

Section G: Using Evaluation Findings

Utility is a hallmark of high-quality evaluation and one of the standards that guides and motivates the work of professional evaluators:

Evaluations should be planned, conducted, and reported in ways that encourage follow-through by stakeholders, so that the likelihood that the evaluation will be used is increased¹.

There are a number of recommended practices used by evaluators to increase the utility of their work, including:

- Focusing the evaluation on a specific and limited set of questions about the quality of program implementation and the achievement of expected outcomes
- Collecting reliable and credible evidence of progress and success from more than one source
- Using data analysis techniques that are appropriate for the available data and which maximize the learning that is possible from the data
- Communicating evaluation findings to multiple audiences with diverse information needs

G.1 Continuous Improvement

In the first section of the *Migrant Program Evaluation Toolkit*, evaluation was situated in a Continuous Improvement Cycle for Migrant Education Programs (MEPs):

1. The cycle begins with the statewide Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA).
2. The CNA guides the development of the state's Service Delivery Plan (SDP).
3. The SDP is in turn implemented and evaluated,
4. The findings of the Program Evaluation are incorporated into the next CAN,
5. The Continuous Improvement Cycle is repeated.

When you have summarized the evaluation findings in a written format that can be shared with state Migrant Education Program (MEP) stakeholders, you will be ready to reconvene the CNA and SDP committees to look at evaluation results related to the Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) for specific MEP services.

To facilitate the process of incorporating the evaluation findings throughout the Continuous Improvement Cycle, a *Protocol for Using Evaluation Findings in a Continuous Improvement Cycle*

¹ [American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators. \(2004\).](#)

is referenced in *Appendix G.1*. You can use the discussion questions in conjunction with the results of your program evaluation as a starting point to:

- Reassess stakeholders' shared understanding of needs, barriers, and assets in the migrant community
- Refine the SDP and MPOs as needed to align with more challenging or more realistic strategies and expectations
- Revise evaluation questions and data collection methods as needed to align with changing strategies and expectations

In addition to reviewing current evaluation findings, committee members should prepare ahead of time for these discussions by reviewing longitudinal performance of Priority for Services and other migrant students on state performance targets, as well as changes in the state's Migrant Student Profile and Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures over time.

G.2 Links to Other Online Resources

[W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook. \(2004\). Step 9: Utilizing the Process and Results of Evaluation \(pp. 99-104\).](#)

[University of Wisconsin Extension Cooperative Extension. \(1998\). Community Group Member Survey: Using the Results.](#)

G.3 Resources and Tools in Appendix G

Appendix G.1 Protocol for Using Evaluation Findings in a Continuous Improvement Cycle

Appendix G.1 Protocol for Using Evaluation Findings in a Continuous Improvement Cycle

1. **Reassess needs in the migrant community** – In collaboration with Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) committee members, compare evaluation findings related to program implementation and Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) to the committee’s original need statements.
 - a. Are the original needs identified by the CNA committee still the highest priority needs for migrant students?
 - b. What, if any, higher priority needs emerged during the previous program year?
 - c. What, if any, additional barriers to migrant students’ success came to light during the evaluation process?
 - d. What, if any, assets in the migrant community or lifestyle came to light that could be leveraged to support student success?
 - e. Based on the evaluation findings and your current assessment of needs, would you recommend any different or additional strategies moving forward?

2. **Refine selected strategies and expected outcomes** – In collaboration with Service Delivery Plan (SDP) committee members, compare evaluation findings related to program implementation and MPOs to the original SDP.
 - a. To what extent have instructional services provided to migrant students produced the desired outcomes in academic achievement?
 - b. To what extent have non-instructional support services provided to migrant students and their families led to increased participation and engagement in their schooling?
 - c. Do findings from the implementation evaluation suggest that changes in service delivery may improve the desired outcomes?
 1. If so, what changes are necessary to improve the delivery of existing services?
 2. If not, what other services may be more effective for achieving the desired outcomes?
 - d. What, if any, adjustments should be made to specific MPOs to reflect realistic but still challenging expectations?

- e. If the CNA committee has recommended new service delivery strategies for the MEP, what are the appropriate MPOs, evaluation questions, and data collection plans?
3. **Revise the Evaluation Plan** – Also in collaboration with the SDP planning committee, review the original plan to evaluate program implementation and MPOs as stated in the original SDP.
- a. To what extent were selected outcome measures appropriate for evaluating specific MPOs?
 - b. What, if any, other measures may be better aligned with specific MPOs?
 - c. To what extent did the questions and methods used to evaluate the implementation of specific MEP services produce useful information?
 - d. What, if any, other questions would you ask about the implementation of specific services?
 - e. What, if any, other methods could you use to get useful information about service implementation?