

TEAMS Presentations at the 2015 AEA Conference in Chicago, IL in November.

TEAMS staff will be presenting several sessions at the American Evaluation Association Conference, November 9-14, 2015 in Chicago, IL. The sessions are identified in the table below, organized in order by day of session. We hope you can join the TEAMS staff at any of these sessions.

Session Type/Title	Description
Poster Session: Evaluation and Alignment of Models to Research Types Presenters: Michael Culbertson, Emma Espel Session ID: 1180 – Poster Reception on Wednesday, November 11 from 7:00-9:00pm CT in conjunction with the Meet the Authors event.	The Common Guidelines for Educational Research and Development (IES/NSF, 2013) suggest that external feedback (peer review, expert panels, advisory boards, external evaluators) is appropriate for evaluating each of the six different research types: foundational research and development; early stage/exploratory; design and development; efficacy studies; effectiveness studies; and scale-up studies. However, there is little elaboration regarding which type of external feedback works best for a particular type of research, or how an external feedback model might be utilized for particular research types. This poster session is intended to allow participants to draw from their expertise and experience to share their thoughts. Participants are asked to reflect on the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which external feedback models are best suited to each research type? • What evaluation questions fit best with each research type?
Demonstration: Designing Surveys Using Construct Mapping Presenters: Karen Drill, Erin Stack Session ID: 1427 - This session will take place: Thu, Nov 12, 2015 (08:00 AM - 09:30 AM) : Grand Suite 5 *	The purpose of this session will be to review best practices in designing surveys, to introduce participants to the concept of construct mapping, and then to engage participants with applying construct mapping to their own surveys. Construct mapping provides a 1) coherent and substantive definition for the construct's content and 2) involves designing items based on an underlying, hierarchical continuum. This facilitates more precise measurement of the latent variable of interest (e.g., attitudes, beliefs). We will also provide a brief introduction to Rasch modeling and its application to developing measures.
Think Tank: Establishing Validity and Reliability for Locally Developed Instruments Presenters: Xin Wang, Emma Espel Session ID: 1583 - This session will take place: Thu, Nov 12, 2015 (01:00 PM - 01:45 PM) : Dusable *	The Common Guidelines for Education Research and Development suggests that evidence of and strategies for ensuring reliability and validity of data collection instruments should be provided in any research or evaluation plan. This session will provide a brief overview of instrument validity and reliability, methods to validate locally developed measures, and methods to measure reliability and validity. The What Works Clearinghouse Standards will be used as a foundation to support the session discussion about what types of validity and reliability evidence should be provided for project evaluations. Specifically, presenters will discuss how to demonstrate that a measure is clearly defined, has a direct interpretation, and consistently measures the intended constructs. Presenters will also draw examples from Math and Science Partnership (MSP) evaluations to facilitate discussion. Participants will be invited to share their experiences and thoughts on creating validity and reliability for locally development instruments for evaluation projects.
Demonstration: Moving beyond satisfaction: A new rubric for evaluating webinar quality	Evaluations of webinars often focus on participant satisfaction through post-event feedback surveys. However, evaluators of education programs that make use of webinars may gain additional insights into

Session Type/Title	Description
<p>Presenters: Michael Culbertson</p> <p>Feature presentation at the Distance Education & Other Educational Technologies (DEOET) TIG Business meeting to be held on Friday, November 13 at 8AM (subject to change).</p>	<p>webinar quality by comparing implementation with best practices. In particular, a crucial feature of webinar quality is the extent to which the webinar actively engages participants. This demonstration session introduces a new rubric for evaluating webinars by examining how each component of the webinar supports and enhances participant engagement. The webinar rubric, developed by the Technical Evaluation Assistance in Mathematics and Science (TEAMS) project, may be used either by external evaluators in formative or summative evaluation or by webinar facilitators as a diagnostic self-assessment tool. In this session, you will receive an overview of best practices for enhancing participant engagement in webinars and see the rubric in action with a number of illustrative examples from actual archived webinars.</p>
<p>Think Tank: Program Evaluation: Raising the Standards</p> <p>Presenters: Emma Espel, Xin Wang</p> <p>Session ID: 1360 - This session will take place: Fri, Nov 13, 2015 (03:30 PM - 04:15 PM) : Picasso *</p>	<p>Parallel concerns and considerations arise across evaluation projects, driving a need for a common understanding of high quality evaluations across projects and the globe. The Program Evaluation Standards (Yarbrough et al., 2010) identifies and defines rigorous features of quality evaluations, and serves to guide evaluators and stakeholders in decisions about their work. The purpose of this session is to provide a brief overview of the five standards and spur essential conversation about integrating the standards into exemplary evaluations around the globe. After a brief overview, presenters will draw examples from extensive experience with math and science partnership (MSP) evaluations to spark discussion. Specifically, this think tank will include “what would you do” scenarios asking participants to apply the standards in small groups, as well as whole group discussion about how the program evaluation standards arise in participants’ evaluation work. The session will conclude with lessons learned.</p>