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Evaluation Strategy in Extension Program

- Needs Assessments*
- Process Evaluations (formative)
- Modified outputs
- Modified strategy
- Outcome Evaluations (formative)
- Impact Evaluations (summative)
- Project monitoring
- Project improvement

*Graphic by Dr. Ayanava Majumdar, ACES
What is the significance of these pictures to evaluation?
AND it all comes down to writing good reports...
# GIS 101 Extension Program Outcomes Summary 2011

## Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
<th>Overall Workshop Quality</th>
<th>First GPS Workshop for Attendee</th>
<th>Pre/Post Test = Knowledge Change</th>
<th>Self-Learning Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomasville</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74% to 92% = 18%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>76% to 96% = 20%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63% to 92% = 29%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autaugaville</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76% to 92% = 16%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>72% to 92% = 20%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>63% to 97% = 34%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscaloosa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALs</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Information source: Chris Dillard, Beau Brodbeck, Jack Rowe
Outcomes Summary: 
AL Vegetable IPM Program 2009-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR PROJECT OUTPUTS (program-centered)</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>What does it indicate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers reached</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Rising interest of farmers in IPM information (lack of Extension entomologist had significantly reduced statewide presence of IPM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey returns (n)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rising trust of farmers in IPM information and confidence in the IPM training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return rate (percent)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Strong feedback system, continuous monitoring of program outcomes &amp; quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of major Extension IPM training events</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increasing IPM training demand from farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of counties represented by audience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Events are multi-county due to Regional Extension system of ACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF AUDIENCE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>What does it indicate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average land holding of participants (acres)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>Higher participation of low resource farmers (LRFs), small producers, and organic farmers is bringing down the average acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New beginning farmers (percent of total audience)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>Increasing participation of new and beginning farmers in IPM program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional producers</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Increasing number of LRFs and small organic producers in AL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic and small producers</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>The small IPM demonstration plots are effective in reaching to this audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturally grown farms</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>The small IPM demonstration plots are effective in reaching to this audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop consultants</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>This is a new group of support personnel that are interested to partner with the Extension IPM vegetable program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reporting Model: Taxonomy of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>WHAT TO REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program-centered*</td>
<td>Reach, participation, publication, satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant-centered*</td>
<td>Change in KAS, behavior, condition/status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-centered^</td>
<td>Policy, economic, social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization-centered^</td>
<td>Personnel, financial, capacity building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Important outcomes for Extension programs
^Detailed guidelines not available

Program-Centered Outcomes & Indicators

1. Reach:
   a) % farmers in the program (outreach)
   b) Participation rate, subscription rate (reputation)
   c) Demand for additional information, publications (access)

2. Participation:
   a) Average attendance rate at events (attendance)
   b) % farmers who keep coming to meetings (engagement)

3. Satisfaction:
   a) Number of favorable responses/satisfaction rate (quality)
   b) % farmers reporting improved attitude (fulfillment)
Participant-Centered Outcomes & Indicators

1. Knowledge/Attitude/Learning
   a) % increase in scores after training (skills, knowledge)
   b) Increase in number of queries (attitude)
   c) % feeling well prepared (readiness)

2. Behavior:
   a) % adoption of new practices (desirable activity)
   b) % change over time (maintenance of new behavior)

3. Condition/Status:
   a) % farmers reporting yield benefits (econ. condition)
   b) % farmers reporting reduction in pesticide usage (environmental)
   c) % farmers with less conflicts with neighbors/consumers (social benefit)
Share & Publish

Prepare report based on who is going to read.

1: 3: 25

One page for policy makers

Three pages for decision makers/journals

Long descriptive reports for content experts

G. Barrington, AEA Summer Institute, 2011
Evaluation & Reporting recommendations: Comm Hort Team

• Use multiple modes of evaluation (standardized instrument when available)
• Devote time to data analyses
• Devote time to writing success stories/reporting
• Follow the logic model for success stories
• Then incorporate the taxonomy of outcomes to weave a story
• Facts and figures are great, but incorporate qualitative information also
Evaluation Tips

• Remember the 20: 80 Rule!
• 20% effort, 80% information
• Evaluation techniques are not set in stone, although methodology and utilization are important.
• Evaluation method/s should be based on program objectives, audience, and the context.
• As experts, you control the evaluation & utilization processes.
• Share the results as raw compiled data or bulleted points!
When sharing information

• Use bulleted points in reports
• Don’t shy away from citing data (numbers)
• Publication citation format (example):
When sharing information (contd.)

- **Regional meeting citation format (example):**
  - **ACES TEAM:** Majumdar, A., and M. Reeves. 2012. Trap cropping for leaffooted and stink bug management. Vegetable Regional Meeting, Cullman, AL. March 1, 2012. 30 participants. 60 min.


- **Field event citation format (example):**
Include revenue generated in reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting organizer</th>
<th>Event date</th>
<th>Event location</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Fee charged per participant</th>
<th>Other fund raising activity</th>
<th>Total amount</th>
<th>Revenue from events</th>
<th>Total new funds from event</th>
<th>Account management (Indicate split)</th>
<th>Other revenues</th>
<th>OVERALL REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>5/2/2012</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0 65 0</td>
<td>30 0 200 150 0</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
<td>Cullman</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>230 200 150 100 0</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 3600 0 0</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (total) 4725
Welcome to the ACES Program Evaluation toolkit developed with purpose of:
1. Providing basic information regarding evaluation systems
2. Assist Extension personnel to develop evaluation instruments of their choice that suits their program areas
3. Serving as a repository of completed need, process, and impact evaluations

ACES Program Evaluation Resources Committee (AC.
Ayanava Majumdar (azm0024@auburn.edu, 251-331-8416)
Paul Mask (maskpau@aces.edu, 334-844-4450)
Henry Famigo (fadamhy@auburn.edu, 334-044-5090)
Ronald Williams (will40@aces.edu, 256-372-4943)
Carolyn Whatley (whatcla@auburn.edu, 334-844-5690)
Annie Adrian (amsann@auburn.edu, 334-844-9660)
Paul Brown (pwb0001@auburn.edu, 334-844-5546)
*Member, American Evaluation Association

Thank you for your attention.

Questions?