correlation The degree of relationship between variables; correlation coefficient provides a measure of strength of perfect, inverse or no correlation.

Cost analysis The practical process of calculating the cost of something that is being evaluated. Cost analysis looks at (1) costs to whom; (2) costs of what type; and (3) costs during what period.

Cost-benefit analysis This process estimates the overall cost and benefit of each alternative project or program; allows for a calculation of the value of the project/program (e.g.net value added / year over 20 years; net present value; internal rate of return).

Cost-effectiveness This analysis determines what a program or procedure costs against what it does (effectiveness); measures the cost of delivery through analysis of inputs to outcomes; is or program worth its costs?

Dependent variable The variable that represents the outcome - the contrast is with independent

variables some of which can be manipulated.

Effectiveness Refers to the conclusion of a Goal Achievement Evaluation. "Success" is its rough equivalent.

Experimental design The plan of an experiment, including selection of subjects who receive treatment and control group (if applicable), procedures, and statistical analyses to be performed.

Experimental group The group that is receiving the treatment.

External evaluation An evaluation conducted by an evaluator from outside the organization within which the object of the study is housed.

False positive When an event is predicted and it does not occur (Type I error).

False negative When an event is not predicted and it occurs (Type II error).

Feasibility The extent to which an evaluation is appropriate for implementation in practical settings.

Focus group A group selected for its relevance to an evaluation that is engaged by a trained facilitator in a series of discussions designed for sharing insights, ideas, and observations on a topic of concern.

Formative evaluation An evaluation designed and used to improve an intervention, especially when it is still being developed.

Gain scores The difference between a student's performance on a test and his or her performance on a previous administration of the same or parallel test.

Generalizability The extent to which information about a program, project, or instructional material collected in one setting can be used to reach a valid judgment about how it will perform in other settings.

Goal-free evaluation An evaluation of outcomes in which the evaluator functions without knowledge of the purposes or goals.

Hawthorne effect Phenomenon in which an intervention (directed towards people), no matter what it is, is likely to have positive results.

Hypothesis testing The standard model of the classical approach to scientific research in which a hypothesis is formulated before the experiment to test its truth. The results are stated in probability terms that the results were due solely to chance. The significance level of one chance in 20 (.05) or one chance in 100 (.01) is a high degree of improbability.

Impact evaluation An evaluation focused on outcomes or pay-off.

Indicator A factor, variable, or observation that is empirically connected with the criterion variable, a correlate. For example, judgment by students that a course has been valuable to them for pre-professional training is an indicator of that value.

Inferential statistics These statistics are inferred from characteristics of samples to characteristics of the population from which the sample comes.

Internal evaluator Internal evaluations are those done by project staff, even if they are special evaluation staff, that is, external to the production/writing/ teaching/service part of the project.

Level of significance The probability that the observed difference occurred by chance.

Meta-analysis The name for a particular approach to synthesizing quantitative studies on a common topic, involving the calibration of a specific parameter for each ("effect size").

Needs assessment Using a diagnostic definition, need is anything essential for a satisfactory mode of existence or level of performance. The essential point of a needs assessment for evaluation is the identification of performance needs.

"No significant difference" A decision that an observed difference between two statistics occurred by chance.

Performance-based The use of global ratings of behavior assessment which is a movement away from paper-and-pencil testing. This assessment is costly and there may be a loss of validity and reliability.

Population All members in a particular group.

Post-test A test to determine performance after the administration of a program, project, or instructional material.

Pretest A test to determine performance prior to the administration of a program, project, or instructional material. Pretests serve two purposes: diagnostic and baseline. Also the use of an instrument (questionnaire, test, observation schedule) with a small group to detect need for revisions.

Process evaluation Refers to the evaluation of the treatment or intervention. It focuses entirely on the variables between input and output.

Progress evaluation A subset of Formative Evaluation.

Qualitative evaluation The part of the evaluation that is primarily descriptive and interpretative, and may or may not lend itself to quantitative treatment.

Quantitative evaluation An approach involving the use of numerical measurement and data analysis based on statistical methods.

Quasi-experimental When a random allocation of subjects to experimental and control groups can not be done, a quasi-experimental design can seek to simulate a true experimental design, by identifying a group that closely matches the experimental group.

Random sampling Drawing a number of items of any sort from a larger group or population so that every individual item has a specified probability of selection.

Recommendations Suggestions for specific appropriate actions based upon analytic approaches to the program components.

Reliability Statistical reliability is the consistency of the readings from a scientific instrument or human judge.

Sample A part of a population.

Sampling error Error due to using a sample instead of entire population from which sample is drawn.

Significance Overall significance represents the total synthesis of all you have learned about the merit or worth of the program or project. This is different from statistical significance that may be testing one of several conditions of a program or project.

Stakeholder A program's stakeholder Is one who has credibility, power, or other capital Invested in the project, and thus can be held to be to some degree at risk with it.

Summative evaluation An evaluation designed to present conclusions about the merit or worth of an intervention and recommendations about whether it should be retained, altered, or eliminated.

Time series study A study in which periodic measurements are obtained prior to, during, and following the introduction of an intervention or treatment in order to reach conclusions about the effect of the intervention.

Triangulation In an evaluation, it is an attempt to get a fix on a phenomenon or measurement by approaching it via several independent routes. It can be more than three routes. This effort provides redundant measurement.

Unanticipated outcomes A unexpected result. Often used as a synonym for side-effects, but only a loose equivalent.

Utilization (of evaluations) Use and impact are terms used as substitutes for utilization. For

evaluations containing recommendations can be seen as the equivalent of Implementation.

Validity The soundness of the use and interpretation of a measure; linked to the core value of the study and useful variable(s)

Table Header 1:	Table Header 2:
Table contents	Table contents