

Levels of Evaluation - Evaluation of Activities

The follow are several Models for Evaluation (in alphabetical order) which planners can consider. This tool is being offered as guidance and not prescriptively. Each activity or organization will need to read further about the model of choice and apply it appropriately.

Abruzzese's Evaluation Model

Abruzzese, R.S. (1996). Nursing staff development; Strategies for success. (2nd ed). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

1. Process evaluation: general happiness with the learning experience
2. Content evaluation: change in knowledge, affect, or skill on completion of a learning experience
3. Outcome evaluation: changes in practice on a clinical unit after a learning experience.
4. Impact evaluation – organizational results attributable in part to learning
5. Total program evaluation – congruence of program goals and accomplishments

Alspach's Evaluation Model

Alspach, J.G. (1995). The educational process in nursing staff development. St.Louis, MO: Mosby

1. Satisfaction: the learner's satisfaction or happiness in reaction to content, teaching methods, instructors, materials, and so forth.
2. Learning: whether learning has occurred, as measured by changes in cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behaviors.
3. Application: the learner's application of learning in the work setting, such as increased clinical competence and improvements in nursing practice.
4. Impact: the impact of program on the organization and its patients or customers; includes elements such as length of stay, incidence of negative outcomes, patient satisfaction, productivity, cost of care, and quality of care.

Consumer-oriented Evaluation Model

Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R. Tyler (ed). Perspectives of curriculum evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally

Evaluation's goal is to judge value. Formative: to assist in developing programs, to improve the development.

Summative: to assess the value of the program once it has been developed and put into use, provides assessments that compare the costs, merits, and worth of competing programs or products, and judgments about the extent to which the goals validly reflect the assessed needs of the consumer.

Countenance Model

Stake, R.E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record, 68 (7), 523-540.

The focus is on intents rather than just educational goals, yet these intents need to include the goals and plans of the students and the planners. This approach includes description and judgment of the program using a variety of data sources and multiple analyses.

Improvement-oriented Evaluation Model

Stufflebeam, D.L. (1971) Education evaluation and decision making. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock

CIPP Model is improvement oriented

Context: the environment in which the program takes place (including institutional conditions, target populations and needs, opportunities and problems underlying the needs.

Input: the system capabilities (internal and external resources, alternate strategies and procedural designs)

Process: the implementation (identification, predicting and monitoring for potential problems, recording and judging the procedural events and activities)

Products: interpreting the worth and merit of the outcomes (descriptions and judgments of outcomes related to objectives and context, input and process information.

International Association of Continuing Education and Training 10 Level Model

IACET (1991). A Practical Handbook for Assessing Learning Outcomes in Continuing Education and Training. Washington, DC: IACET.

Plan 1 – No feedback necessary

Plan 2 – Participant feedback questionnaire (PFQ)

Plan 3 – Pre assessment (optional), Post-assessment, PFQ

Plan 4 - Pre assessment (optional), Post-assessment, Plan of action, PFQ

Plan 5 – Screening to participate, Pre assessment, Assess during program, Post-assessment

Plan 6 - Screening to participate, Pre assessment, Assess during program, Post-assessment, Follow-up in the workplace

Plan 7 - Screening to participate, Pre assessment, Assess during program, Post-assessment, Follow-up in the workplace, Ongoing support

Plan 8 - Screening to participate, Interface with learner's environment, Pre assessment, Assess during program, Post-assessment, Follow-up in the workplace, Ongoing support, Monitor and redirect

Plan 9 - Screening to participate, Experimental and control groups selected, Interface with learner's environment, Pre assessment, Assess during program, Post-assessment, Follow-up in the workplace, Ongoing support, Monitor and redirect

Plan 10 - Screening to participate, Experimental and control groups selected, Interface with learner's environment, Pre assessment, Assess during program, Post-assessment, Follow-up in the workplace, Ongoing support, Monitor and redirect, Assess application, impact of application and compare with experimental group.

Kirkpatrick's Model

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1994). Evaluating training programs: The four levels. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler

1. Reaction evaluation measures the reaction or satisfaction of the participants in the program.
2. Evaluation of learning is defined as the extent to which participants change attitudes, improve knowledge, and/or increase skill
3. Evaluation of behavior is defined as the extent to which change in behavior occurs as a result of participation in training.
4. Evaluation of results is defined as final results that occur because participants attended the program such as increased production, improved quality, decreased costs, reduced frequency or severity of accidents, increased sales, decreased turnover, and higher profits.

Objective-Based Model

Tyler, R. (1967) Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally.

The learner behaviors are the outcome criteria.

Responsive Evaluation Model

Stufflebeam, D.L.& Shinkfield, A.J. (1985). Systematic evaluation: A self-instructional guide to theory and practice. Boston-Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Evaluation is to provide a service to clients, making comprehensive statements about what the program is observed to be and about the satisfaction and dissatisfaction that appropriately selected people feel toward the program. These reports need to be in the language of the audience.