

## Program Evaluation and Design Workshop - Participant Survey Results

Participants were asked about each of the intended workshop objectives in terms of their motivation for attending in the PRE survey and then about the extent to which the workshop achieved those objectives at POST survey. At both survey times responses were made on a three-point scale Low, Moderate and High, for which mean scores were tabulated in which 1 represented *Low*, 2 represented *Moderate*, and 3 represented *High*.

Objective	Level of Motivation (PRE)				Level of Achievement (POST)			
	Mean	Low	Moderate	High	Mean	Low	Moderate	High
a. Gain a shared understanding of program evaluation	2.88	0.0%	12.5%	87.5%	2.53	5.3%	36.8%	57.9%
b. Identify and prioritize measurable outcomes	2.69	0.0%	31.3%	68.8%	2.11	15.8%	57.9%	26.3%
c. Gain increased fluency in a common language of evaluation	2.38	6.3%	50.0%	43.8%	2.58	5.3%	31.6%	63.2%
d. Learn about different data sources [and how to extract data from the User Metrics API (PRE)]	2.00	29.4%	41.2%	29.4%	2.26	10.5%	52.6%	36.8%
e. Learn to extract data from the User Metrics API (asked separately at POST)	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	1.75	31.3%	62.5%	6.3%
f. Work collaboratively as a community of evaluation leaders	2.12	23.5%	41.2%	35.3%	2.50	5.6%	38.9%	55.6%
g. Enjoy time networking with other program leaders	2.41	0.0%	58.8%	41.2%	2.89	0.0%	10.5%	89.5%
h. Other motivating factor	2.20	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>

### Other Motivating Factors Named (PRE):

- Discuss about several programs running
- Enjoying Learning
- Share personal experiences about evaluation and design with other Wikimedians
- To be able to discuss evaluation with Wikimedians who have been here
- To learn from other's systems of evaluation

When asked to share one or two sentences about what program evaluation means to their own Wikimedia work participants of the PRE survey shared that:

- As a chapters board member, it is my duty (and interest) to make sure movement money and time is rightly used in programs - which call for program evaluation.
- Better outcomes of our programs and better focus in the future.
- Checking if money spent for project gave good effects
- Essential to [ae]ges involvement and there is very little application or understanding in the chapters
- Evaluation is more than numbers. Challenge to implement without alienating volunteers.
- Help me to prepare and value the programs - Having a common language with the FDC Team. I expect to better understand which level and kind of metrics and evaluating we must work about.
- Make the program activities of my chapter relevant and effective. Understand what I can do better!
- Program evaluation should give a hint on what programs can be interesting Program evaluation helps in better understanding what should/could be fixed in the future.
- Setting better goals and achieving them.
- Through evaluation, I would know if I am going in the right direction. Knowing it gives me motivation. Also, knowing and presenting the impact of my work helps to get financing and others assistance.
- To justify the usage of donations to donors.
- To know that the work we're doing has an impact.

## Program Evaluation and Design Workshop - Participant Survey Results

- To work and identify sources and common prioritize the activities. To begin in measure of images in WLM organization.
- Trying to figure out whether what I do makes sense, and for those programmes that do make sense whether there are obvious areas of improvement.

Participants were also asked to rate their level of understanding of ten select program evaluation terms that related to the workshop learning concepts at both PRE and POST survey time. Participants rated their understanding on a four-point scale:

- *None* “I do not yet understand this concept”
- *Basic* “I understand the concept but need help applying it to my program”
- *Applied* “I understand how this concept applies to my program”
- *Expert* “I could teach someone else this concept”

Mean scores were tabulated in which 1 represented *None*, 2 represented *Basic*, 3 represented *Applied*, and 4 represented *Expert*.

Program Evaluation Term	Level of Understanding									
	PRE					POST				
	Mean	None	Basic	Applied	Expert	Mean	None	Basic	Applied	Expert
a. Cohort**	1.88	37.5%	43.8%	12.5%	6.3%	2.94	5.6%	16.7%	55.6%	22.2%
b. Inputs**	2.44	0.0%	62.5%	31.3%	6.3%	3.26	0.0%	0.0%	73.7%	26.3%
c. Logic Model**	1.94	31.3%	43.8%	25.0%	0.0%	2.68	0.0%	42.1%	47.4%	0.0%
d. Outcomes*	2.33	13.3%	46.7%	33.3%	6.7%	2.95	0.0%	15.8%	73.7%	10.5%
e. Outputs**	2.31	12.5%	56.3%	18.8%	12.5%	3.05	0.0%	5.3%	84.2%	10.5%
f. Metrics*	2.38	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	0.0%	2.74	0.0%	36.8%	52.6%	10.5%
g. Program	2.75	0.0%	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	2.89	0.0%	26.3%	57.9%	15.8%
h. Qualitative	2.94	0.0%	25.0%	56.3%	18.8%	3.00	0.0%	26.3%	47.4%	26.3%
i. Quantitative	2.81	0.0%	25.0%	68.8%	6.3%	3.05	0.0%	15.8%	63.2%	21.1%
j. Theory of Change**	1.75	43.8%	43.8%	6.3%	6.3%	2.58	0.0%	47.4%	47.4%	5.3%

Note: A paired samples T-test was used to test statistical significance of the change in understanding from PRE to POST report. Significance levels are noted by asterisks where \*\* =  $p < .01$  and \* =  $p < .05$  and indicate either a less than 1%, or less than 5%, possibility, respectively, that the change occurred by chance.

As seen in the table above, the majority of participants had entered the workshop with *no* or only *basic* understanding of the eight of the ten program evaluation terms included in the survey, only the terms program, qualitative, and quantitative were well-known to the group. By POST survey time the majority were leaving the workshop with an *applied* or *expert* understanding of nearly all the key terms included on the survey. Importantly, the core concept terms “theory of change” and “logic model” while still less understood than the other terms, demonstrated highly significant gains along a similar trajectory as the other selected terms that were less known at PRE survey time. Specifically, understanding of each of the selected terms demonstrated the following growth from PRE to POST:

- *Cohort*: Understanding grew from 19% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 78% at POST
- *Inputs*: Understanding grew from 38% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 100% at POST
- *Logic Model*: Understanding grew from 25% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 47% at POST
- *Outcomes*: Understanding grew from 40% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 84% at POST
- *Outputs*: Understanding grew from 30% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 95% at POST
- *Metrics*: Understanding grew from 50% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 63% at POST

## Program Evaluation and Design Workshop - Participant Survey Results

- *Program*: Demonstrated a growth trend from 63% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 74% at POST
- *Qualitative*: Understanding maintained with 75% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE and 74% at POST
- *Quantitative*: Demonstrated a growth trend 75% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 84% at POST
- *Theory of Change*: Understanding grew from 12% reporting *applied* or *expert* understanding at PRE to 53% at POST

In addition to actual change in understanding of a new, shared vocabulary, participants also demonstrated a high level of success in accessing several core learning concepts that were presented and modeled throughout the course of the workshop. At POST survey time, participants were also asked to rate their level of understanding of six key learning concepts that were part of the workshop presentations.

Participants rated their understanding of the concepts on a three-point scale:

- Low (I need more help to understand this concept)
- Moderate (I have a basic understanding, but need some help to remember and/or apply)
- High (I have a good understanding and can apply this concept in my work)

Mean scores were tabulated in which 1 represented *Low*, 2 represented *Moderate*, and 3 represented *High* and results indicate that all six of the core concepts included in the POST survey demonstrated moderate to high understanding by the overwhelming majority of participants.

Workshop Concepts	Level of Understanding			
	<i>Mean</i>	Low	Moderate	High
a. Evaluation is a continuous practice toward understanding and improving programs.	2.84	0.0	15.8	84.2
b. There are many stages and types of evaluation, not just outcomes evaluation and reporting.	2.42	10.5	36.8	52.6
c. Program Evaluation is an iterative process of that may involve different stages and types of evaluation.	2.37	10.5	42.1	47.4
d. A theory of change is the description of the cause and effect relationships expected along the pathway to program success.	2.32	10.5	47.4	42.1
e. Logic models are a tool to help articulate a program's theory of change.	2.32	10.5	47.4	42.1
f. Different types of data and sources should be used to capture evidence of programming in terms of inputs, outputs and outcomes.	2.32	15.8	36.8	47.4

Furthermore, the majority of the participants were highly satisfied with the process of, and logic models generated by, the break-out group sessions. At POST survey time participants were asked to rate the extent to which they were satisfied with their break-out group in terms of processes and outcomes. Participants rated their understanding on a four-point scale: *Not at all*, *Somewhat*, *Mostly*, and *Completely*.

## Program Evaluation and Design Workshop - Participant Survey Results

Mean scores were tabulated in which 1 represented *Not at all*, 2 represented *Somewhat*, 3 represented *Mostly*, and 4 represented *Completely*.

Break-out Group Process/Outcome	Level of Satisfaction				
	Mean	Not at all	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely
a. The group process of articulating theory of change and logic model elements	3.16	0.0%	5.3%	73.7%	21.1%
b. Your break-out group's summary logic model	3.18	0.0%	11.8%	58.8%	29.4%
c. The group process of prioritizing outcomes and indicators	2.63	12.5%	12.5%	75.0%	0.0%
d. Your inclusion in the development and prioritization process	3.11	0.0%	11.1%	66.7%	22.2%
e. The break-out group process overall	3.19	0.0%	12.5%	56.3%	31.3%

At both PRE and POST survey time participants were asked to share one word or phrase that best represented their *feeling(s)* about evaluation. At PRE survey, motivations, while somewhat "curious" also presented some aspects of feeling pressured to participate while at POST survey time there was much more excitement expressed, along with a fair bit of overwhelming.

PRE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actually forced, but genuinely interested</li> <li>• Blurry</li> <li>• Curiosity</li> <li>• Curiosity &amp; some stress</li> <li>• Eagerness</li> <li>• Hesitation (I think)</li> <li>• High interest (but need a lot of work)</li> <li>• Impatience we don't do it</li> <li>• Interest</li> <li>• Motivation</li> <li>• Necessary</li> <li>• Necessity</li> <li>• Oh my</li> <li>• Pandora's Box</li> <li>• Very Interesting</li> </ul>

POST
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burned out</li> <li>• Confused</li> <li>• Curious</li> <li>• Curious to get started</li> <li>• Do it!</li> <li>• Eager</li> <li>• Encouraged</li> <li>• Excited</li> <li>• Curiosity</li> <li>• Manageable confusion</li> <li>• Mixed feelings</li> <li>• Moderate understanding</li> <li>• Overwhelming</li> <li>• Overwhelming anxiety</li> <li>• Trepidatious excitement</li> <li>• Useful</li> <li>• Very interested and involved</li> </ul>

When asked what they liked most about the Program Evaluation and Design Workshop participants mentioned some of the same aspects that were part of their original motivations and workshop objectives (e.g., learning about program evaluation, gaining a shared vocabulary, collaborating with other program leaders) as well as some specific components that were especially useful and should be replicated and/or expanded in future implementations of the workshop such as the resource booklet, the glossary, time for sharing stories, networking, pausing for discussions, and the program specific logic models.

## Program Evaluation and Design Workshop - Participant Survey Results

Specific responses as to what participants liked most about the workshop included:

- A book of materials
- Anasuya's sessions - Fear is Fantastic Breakdown
- Community of people interested about PED  
Community of program leaders
- Discussions
- Finding common ground Interesting discussions
- It's not a top-down model
- Location/facilities excellent!
- Logic Models specific to things/projects I do
- Networking
- Shared stories and cases
- Socialization
- Terms
- The basic conception of program evaluation
- To have a sample of data UMAPI seems to be ready to use soon
- Talking about project design
- Trust building
- Working about vocabulary and examples
- Background on design and evaluation
- Group of about 20 people = good for learning size
- To be heard on various issues

When asked what they would suggest to improve the workshop participants most often pointed to the amount of work to be covered in the workshop and the workshops length along with some recommendations and strategies for how to make it more digestible (e.g., more days, less content, or more advance work), a desire for additional content coverage, and recommendation for more role clarity and better moderation of some of the discussions.

- 2 days was too short or in other wording "too much" (as too much info in too short time)
- A template with an example would have helped during breakouts
- API demonstration that works and isn't absolutely confusing and difficult
- Ask maybe for more preparation from participants before?
- Better time planning
- Build some "logic model" together to share with chapters and community
- Estimate participation of the member of Wikimedia chapters
- Less top-down
- Maybe more interactive presentations (Images etc.)
- More and longer breaks (First day was too condensed)
- More time for open discussions
- Shame the API tool was not ready
- Sometimes more time to clarify on problems and fears
- Spread it among the community
- There could be some materials sent before the workshop for such beginners like me ;)
- We kind of stayed on the theoretical level and didn't have time for more
- Clear leadership from the foundations, who's leading what?
- Cover all the scheduled topics
- Explain information about MediaWiki UserMetrics API
- Having more time to present our programs with a logic model (re write them)
- Include and allow alternative approaches
- Less theoretical concepts - many people in the group aren't project managers.
- More on Measurability
- Need a moderator
- Share dietary info with the organizers so they can prepare better (e.g., cancel vegan food if the person is not coming)
- Some "keep on track" leader, a person in charge of focusing the topics
- Answer the questions you collect
- Covering the prioritising outcomes part - I really need direction here so I don't do everything at once. Crash and burn.
- More time about types of metrics and data
- Schedule with more time to safe cost trips
- Shorter participant survey

## Program Evaluation and Design Workshop - Participant Survey Results

Sixty-three percent of participants reported they felt "mostly" (50%) or "very" (12.5%) prepared to implement next steps in evaluating their program. When asked what next steps they were planning to implement in the next 45 days, the participants' most frequent responses were:

- Develop measures for capturing outcomes (47%)
- Conduct a visioning activity to articulate their specific program's impact goals and theory of change (42%)
- Develop their own custom logic model to map their specific program's chain of outcomes (42%)
- Develop monitoring tools to track inputs and outputs (37%)

<b>To what extent do you feel prepared to implement next steps in evaluating your program? (Mean= 3.75)</b>	
(1) Not at all	0.0%
(2) Slightly	0.0%
(3) Somewhat	37.5%
(4) Mostly	50.0%
(5) Very	12.5%

<b>What, if any, evaluation strategies do you plan to implement in the next 30-45 days?</b>	<b>% Selected</b>
Visioning to articulate your specific program's impact goals and theory of change	42.1%
Developing your own custom logic model to map your specific program's chain of outcomes	42.1%
Developing monitoring tools to track inputs and outputs	36.8%
Developing measures to capture outcomes	47.4%
Creating cohorts and extracting UMAPI metric data	10.5%
Comparing data with other similar programs	21.1%
Other	36.8%

Other next steps shared: Explain to others; participating in on-going discussion re. issues raised and waiting to see how the tool looks; Recreating this event in my native language is the level :); Telling others about the workshop so they can have their own strategies; Try to disseminate this knowledge; Use evaluation concept for design of new and follow-up projects WLM Implementation for data evaluation.

Participants also said what kind of assistance they need most: broader community involvement, quality tools for tracking data, survey strategies, tools to teach other program leaders, and an online portal for engagement.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad discussion in the movement - for common understanding of evaluation and it's importance.</li> <li>• Community and group discussions.</li> <li>• Follow-up group.</li> <li>• Get community on board how to train those suggesting/implementing programs?</li> <li>• Help to build logic models (examples)</li> <li>• Portal with programs documentation of other groups/chapters to share ideas and learn</li> <li>• Survey strategies</li> <li>• Teaching tools</li> <li>• To get image upload survey</li> <li>• Tracking tools (4)</li> <li>• Write-ups of logic models created at the event and feedback</li> <li>• Accessible documentation</li> <li>• Analyze kiwix offline user experience with survey items</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better surveys</li> <li>• Community space to share usecase/case studies</li> <li>• Guidance for metrics definitions</li> <li>• People available to answer my concerns as I go along</li> <li>• Tool finally ready</li> <li>• Local chapter adopts strategy</li> <li>• Poll in WLM portal</li> <li>• Strategy Strong arguments to convince community to work with me</li> <li>• Way to speak with evaluation team when we build our programs</li> <li>• Working tools</li> <li>• Community portal</li> <li>• F2F Dialogues</li> <li>• The slides of the workshop</li> <li>• Tools for Data Analyze</li> <li>• Down-to earth explanation and graphics</li> </ul> |
|---|---|