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Introduction

Conditions of Use

This E-Book is designed for graduate programs and department leaders who are interested in conducting holistic program review that is developmental, student-centered and action-orientated. The Graduate Review and Improvement Process (GRIP) development team at the University of Minnesota is committed to monitoring and evaluating GRIP as it is implemented in an increasing number of diverse programs, and in institutions outside of the University of Minnesota. The GRIP team asks that you read and adhere to the following set of conditions if you plan to implement information in this e-book at your own institution. Please contact mesi@umn.edu if you have additional questions, comments, or concerns about the conditions of use for this GRIP E-Book.

1. Please contact mesi@umn.edu if you plan on implementing GRIP in your program or department as we may invite you to be a part of the GRIP research and evaluation team, which is focused on disseminating research and evaluation findings around the GRIP initiative.


3. If intending to implement GRIP, please ensure that the “GRIP Central Tenets” are part of your process.
In 2011, GRIP was created through a collaborative effort of educational leaders at the University of Minnesota (UMN), in response to important challenges generated by the report, *Commission on the Future of Graduate Education in the United States* (Triggle, & Miller, n.d.). This collaboration included: Dr. Henning Schroeder, Dean of the UMN Graduate School; Dr. Jean King, professor of Evaluation Studies; Dr. Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Professor of higher education and chair of the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development (OLPD); Leah Hakkola, president of the student governing association of OLPD, and Marta Shaw, doctoral student of OLPD. This group slated a set of questions to be asked of UMN’s graduate programs:

1. What purpose does the [graduate] program serve?
2. How well, and how effectively, is the program meeting its purpose?
3. With what evidence, and/or rationale, will we know?

This leadership group, two additional GRIP student consultants (doctoral students Michelle Gensinger and Doug Moon), and Melissa Chapman-Haynes PhD, Coordinator of the Minnesota Evaluation Studies Institute (MESI), designed, piloted, expanded, and documented the GRIP implementation at UMN. As of January 2015, GRIP has been conducted in over twenty graduate programs. From 2011 to 2015 the number of graduate programs engaging in GRIP has grown steadily. The GRIP team has designed this e-book to support the continued expansion of the initiative and to share the experiences, knowledge and outcomes we have gained in the past few years. We view this as a living document and are dedicated to updating the content as GRIP continues to expand.
Getting a GRIP on Your Graduate Program

The Graduate Review and Improvement Process (GRIP) allows program leaders to consider the educational quality of their courses, curriculum, and services for the purposes of program improvement. GRIP is a student-centered process designed to identify and develop actionable steps that will enhance educational success. It was developed as an alternative to the traditional external review process that occurs every five to ten years, and which produces largely quantitative and summative information about the program. Further, GRIP can serve as a complementary process to external monitoring and surveying that is conducted to assess indicators such as time to degree, retention, number of publications, financial aid provided, or student demographics.

GRIP is unique in that it places the emphasis of the evaluation process and program improvement in the hands of participating students, faculty, and staff. GRIP is a collaborative and participatory process, which means that individuals identified to be on the internal program team determine what information should be collected and relay that information back to other program stakeholders, allowing for feedback and additional data collection and review. GRIP allows programs to define discipline-specific metrics and outcomes using a variety of evaluation tools and methods.

GRIP provides a way to explore and measure both qualitative and quantitative data in graduate education. For example, programs may ask questions such as:

1. How should we evaluate the crossing of disciplinary boundaries?
2. What is the ideal path to degree in our program?
   - What strategies have students created and used in their paths to degree?
3. How do we quantify intellectual risk-taking?
4. How can we measure originality and innovation?
5. How can we enhance program recruitment, retention, and graduation?
6. How aligned is our program curriculum and coursework with current career trends in our field?
GRIP is a customizable process that is intended for a wide range of programs. Graduate programs that have participated in GRIP span a variety of degree types (Master of Science; Master of Art; Master of Fine Arts; Doctoral students and candidates). GRIP has been applied across various disciplines and specialized areas of learning, from dentistry to veterinary medicine, and securities technology to curricular instruction. The flexible nature of GRIP has allowed for successful implementation in programs including: entomology, public affairs, business administration, anthropology, and nursing. For a full list of past participating programs and their key outcomes, please see “Appendix I: GRIP Programs and Outcomes”.

**GRIP Central Tenets**

- Identify a project-specific GRIP team that includes the following individuals: current student(s), director of graduate studies and/or a faculty in an administrative role, and program faculty or staff.
- Determine whether the review process will include any external evaluation consultation (like a GRIP consultant), or whether the review will be conducted internally.
- Complete an initial evaluability assessment, which includes meeting as a project-specific team in consultation with a GRIP consultant, to review existing information about the graduate program of interest, and determine the evaluation questions of most relevance to program needs.
- If you have decided to work with an external evaluator such as a GRIP consultant to develop regular meetings throughout the semester outlining the following activities:
  - Development of an evaluation plan
  - Evaluation tools specific to program needs
  - Evaluation method administration dates
- Design and implement a process for sharing evaluation findings with program constituents (students, faculty, staff, alumni). Develop an action plan that includes reflections on lessons learned, next steps, roles and responsibilities.
How to Use this E-book

GRIP is a tailored evaluation process that is contingent upon program needs, resources, and scope. Accordingly, the GRIP team has developed several key factors that will shape your evaluation. Factors include the following:

1. The graduate program’s internal capacity to conduct program evaluation
2. The information needs of the program
3. The timeline that evaluative information is needed
4. Motivation of the program to prioritize and implement that timeline

Generally speaking, the above factors provide a framework for an initial evaluability assessment so that a graduate program can determine how to approach GRIP activities. The degree to which an initial evaluability assessment is formalized is up to each graduate program interested in pursuing GRIP as a model of program evaluation.

The GRIP team has worked with over 20 programs, providing them with evaluation expertise, consultative service, and internal program capacity-building. For programs interested in working with such an external evaluator or GRIP consultant, this e-book will provide an overview of the major components of this process. Our hope is that this e-book will help to guide graduate programs interested in developing and utilizing their internal capacity to conduct GRIP activities with confidence. This e-book can also be used with the guidance of an internal staff member who has expertise in graduate education evaluation.

THE GROUNDING OF GRIP

GRIP is designed to provide graduate program leaders with the tools and strategies they need to conduct a thorough review of their educational quality and effectiveness. GRIP responded to a need for information on graduate programs and how well they prepare students for an increasingly complex and ever-changing world. Our GRIP “strategy” builds upon the scholarly evaluation approaches introduced and refined
by leading scholars and practitioners in the fields of evaluation and higher education. The GRIP initiative is informed by scholarship from *The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate* and Michael Patton’s *Developmental Evaluation* and *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. GRIP consultation is guided by the *Professional Program Evaluation Standards*. The scholarship and evaluation tools mentioned above provide a solid foundation for implementing and facilitating high-quality, meaningful, relevant, and useful program review and improvement.
Establishing a GRIP Leadership Team

Implementing GRIP requires facilitation and coordination from a leader in the graduate education program with other key program stakeholders. Based on our three years of experience at UMN, GRIP leadership has found that the most effective internal GRIP program teams consist of at least one faculty member, at least one student representative, and consultation with one GRIP consultant. Team member participation rates vary depending on the resources allocated to each individual. For example, approximately half of past participating programs created graduate assistantships for interested students from their programs. Other programs selected student leaders who wished to volunteer their time while gaining evaluation experience in the process.

The “GRIP Leadership Team” provides tremendous value and is necessary in moving GRIP through its various phases. This leadership team strategically involves decision-makers and champions (Director/Coordinator of Graduate Studies, other faculty) in the program, and at least one student from the program’s population of interest. Additional team members may include alumni and staff from the program. Throughout this manual, we refer to a “GRIP Consultant” as an individual with evaluation expertise whose primary role is to guide and facilitate the GRIP leadership team throughout the evaluation process. This individual provides the group with evaluation training, coaching, and internal capacity building in order to ensure quality and effectiveness of the evaluation process and results. Please note that at UMN, GRIP consultants...
were advanced doctoral students with expertise in evaluation and post-secondary education. These consultants were supported largely by the UMN Graduate School to facilitate University-wide graduate education review. In your program, the GRIP consultant may be an internal faculty or staff member, or a graduate student with expertise in evaluation.

ESTABLISH INITIAL CONNECTIONS

We recommend inviting students, faculty, and staff to an initial and informative meeting to discuss how your program could benefit from a review and improvement process. Casting a net among the program at large may generate a variety of individuals who can be helpful in developing the internal GRIP leadership team and the evaluation plan. We suggest contacting program constituents through program listservs, e-newsletters, student leadership organizations, and faculty meetings. The table below can be used to assemble a GRIP leadership team and provide an initial framework for roles and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRIP Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Leader (Chair, DGS, Senior Faculty Member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Representative (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the initial interest meeting, we recommend providing a brief overview of GRIP using “GRIP Central Tenets”. Providing useful information with definitions for any evaluation rhetoric will help to build healthy rapport. In this meeting, make sure to highlight the fact that GRIP is distinct from external reviews and accreditation and is designed to engage with qualitative and quantitative data to develop focused plans.
for improvement. GRIP uses quantitative data to demonstrate what is going on in your program, while making use of qualitative data to provide the narrative for why those elements exist. GRIP is based on the principles of developmental evaluation and action research methodologies, and creates a complementary method for graduate education review.

Regular GRIP leadership team meetings offer a venue for deeper analysis of evaluation results and discussions of next steps. Involvement in the GRIP leadership team requires consistent participation and ongoing commitment. Clarification of expectations, roles, and responsibilities is critical in the initial meeting. Near the end of this meeting, make sure to structure an opportunity for questions and answers, and provide a way for individuals to sign up if they are interested in joining the GRIP leadership team. Once you have established your internal GRIP leadership team, your next step is to schedule your first GRIP leadership meeting where you will conduct a brief stakeholder analysis, discussion of Primary Intended Users (PIUs) and an evaluability assessment.

YOUR FIRST GRIP TEAM LEADERSHIP MEETING

Conducting a Stakeholder Analysis

Implementing GRIP successfully requires the engagement of those who are primarily affected by the program. The meaningful involvement of stakeholders—those who have a stake, or investment in the program—will increase ownership of the process, decrease resistance to change and involvement, and can save time and resources. Investing time at the beginning to consider the program’s key actors, decision-makers, service providers, and clients—the graduate students—will increase GRIP’s quality and usefulness. Knowing who should be involved, when to inform them, and how to involve them are key questions in the stakeholder involvement process (Aerden, 2013). Those with more interest in the program will be more likely to actively contribute (Bourns, 2013).
Helpful stakeholders for GRIP include the following:

- Coordinator of Graduate Studies
- Director of Graduate Studies
- Program Director or Chair
- Faculty (junior, tenured, adjunct, etc.)
- Companion and/or Co-located Programs
- Students

When recruiting students:

- Look for naturally occurring groups (by year of program, by program track or specialty, by location).
- There might also be student leadership groups within a program or department.
- Universities often have councils and/or associations with elected or appointed student leaders.

Check these groups out as appropriate; in addition to comprising your stakeholder group, they might have keen insights into the political climate and cultural nuances of the program.

Remember that stakeholders have various reasons to be involved, a range of perspectives, different priorities, and, often, preferred ways to communicate. Some might be directly involved in delivering or supporting aspects of the program; others may be indirectly affected (e.g., potential students, students who withdrew from program). It is worth investigating to see if communication plans or documents exist that describe program stakeholders already. The following table will be helpful for organizing a stakeholder analysis and a plan for engaging them throughout GRIP implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Name</th>
<th>Ex: Dr. Jan Yang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Category*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest or Perspective</td>
<td>Wants to strengthen student involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in the Evaluation</td>
<td>Volunteer member of GRIP leadership team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Involvement</td>
<td>Regular GRIP team meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: Communication</td>
<td>She is the faculty advisor for the department student organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*You might create categories of stakeholders based on their interest, experience, resources, or program relevance. Simple classifications such as: {PRIMARY, SECONDARY, TERTIARY} or by communication strategy: {e.g., INCLUDE, INFORM, INVOLVE, ENGAGE} are useful. Be diplomatic in assigning “importance” to people—these are often public documents.

**IDENTIFYING INTENDED USERS AND “PRIMARY” INTENDED USERS**

Intended users—and specifically, the primary intended user (PIU)—are not only stakeholders, but also offer critical insight and direction for how the GRIP evaluation will be conducted and ultimately how the findings will be communicated and used. Years of research on evaluation use suggest that “evaluators should facilitate the evaluation process and design any evaluation with careful consideration of how everything that is done, from beginning to end, will affect use” (Patton, 2012). PIU(s) have the unique responsibility of making decisions on when to take action and how the GRIP evaluation strategy should evolve because of their involvement with the evaluation process and findings (IRDC, 2012). Plan on regular, high-quality interactions with the PIU(s), and other intended users because they will be instrumental during GRIP implementation, analysis, and in the development of an action plan.

**Focusing on Intended Use**

We have found that maintaining a focus on how the primary intender user(s) will
use the information generated by the evaluation is critical to conducting a successful evaluation. This process includes engaging stakeholders, especially intended users, in a conversation to reach shared understanding about how the results can and will be used. Be mindful that you may initially encounter some resistance to this process. Building rapport and trust is an important aspect in easing this resistance, and gaining consensus among intended users about the evaluation design. King & Stevahn (2010, p.61) address this issue in their practical guide to *Principles for Interactive Evaluation Practice (IEP)*. Their IEP principles provide a structured process to manage evaluator-stakeholder interactions by examining the political and cultural dimensions of the evaluation context. Developing a shared understanding of the decision-making process and other environmental factors can help mitigate resistance towards the evaluation process and use of subsequent findings. Below is a set of questions for intended users to explore in order to identify the extent to which GRIP will influence forthcoming program decisions.

**Questions for Intended Users about How GRIP will Influence Forthcoming Decisions**

- What is the history and context of the decision-making process in the program?
- What do we know are current issues in our program?
- What decisions, if any, do we expect GRIP findings to influence?
- Who makes the decisions and when will decisions be made?
- When do findings from GRIP need to be presented in order to be timely and influential?
- What controversies or issues surround the decisions? Around GRIP itself? For whom?
- What other factors (values, politics, personalities, promises already made) will affect the decision-making? Could decisions somehow be kept from being made?
- How much influence do you expect GRIP findings to have on decision-making?
- Have decisions already been made—regardless of GRIP and its findings?
- What can be done to enhance GRIP’s relevance and influence in your program?
- How will we know the extent of GRIP’s usefulness or if it was used as intended?
Defining Intended Use

Engaging a program in a methodical self-study process to explore values, attitudes, and interests among its stakeholders will likely build useful knowledge. Gathering information for the purposes of program improvement, however, implies some degree of decision-making and/or prioritization processes. Identifying the purpose of the evaluation and how the findings will be used is critical. GRIP thrives in a developmental construct and nurtures itself through iterative, meaningful, and useful pieces of information. The healthy, living, and breathing evaluation process gets off to a good start with a centering, systematic inquiry. It is recommended that questions here stimulate dialogue and shared understanding. Documentation of agreements, decisions, and plans will prove undeniably worthwhile. Below are central questions that inform the evaluation design for intended use.

Building Agreement & Focusing the Evaluation on Intended Use

1. What are you asking?
2. Who are you asking?
3. How will you ask?
4. Why are you asking this?
5. How will this information be used?
6. When is this information needed?

Conducting the Evaluability Assessment

For many years, evaluability assessments have been recommended as the first step for those interested in program improvement. Assessing your program’s readiness for GRIP, or any evaluation process for that matter, helps to test it for reality—to see if the espoused theory of the program and its design is aligned with how participants
actually use it (Schön, 1997). Smith (1989) provides a concise description of this process below:

[Evaluability assessment] is a diagnostic and prescriptive tool for improving programs and making evaluations more useful. It is a systematic process for describing the structure of a program (i.e., the objectives, logic, activities, and indicators of successful performance); and for analyzing the plausibility and feasibility for achieving objectives, their suitability for in-depth evaluation, and their acceptability to program managers, policy makers, and program operators. (Smith, 1989, p. 1)

It is possible that the graduate program for which you want to introduce GRIP has faculty and staff that are familiar with evaluation. It is also possible that there will be a range of opinions about what evaluation should be and what it entails. In addition to preparing the program for reality-testing, evaluability assessments bring program staff, faculty, and other stakeholders onto the same page to share their hopes, fears, expectations, and exceptions for what GRIP might bring. During the evaluability assessment discussion, be mindful that there is no “right” way to decide on the overarching evaluation questions that will drive your participation in GRIP. We recommend an open and reflective process that is guided by the GRIP evaluability assessment questions described in the “Evaluability Assessment Report”.

There are several ways to begin an evaluability assessment, and the process does not have to be linear. While some (Strosberg & Wholey, 1983) prefer a checklist of activities, Michael Quinn Patton (Essentials of UFE) gravitates towards a more informal conversation designed to build consensus around the nature of the program, its political climate, and why the evaluation is being conducted. Both approaches emphasize the involvement of key program stakeholders, intended users, the review of program-defining documents, and a focused discussion on how the information gained will be used. Working with your GRIP leadership team, we recommend using the questions outlined below to structure your evaluability assessment discussion.
NOTES ON ASSESSING & BUILDING READINESS FOR GRIP

1. Review website and printed information (e.g., handbooks, newsletters, brochures) that describes the program and its history.

2. Meet with key program stakeholders to explain GRIP (or the evaluation initiative), but more importantly to get a sense of general issues with the program.
   A. How does the program fit within the larger department or college?
   B. Are there recent changes or political issues?
   C. When was the last evaluation conducted? How did that go? Who was involved? Were any findings used?

3. What kinds of [evaluation] information are collected?
   A. Exit interviews? (look for useful questions)
   B. Course evaluations? (look for trends)

4. Navigate through potential resistance to evaluation, but promote the positive aspects of evaluation:
   A. Program clarity and improvement;
   B. Invites reflection and input from others;
   C. Can build cohesiveness, morale, and motivation.

5. Generate some initial evaluation questions:
   A. What does the program want to know?
   B. How would this information be used?

Evaluability Assessment Report

Because GRIP is an internal and ongoing improvement process rather than a one time assessment, documenting the building of readiness, including the people involved and the questions to be asked, is an essential activity. Hence, the evaluability report will serve as a guide for ongoing and future review and adjustment of activities and decisions made in your program. The nature of the evaluability report will vary depending on the needs of your program; however, there are some essential pieces of
information that should be documented. These include:

• Description of the graduate program
• Names of individuals on the GRIP Leadership team
• Names of primary intended users
• Stakeholder groups who should inform the process
• Information that is currently collected about the program – type of information collected and results, as applicable
• Information needs of the program – what do we want to know?
• Initial evaluation questions
• Actual or perceived resistance to GRIP

HOW TO STRUCTURE OVERARCHING EVALUATION QUESTION(S)

Evaluation questions in GRIP lay the foundation upon which other lines of inquiry are constructed. Honing in on one to two primary questions such as, “What do you really want to know?” is a critical step in designing the GRIP evaluation. These “big” questions (no more than one to three) should focus the program towards improvement. GRIP provides an opportunity for the program to gather actionable feedback from current students, alumni, faculty, staff, or some combination of these stakeholders. Keep in mind that the information collected from the evaluation will become the content used for strategic planning and improvement processes. It is important to understand that the quality of the questions is enhanced by their orientation towards use and improvement.

Below, we offer examples of past GRIP evaluation questions:

• What is the ideal path to degree in our program?
• What strategies have students created / used to in their path to degree?
• What would help our Master students improve their post-graduation career prospects?
• How can we increase our recruitment of _______________?
• To what extent is our program’s purpose aligned with the interests of our incoming and current students?
• Does our program mission align with student expectations and the employment landscape in our field?
• How satisfied are our students with our coursework, curricula, and pedagogy?

Developing an Evaluation Plan

A critical step in your GRIP evaluation is the design of the evaluation plan. This evaluation plan can provide a large amount of information in a matrix format that will be a visual representation for your process. The evaluation plan provides an at-a-glance depiction of the what, who, how, why, and when questions asked and answered. The plan identifies your program’s primary evaluation questions, central evaluation objectives, key stakeholders, methods for data collection, and when collection of information will be completed. This plan should be developed within the first few GRIP team leadership meetings and will act as a guide throughout the GRIP process. Please visit the following website for additional guidance on developing an evaluation plan: https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/guide/documents/developing_an_evalu.htm.

To put our learning to practical use, imagine the following fictitious graduate program scenario:

The “Business-Ready-Instruction (BRI)” graduate program at UMN is designed to provide students with both academic grounding and professional skills that prepare them for future employment in settings as diverse as university instruction, entrepreneurial consulting, and marketing research. For the last few years, the administrative staff has commented on the time it takes to respond to a wide range of questions from Master students who stop in the DGS’ office. Perhaps not so surprisingly, these questions are addressed in great detail in the 115-page graduate program handbook that each newly admitted student receives by mail. Additionally, SRTs (student rating of teaching) administered at each term’s end have hinted at a growing dissatisfaction with the teaching of professional development. Phrases like
“outdated information” and “more opportunities to practice” are common in student evaluations.

The graduate program coordinator suggests that a GRIP evaluation would be an effective way to address the student complaints and concerns. After some informal conversations with office staff, an agenda appearance at the monthly BRISTLE (BRI Student Learning Event), and a subsequent one-on-one with the Director of Graduate Studies, the program Chair agrees to an initial meeting with a GRIP consultant. Brainstorming ensues, details are discussed, and spirited exchanges are followed with more reflective e-mails. The GRIP leadership team, a thoughtfully composed and now, more formalized group (including the DGS, program coordinator, associate professor, adjunct faculty member, student graduate assistant, staff member from the BRI career center, and GRIP consultant from the Graduate School) emerges with the latest iteration of its two evaluation questions. The program has arranged for the GRIP consultant to facilitate the evaluation plan discussion that will explore how to get answers to their overarching questions below.

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

1. How can the BRI program better prepare students to succeed in their chosen careers?
2. What are effective modes of, and how can BRI improve, program communication to its student
**Evaluation Design/The Matrix Model**

Below, we have provided an exemplar evaluation plan based on the Business-Ready-Instruction Graduate Education scenario:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q1. How does BRI improve career preparation for students? | • Perceptions and suggestions of BRI alumni re: program relevance across various career options  
• Perceptions and suggestions of BRI students regarding program information (quality) and curricular focus (relevance)  
• Expectations of incoming Master students re: BRI program  
• Current BRI curriculum and program requirements; BRI promotional info | • BRI students  
• BRI faculty  
• BRI alumni  
• BRI website  
• BRI exit interviews? (can we do this confidentially?) | Document analysis: Explore SRTs and student exit surveys for questions and comments re: career preparation, skill development, etc.  
Website analysis: Review program website for messages re: career prep, expectations, etc.  
Online survey: of BRI students and alumni (retrospective-post) | Sept-Nov 2013  
Nov’13-Jan’14  
August 2013 |
The BRI program, has committed to a full year of continuous GRIP activities. The evaluation plan both summarizes and organizes content from numerous discussions among program stakeholders. This template can be used generally for GRIP evaluation planning, implementation, and next steps. The evaluation plan displays a shared understanding about important program aspects and the information and data needed to answer the evaluation questions and improve the program.

Evaluation plans evolve in developmental evaluations. For more information on developmental evaluation, please see Appendix A. While documentation is highly recommended, nothing is written in stone. Your GRIP leadership team might not have all the information it needs, for example, to determine what methods might work best to get alumni input. Gathering more information from a broader stakeholder circle, in this case—especially alumni—makes sense. Knowing when information is optimally needed for decision-making helps determine the timing of the data collection activities. This evaluation design provides important content for a more comprehensive and time-bound evaluation plan.
Part II
Data Collection

A thoughtfully constructed evaluation design will help facilitate data collection activities. **Successful** data collection involves gathering substantial feedback from a representative cross-section of program participants. The value of stakeholder involvement has been emphasized throughout this manual. As we approach the data collection phase of GRIP, it is important to include stakeholders and champions of your program to help promote data collection activities. Please note that GRIP does not recommend one method over another. More importantly, the evaluation question(s) should determine the methodological choice. Deciding on a method is not the first step in the GRIP process. The intended use and the intended users along with the overarching evaluation questions will guide the data collection process.

**Data** are the information that is collected from a variety of methods that your GRIP leadership team identifies in the evaluation design. Examples of methods to collect data include surveys, online or in-person focus groups, and interviews. In addition to gathering *enough* data, data must be collected systematically, with quality control in mind. In many higher education settings, surveys can be administered online and statistical analysis can be generated using the online survey instrument. Focus group and interview data requires careful note-taking, recording, transcription, and a systematic analysis process. Selecting the appropriate data collection method is an important decision based on a variety of factors, such as time and resources as well as the type, quality, and depth of information needed to address the respective evaluation question. In addition to surveys and focus groups, your program can also conduct an analysis of existing information as a method of data collection. Using information that is *already* gathered may be more economical and efficient and reduce the burden
among others in the program.

Collecting Secondary Information First

The type of already existent information that would be useful to address an evaluation question is called secondary data. It is advised to be systematic and careful about how this secondary data collection is performed. The following list might be helpful.

1. Depending upon the needs of the intended users, secondary data might include:
   A. Program information (enrollment, demographics, performance, etc.) from the college or department that houses the program. University-wide information is often available from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR)—or a similar unit. A university’s OIR usually has a wealth of untapped information and can often compare aggregate program/college data across different units of analysis: colleges, departments, universities, regions, etc.
   B. Existing program/departmental mission statements and goals. Don’t shrink from the challenge of finding where it is written what the program is supposed to do.
   C. Current program handbook—is it accurate? Up to date? Does the printed version match the online version?
   D. Diagrams of how the program is structured—how does communication flow? Is there agreement about how the program looks on paper? Are there omissions?
   E. Existing evaluation reports; program metrics and data collection tools; strategic planning notes—all can be helpful to initiate conversations.

2. There may be a need to create a presentation for stakeholders that provides a historic picture of the program so the current situation can be placed in context. Such a presentation might include:
   A. How the program is defined to students, to the public;
   B. How the program may have changed recently (e.g., graduation requirements; curricular emphases; technology use);
C. How the program changes might reflect longer-term trends (e.g., program expansion or downsizing; declining enrollment; changing demographics of students; aging faculty)

3. Check with administrative staff who have access to student self-assessments, progress reviews, and/or exit surveys. Students are routinely asked to identify general program challenges and concerns from their perspective. It might be possible to get aggregated responses from these sources without violating anyone’s confidentiality. Efforts like these can potentially inform survey or focus group questions and save the evaluation process time and resources.

**Collecting Primary Data**

One of the fundamental challenges of evaluation is identifying the appropriate data collection method that matches the information that you are trying to obtain. Working with your program’s stakeholders and especially those from whom you wish to collect data will be of great benefit when you’re at the point of considering what might be optimal methods. Some data needs are easier to obtain than others. Demographic information such as age, income, last year of schooling, etc. may be captured in a survey, questionnaire or intake sheet. Gathering other information, such as whether one feels motivated academically with the current curriculum; or the degree to which one’s proximity to campus affects communication needs, presents more challenges.

Among the more common data collection methods are those which attempt to solicit information from individuals about their attitudes, opinions, behavior, knowledge, skill level, memory, suggestions, or a range of other beliefs or behaviors. Some of this information is better collected in quantitative form; while, as illustrated above, other information is better described as a qualitative narrative. Many in the evaluation field would agree that getting both kinds of data (quantitative and qualitative) can strengthen the evaluation overall.

The survey, or questionnaire, is one of the most commonly used methods of data collection. Taking time to create a good survey is important. Equally critical is exploring strategies to increase the likelihood that the survey reaches the intended audience and
that the survey will be returned. For sample surveys, see “Appendix C: Sample Survey One” and “Appendix D: Sample Survey Two”.

Besides surveys, there are other ways to gather information. One-on-one and small-group interviews have proved particularly useful when trying to get more nuanced and specific descriptions from knowledgeable sources. For example, it might be worthwhile to explore different perspectives regarding how a graduate program’s degree requirements should be communicated to students. Engaging students, staff, and faculty in comfortable, appropriate, and confidential settings, with a well-structured set of questions can also provide insight about the quality, consistency, and accuracy of – in this case – communication within a program.

GRIP evaluations have also used focus groups to explore important topics and themes in participating programs. The advantage of having a focus group is that it brings together those who share a common interest, such as program instruction, and structures a dialogue that explores agreement and differences among its participants’ perspectives. Doing focus groups well, however, requires a good deal of expertise and facilitative skill in the group moderator. An increased commitment is also needed from the group participants. Focus groups take more time (on average from 45 to 90 minutes) and a degree of comfort with being vulnerable in a peer group (Krueger & Casey, 2008).

One of the novel things about GRIP is the extent to which creativity can be explored in the collection of information. At the University of Minnesota, GRIP teams have developed appropriate methods to engage students with multiple, divergent, and competing priorities. For example, events such as town-hall styled forums were used in more than one program to bring students together in a social and convenient setting – with food – in order to generate interactivity and dialogue about important program issues. Another program invited all of its residents, separated by their specialty, to a one-hour lunch to glean information through facilitated, interactive conversation and activities.

Whether quantitative or qualitative data, or a mix of both, are needed to address a
The program’s particular evaluation question is a decision for the GRIP program team. However, the value of the GRIP evaluation is often determined by the degree of student participation in the process. Participatory methods that bring together previously untapped voices can also be scrutinized for having the appearance of a random, haphazardly organized student mixer. This may be especially true for veteran faculty or conservative programs accustomed with more traditional methods of data collection. Working closely with program stakeholders can help define where effective student engagement practices meet appropriately rigorous methodology to get the information most useful to improve the program.

The following table created by the Northwest Health Foundation (Gelmon, 2005) may help your GRIP leadership team decide which data collection methods are appropriate and more likely to be successful.

**DATA COLLECTION METHODS: COMPARISON OF ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>When to use</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Document review | Program documents or literature are available and can provide insight into the program or the evaluation | • Data already exist  
• Does not interrupt the program  
• Little or no burden on others  
• Can provide historical or comparison data  
• Introduces little bias | • Time consuming  
• Data limited to what exists and is available  
• Data may be incomplete  
• Requires clearly defining the data you’re seeking |
| Observation   | You want to learn how the program actually operates—its processes and activities | • Allows you to learn about the program as it is occurring  
• Can reveal unanticipated information of value  
• Flexible in the course of collecting data | • Time consuming  
• Having an observer can alter events  
• Difficult to observe multiple processes simultaneously  
• Can be difficult to interpret observed behaviors |
| Survey        | You want information directly from a defined group of people to get a general idea of a situation, to generalize about a population, or to get a total count of a particular characteristic | • Many standardized instruments available  
• Can be anonymous  
• Allows a large sample  
• Standardized responses easy to analyze  
• Able to obtain a large amount of data quickly  
• Relatively low cost  
• Convenient for respondents | • Sample may not be representative  
• May have low return rate  
• Wording can bias responses  
• Closed-ended or brief responses may not provide the “whole story”  
• Not suited for all people—e.g., those with low reading level |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>When to use</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interview  | You want to understand impressions and experiences in more detail and be able to expand or clarify responses | • Often better response rate than surveys  
• Allows flexibility in questions/probes  
• Allows more in-depth information to be gathered                               | • Time consuming  
• Requires skilled interviewer  
• Less anonymity for respondent  
• Qualitative data more difficult to analyze                                     |
| Focus group| You want to collect in-depth information from a group of people about their experiences and perceptions related to a specific issue. | • Collect multiple peoples’ input in one session  
• Allows in-depth discussion  
• Group interaction can produce greater insight  
• Can be conducted in short time frame  
• Can be relatively inexpensive compared to interviews                             | • Requires skilled facilitator  
• Limited number of questions can be asked  
• Group setting may inhibit or influence opinions  
• Data can be difficult to analyze  
• Not appropriate for all topics or populations                                     |

*Data Collection Methods—Comparison of Advantages & Disadvantages* Advantages courtesy of *Northwest Health Foundation, Gelmon, S., 2005*

A selection of data collection tools is included in the [Appendices](#).
Part III

Data Analysis

As described in the previous section, the most appropriate type of data collection will depend on the evaluation questions being asked. Subsequently, data analysis activities will depend on the kinds of information gathered and the degree of rigor (appropriate and/or possible) needed by the intended users of the evaluation. In our experience, the preference of most programs participating in GRIP is to collect both quantitative and qualitative types of data, thus utilizing a mixed-methods approach.

In this section, we provide a framework for how to approach the task of analyzing data—quantitative, qualitative, or a mix of both. For detailed guidance on specific data analysis techniques, there is a multitude of available resources. Selected resources that may be helpful to GRIP programs are listed in the “Related Resources” section of this e-book.

What is Needed?

Two topics are commonly visited for GRIP leadership teams throughout each stage of GRIP: 1) the capacity to conduct the tasks at hand; and the information needs of the intended users, and 2) it is critical that a thoughtful plan connects the evaluation question and evaluation design with what will be needed in the analysis stage of GRIP.

First, when developing the evaluation questions and the evaluation design, it is
important to consider the capacity of the program team to conduct the analysis. By capacity, we mean both the knowledge of conducting the specific analysis as well as the time to do so. Building the capacity of your GRIP Leadership team is essential for many reasons, including capacity to potentially conduct some or all of the analysis.

Second, it is important to revisit the needs of the intended users at this point in the process (see: “Evaluability Assessment Report”). The intended users should be involved in discussions regarding the degree of rigor needed for the analysis. For example, if the evaluation questions are highly political, it may be important to have an external consultant conduct qualitative data analysis. Depending on resources, it may be worthwhile to have discussions about reliability of qualitative coding. On the other hand, in some situations it may be acceptable to have qualified students who are internal to the program conduct the analysis.

**What Kind of Analysis?**

Quantitative data can usually be entered into free, low-cost, or university-supported Web-based software, such as QDA miner. Programs such as Qualtrics or Survey Monkey can generate useful descriptive summaries, conduct data comparisons and cross tabulations, and provide graphic illustrations to display the data. These survey instruments also provide generic reports and data that you can import into Microsoft Word or Excel to conduct further analysis.

More complex methods used to collect qualitative information, such as interviews, focus groups, and observations generally require more time for the analysis and a higher degree of skill to organize, code, and analyze this qualitative and narrative information. Resources may also need to be considered for transcription of textual data. As with quantitative data analysis, Web-based data analysis software programs, such as QDA miner and nVivo, are available and can be quite helpful. There are generally five basic steps in the analysis of qualitative data:

1. **Processing, exploring, and assessing the data** – This first step involves the
task of gathering the information into one place. Being able to see all the data, transcribed and entered into a quality software program, provides the opportunity to get to know and assess the quality of the information.

2. **Aligning the data analysis with the evaluation purpose** – Knowing what is ultimately needed will inevitably shape the way the data are read. If the qualitative data collection tool (focus group or interview protocol, for example) reflected what information was important, it is likely that the way in which the tool was organized will provide a helpful way to approach the data.

3. **Organizing the data into the practical categories and themes** – The amount and complexity of the data will affect how much time and skill are needed in this step. A practical approach would be to use the focus group or interview protocol to categorize the responses, and then to summarize the responses for each question. A complementary, but more open, approach would be to allow themes and patterns to emerge from the data.

4. **Connecting patterns, themes, and categories** – After having spent a considerable amount of time with the data, sorting it into a useful thematic framework, and then sitting with the data some more, it is likely that higher-level groupings can be made. Strategies at this point include combining themes into larger categories, or assigning differing levels of importance to categories, and describing the relationships between categories.

5. **Moving towards interpretation and triangulating meaning** – by now you have a more organized set of useful data; synthesizing this work into a meaningful display is the next step of qualitative analysis. Depending again on the needs of the intended users, you might consider working with them and other skilled analysts to support and/or challenge interpretations reached in the organization and analysis phase. Packaging and presenting the findings will depend upon the needs of the program stakeholders.

**Final thoughts on analysis**

Remember that analysis is an iterative and flowing process. It is beneficial to work within an adaptive framework so that a shared understanding of the data,
interpretations and next steps can be achieved. The goal of this analysis is to shed light on diverse perspectives and experiences within your program with the hope of improving programmatic objectives and outcomes.
One of the central tenets of GRIP is that data collected is reported in ways that are meaningful, so that results turn into actionable next steps for program improvement. Below we present a realistic GRIP scenario that may help you decide how you may consider reporting similar information to different groups of stakeholders.

Scenario 1: The Master of Science in Security Technologies (MSST) Program

(MSST) is a 14-month interdisciplinary program. While there is a core group of departmental faculty, the program relies on faculty from a range of fields from both within and outside of the university. Further, of the 32 credits required for the program’s MS degree, one-third of these is dedicated to an area of specialization decided by the student. The MSST program is approaching five years as a program and there is interest in evaluating the successes and areas for improvement. MSST’s GRIP leadership team decided to work with a GRIP consultant to develop an online survey for current students and for alumni. After a successful data collection period, data were analyzed together by the GRIP team and the consultant.

In this example, one of the key findings was that current students needed advisers with various specialties, many of whom are in other departments. The survey findings indicated that over 60% of the students were having difficulty finding a willing faculty adviser outside the MSST program. The GRIP leadership team was convened to
discuss this and other findings, to debrief the survey process, and to draft a document listing preliminary key findings. Though it was easy to list the strengths of the program, just as much time was spent identifying challenges commonly reported by the survey respondents. Where there were areas needing improvement, the group suggested feasible solutions.

Earlier in the GRIP process, the leadership team had promised a report about GRIP findings to many different stakeholders. Having discussed the survey process and key findings, the group was now ready to share this information with others. It is advisable to review your GRIP team’s communication plan or decisions made earlier in the process regarding what kinds of information was needed by which stakeholders. The next step is deciding when and how best to present GRIP information to these various audiences. As important as the conversation among your leadership team is what kind of information or feedback you want in return. Do you want certain groups to discuss certain findings, make recommendations, or help plan next steps? Knowing ahead of time will facilitate your success in attaining the desired outcomes set for each presentation.

Reporting to Stakeholder Group A: Other GRIP Programs

One of the GRIP traditions was to facilitate collaboration across different GRIP projects and leadership teams. Programs presented at a final “showcase” where leadership team representatives presented an overview of their programs and gleanings from their GRIP evaluations. Because there were several programs presenting, one guideline was that presentations were brief and illustrative of the “big picture” results. In this situation, the MSST program developed and delivered a five-minute PowerPoint presentation. In general, for this type of setting GRIP suggests a simple three-part presentation, covering the important points of the GRIP project below.

GUIDELINES FOR CONCISE GRIP PRESENTATIONS:

1. **What:** Describe the program, its key concerns, the evaluation questions and
methodology

2. **So What?** Describe the key findings and how they are important to the program

3. **Now What?** Present and discuss recommendations, or important next steps for action.

**Reporting to Stakeholder Group B: Program Students**

As with most stakeholder groups and other intended users of the evaluation findings, creating a continual feedback loop between them and GRIP project teams can enhance buy-in for the current project and will likely facilitate future assessment efforts.

It is highly suggested that your GRIP leadership team creates a feedback loop with students whose programs are involved with GRIP. In addition to delivering key findings, GRIP should involve students in the discussion and development of recommendations and in the prioritization of next steps.

Creative ways of reporting GRIP information to students include the following:

- Town Halls
- Data Dialogues
- Subsequent Focus Groups
- E-mail updates, websites, social media

**Reporting to Stakeholder Group C: Program Faculty/Staff**

Generally speaking, faculty and staff have standard ways in which information is shared. While faculty meetings, memos, and email chains are common—and should be respected—and *utilized*—there might be alternative ways of presenting key information to this important group of stakeholders. An important strategy for GRIP leadership teams is maintaining a transparent relationship with faculty who, in many cases, hold power and authority to facilitate—or block—the improvement or change suggested by GRIP reports. Equally important is recognizing the important role and contributions of program staff—often the glue holding program components together and the keepers of institutional knowledge. Efforts to work with and through widely
respected faculty members, and ones that have indicated their support for GRIP may yield positive results when trying to share important information pertaining to GRIP. Administrative staff, especially GRIP champions, can prove to be very important allies.

**Other Suggestions for Reporting/Disseminating GRIP Information:**

A variety of tools are available to inform program stakeholders and/or to remind them of the value of their participation in the evaluation. Your team might consider the use of dashboards to display visually appealing summaries, emergent themes, and broad outcomes. Conferences can also be used to showcase well-conceived program evaluation processes and findings. Using the Internet and e-mail to disseminate findings can also be very cost-effective. Work closely with the program stakeholders to clarify how and where program information and findings are discussed and shared.

Information can be delivered in a traditional written format; through formal presentations and informal discussions; or in the creative use of technology, poetry, or data visualization. Reporting the findings is not the end point of evaluation, however. Reports should always lead to “next steps” and a clear plan for how the findings will be used to improve the program.

**Data Visualization Resources**

- Stephanie Evergreen ([http://stephanievergreen.com/](http://stephanievergreen.com/))
Part V

Checklist for Managing your Evaluation

Below, we provide several tables that can help your GRIP leadership team manage and implement your evaluation. Having documents that list what needs to be done, by whom, and when will help keep your GRIP evaluation on track. These tables can be used to structure your meetings and can be easily shared with members on your team. Often, teams might have both narrative descriptions and something more shorthand, like checklists or tables. Making sure that everyone is clear on what activities are happening, by when—and why they are happening is key to a successful GRIP evaluation.

Data Collection Management

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED:

- What data will be collected?
- What activities are needed to carry out the data collection successfully? When should each of these activities be completed?
- Who is responsible for conducting each activity?

Table 1. Data Collection Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Activities Needed</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis Management

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED:

- What data will be analyzed, how, and when?
- Who is responsible for conducting the analyses?

Table 2. Data Analysis Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis to Be Performed</th>
<th>Data to Be Analyzed</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED:

- Which stakeholders need progress reports? How often? In-person? E-mail?
- How about reporting findings? What format needs to be used?
- What other kinds of communication does each stakeholder group need? When?
- What is the best way to share this information? Different for different audiences?
- When will the communication take place? Is feedback needed from them?

Table 3. Communication and Reporting Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience 1: (insert name of audience)</th>
<th>Purpose of Communication</th>
<th>Possible Formats</th>
<th>Timing/ Dates</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Include in decision making about evaluation design/activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform about specific upcoming evaluation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep informed about progress of the evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present initial/interim findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present complete/final findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document the evaluation and its findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Timeline
QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED:

- When will planning and administrative tasks occur?
- Will any pilot testing occur? When?
- When will formal data collection begin? Is there an end date planned?
- When will analysis tasks occur? Is analysis concurrent with data collection?
- When will information (updates, reports, interim findings, etc.) be disseminated?
- If a single timeline were created for the project, are there foreseeable bottlenecks or sequencing issues? Does the evaluation timeline conflict with that of the program?

Table 4. Evaluation Timeline Template:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part VI

### Next Steps

The goal of GRIP is to put continuous review and program improvement in the hands of students, faculty, and staff. It is designed to generate meaningful information that can be readily used to the benefit of programs, students, and faculty. It is our hope that this manual has provided a step-by-step process for you to follow as you move through the review of your program. We encourage you to create an action plan that spells out action items for improvement that will address issues that emerged in your findings and final report. Below, is an example of an Action Plan template you can use to help guide you in this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Issues with Communication** | • Convey clear student responsibilities  
• Revise handbook-more specific regarding student responsibilities | DGS / Chair  
Faculty |
| **Funding**                 | • Find alternative to Grad calendar  
• Create advanced student mentor group | DGS  
Student leaders / Advanced Ph.D. students |
| **Prelim exam / prospectus schedule / format / process** | • Faculty / advisors / older students can encourage newer students to self-advocate more  
• Faculty will communicate next steps earlier in the process | DGS / Advisors  
Advanced Ph.D. students |
Appendices

Appendix A: The Grounding of GRIP

**Developmental Evaluation**

The modality of “developmental evaluation” evolved from Michael Quinn Patton’s insight that a more nuanced approach was needed to help evaluation processes and social programs become more responsive to the context in which they are situated. Distinct from both summative and formative judgments, developmental evaluation “supports innovation development to guide adaptation to emergent and dynamic realities in complex environments...if one is paying attention and knows how to observe and capture the important and emerging patterns” (Patton 2010),

Working within a GRIP framework gives the evaluation consultant and the program stakeholders the opportunity to obtain real-time feedback from those who take part in the process. Current students, alumni, faculty, and staff within the graduate program are engaged to develop appropriate ways to gather information on topical concerns and measure outcomes as they take shape. This flexible, and user-friendly, approach ultimately helps to diminish resistance, stimulate organizational learning, and increase the utilization of the GRIP evaluation.

**Utilization-Focused Evaluation**

Patton’s orientation towards developmental evaluation embraces the concept of utilization-focused evaluation, or UFE of the findings and the organizational learning in the process itself.
UFE has two essential elements. Firstly, the primary intended users of the evaluation must be clearly identified and personally engaged at the beginning of the evaluation process to ensure that their primary intended uses can be identified. Secondly, evaluators must ensure that these intended uses of the evaluation by the primary intended users guide all other decisions that are made about the evaluation process (Patton, 2008).

**Interactive Evaluation Practice**

Involving intended users will increase an evaluation’s usefulness; however, GRIP will be more successful when the evaluation team (consultant and/or program members) uses skillful communication and interpersonal dexterity. King (2011) expands upon Patton’s personal factor that facilitates evaluation utilization (Patton, 2008) with an equally important focus on the interactive practices that establish stakeholder rapport and buy-in so that valid evaluation processes get to such a UFE outcome.

King has been directly and uniquely involved with GRIP since its inception at the University of Minnesota. Though she would deny it, she is responsible for much of GRIP’s initial success, in large part due to her personal factor: professorial grace, being held in high regard, and her attentiveness to relational dynamics. Her legacy, however, lies in the practical wisdom instilled in interactive evaluation practice (IEP) and in GRIP: skilled inquiry, negotiated collaboration, facilitated decision-making, and attention to process.

**Evaluation Capacity Building**

Among the challenges that are inherent in processes that address change within programs and institutions are opportunities to build upon organizational development practices and adult learning theories so that a more positive attitude towards evaluation can emerge. Preskill & Boyle (2008) shed light on the growing need for evaluation capacity building, or ECB:
The ultimate goal of ECB is sustainable evaluation practice—where members continuously ask questions that matter, collect, analyze, and interpret data, and use evaluation findings for decision-making and action (Preskill & Boyle, 2008, p.2).
Appendix B: Sample Communication Templates

Introductory Letter to Program Stakeholders

In many cases it is necessary or optimal to provide a descriptive overview of GRIP to key faculty and staff—who may or may not have experience with assessment and evaluation, or student-centered processes. The formality of the group, the informational needs of the stakeholders, and the overall communication plan will affect the types and timing of communication efforts. Below is a sample letter sent as GRIP was beginning in this particular program.

UMN SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY (SOD) MS PROGRAM

GRIP Evaluation Plan: 26 October 2012

Greetings!

We hope this document is helpful. It is designed to familiarize you and other key stakeholders of the School of Dentistry about the Graduate Review Improvement Process, commonly referred to as “GRIP.” There are opportunities to provide input in alternate ways, and certainly questions can be posited at any time.

However, we know you’re busy. The following information gives an overview of GRIP’s University-wide purpose and a suggested draft of an evaluation design for SOD—based on input from Dr. H., Dr. L., and secondary data previously gathered from UMN and
SOD sources. A.T. is the RA selected from SOD to work on this project. D.M. is SOD’s GRIP Consultant.

GRIP Overall Purpose

Systematize a meaningful and ongoing evaluation process throughout UMN Graduate Programs that include and/or highlight students’ experience and result in actions designed towards Program improvement.

Key Evaluation Questions

- Overall UMN Grad School Questions (source: Grad School Dean):
  - What is the purpose of the Program? What are its desired outcomes?
  - What is the rationale and education purpose of each element of the program?
  - Which elements of the program should be retained and affirmed?
  - Which elements of the program could usefully be changed or eliminated?
  - How do you know?
    ◊ What evidence aids in answering these questions?
    ◊ What evidence can be collected to determine whether changes serve the desired outcome?
- Key Questions from SOD Faculty (sources: Dr. Hamamoto, Dr. Larson, A. Tasca):
  - What are the goals of the MS of Dentistry program and are we meeting them?
  - How valuable (and or relevant) is it to have a Master’s degree (in this field; to practice)?
  - Is the current curriculum the best or do we need to re-evaluate?
  - Should milestones be set in place for incentive to keep students on track?
  - Should it be required for students to complete a Master’s (MS) with certificate training?
- Key (Additional) Questions from SOD Student Perspective & Literature (source:
TBD)

- How to refine questions above and pilot test selected methods?
- What does literature/field expertise offer as design options for addressing above?
Appendix C: Sample Survey One

Vet Med Survey v3.0

This survey has been designed with you in mind—and your participation is very important!

You have been selected to help evaluate your Veterinary Medicine graduate program. Your program’s faculty and staff want to better understand how to improve your experience as a graduate student.

While participation is voluntary, your completion of this entire survey will help us strengthen and improve the program for you and future students. We are not requesting your name, so your responses will be confidential. We estimate this survey will take no longer than 15 minutes to complete. THANK YOU!

SECTION A: PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Please check the appropriate response to each of the following questions.

1. How do you identify your status within the Veterinary Medicine Graduate program?
   ☐ Master’s Student
   ☐ PhD student
   ☐ PhD candidate
2. Are you currently in a residency program?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, please indicate specialty:
   - Small animals
   - Large animals
   - Dairy
   - Other

3. What is your Veterinary Medicine Program Track?
   - Infectious diseases
   - Comparative Medicine and Pathology
   - Population Medicine
   - Surgery/Radiology/Anesthesiology
   - I don’t know

4. When do you plan to have completed all of your current program’s requirements?
   - By August 2013
   - By August 2014
   - By August 2015
   - After August 2015

**PHDS ONLY**

5. How clearly do you understand the following requirements to complete your PhD?
6. How clearly do you understand the following requirements to complete your Master’s degree?

![Table]

**MASTERS ONLY**

**SECTION B: WHAT’S IMPORTANT?**

The following table identifies various components of your graduate education.
experience. We’d like to ask you how important these items are in your Veterinary Medicine graduate program.

7. Please indicate **how important** the following numbered items are to you by marking the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not that important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Developing research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Opportunities to assist/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborate with faculty on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his/her research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Opportunities to pursue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my own research ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Opportunity to take courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directed towards my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not that important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Developing skills to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become an instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Opportunities to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or present material in front</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of others in a classroom setting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. For each item in Q#7 that you rated “important” or “very important” (and ONLY for those items), please indicate below **how satisfied** you are with your relevant experience in your Vet Med graduate program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Developing research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Opportunities to assist/collaborate with faculty on his/her research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Opportunities to pursue my own research ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Opportunity to take courses directed towards my own research interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Developing skills to become an instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Opportunities to teach (or present material in front of others in a classroom setting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Knowing how to submit material to scholarly journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Knowing how to successfully build my CV/professional résumé.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Developing grant-writing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Having peer support from others in the Vet Med program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Feeling like other Vet Med students are enthusiastic about our program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C: FACULTY FEEDBACK AND SUPPORT**

These next questions ask you to assess the feedback and support you receive from faculty in your graduate program. Please check the appropriate response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied enough</th>
<th>Not very satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Overall, how satisfied are you with the feedback you have received from various instructors regarding coursework?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How helpful has your advisor(s) been in providing you feedback about your overall progress in your graduate program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>How timely has your advisor(s) been in providing you feedback about your overall progress in your graduate program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How responsive has your advisor(s) been in addressing concerns or questions that you raise regarding your graduate program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. What is one suggestion you have to improve the advising you wish to receive regarding your Veterinary Medicine graduate program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied enough</th>
<th>Not very satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. To what extent are you satisfied with the academic support you receive in your graduate program from the following sources? Mark the appropriate response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied enough</th>
<th>Not very satisfied</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Co-advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Graduate school staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Director of graduate studies (DGS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fellow graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your experience in your Vet Med graduate program. Mark the appropriate response:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mostly agree</th>
<th>Mostly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>I have received adequate support to develop my research ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>I have received adequate support to attend conferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>I have received adequate support to practice presentation skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>I have enough time to conduct my own research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>I have adequate support to develop my thesis. (MS only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>I have adequate support to pass my preliminary exam(s). (PhD only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>I have adequate support to develop my dissertation. (PhD only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Please answer the following questions about your [research] contributions in the space provided.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>How many scholarly articles have you helped develop as co-author?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td># of these articles published?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td># of scholarly articles written as primary author?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td># of these articles published?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>How many times have you orally presented [your own research] at U of M?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td># of oral presentations at a conference outside U of M?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What research opportunities and practical experience would you like to have by the time you graduate?

18. Overall, how do you think the Vet Med program is doing in preparing you for your career goals?

19. What is one suggestion you have to improve the academic support you wish to receive in your Vet Med graduate program?

20. What is one suggestion you have to improve the quality of mentorship you wish to receive in your Vet Med graduate program?

21. Have you been placed into a graduate assistantship?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

   if NO, SKIP to Question #25
22. Overall, to what extent are you satisfied with the assistantship into which you have been placed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much so</th>
<th>Mostly clear</th>
<th>Not quite clear</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What is your favorite aspect about your teaching or research assistantship?

24. How would you improve the overall experience of a teaching or research assistantship in the Vet Med graduate program?

SECTION D: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please mark the appropriate response.

25. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Trans

26. What type of career are you seeking upon receiving your graduate degree?
   - Academic (e.g., teaching at University)
   - Government
   - Veterinary Practice
   - Working in Industry
   - Continue post-grad studies
   - Continue post-doc studies
   - Other (please explain:____________________ )
   - I don’t know

27. Which category best describes your race and/or ethnicity? (Choose all that apply.)
☐ American Indian/Alaska Native
☐ Asian
☐ Black or African American
☐ Hispanic/Latino
☐ Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
☐ White/Caucasian
☐ Other ______________________________
☐ Choose not to answer

28. Are you an international student?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

29. When did you enter your Veterinary Medicine program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Doesn’t Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Any final comments about your graduate experience or this survey?

Thank you for completing this survey.
Sample Report of Survey Data (Abridged)

1. How do you identify your PhD status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PhD Student</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. When do you plan to have completed all requirements for your PhD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>By August 2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>By August 2014</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>By August 2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>By August 2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>After August 2016</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How clearly do you understand the following requirements to complete your PhD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very much so</th>
<th>Mostly clear</th>
<th>Not Quite Clear</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How well has your advisor (or team of advisors) explained to you the requirements for completing your PhD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very much so</th>
<th>Mostly clear</th>
<th>Not Quite Clear</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preliminary Exams</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Much So</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Well Enough</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Very Well</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not Well at All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. What is one suggestion you have to improve the quality or timeliness of feedback you wish to receive regarding your PhD program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow the department rules, I don’t think I have had a formal evaluation in the last 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Seminar feedback should be more than just once per semester (after turning in the paper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much for now, I am very happy with my communications with faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it’s fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more standard feedback process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it would’ve been helpful if there had been some sort of feedback immediately after my first semester of the PhD program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the PhD coordinator should officially meet with every student once a semester instead of once a year. However, it is true that he is available for informal meeting upon students’ request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no suggestion, the program is running well and the Ph.D.staff as well as my Ph.D. coordinator are doing a good job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Overall, to what extent are you satisfied with the assistantship (including both teaching and/or research) into which you have been placed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Completely Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfied</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Quite Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not at all Satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. What type of career are you seeking upon receiving your PhD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic (e.g., teaching at University)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Research (e.g., research facility)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Working in Industry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue post-doc studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other, please explain:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Sample Survey Two

The Graduate Student Experience Survey

SURVEY INTRODUCTION

Greetings!

Through the Graduate Review and Improvement Process, the Department of Spanish and Portuguese Studies has the opportunity to explore your thoughts about your experience as a graduate student here. You have been chosen to participate in this survey because you are a graduate student in this department and you have very valuable information to share. We strongly encourage you to take the time to complete this 15-minute survey. Your personal information will remain completely confidential and your feedback will be used to improve the experience for you and future students in Spanish & Portuguese Studies. You are welcome to answer this survey in the language with which you are most comfortable. At the end of this survey, you can choose to enter a drawing for one of four $10 gift cards to Bordertown Coffee.

You can access the survey by clicking on the following link:

Sincerely,

Graduate Student Representative

The Graduate Review & Improvement Process Team
BEGINNING OF SURVEY

Section Header: Background Information

1. What academic year did you enter the program?
2. What level of graduate study are you currently in?
   □ First year Masters student
   □ Second year Masters student
   □ First year Ph.D. student
   □ Second year Ph.D. student
   □ ABD (all but dissertation)
3. What track are you in?
   □ Hispanic Linguistics
   □ Hispanic Literatures and Cultures
   □ Portuguese Literatures and Cultures
4. How do you identify as a student?
   □ Domestic graduate student
   □ International graduate student

Section Header: Core Department Elements

Department Orientation /Teaching Preparation

5. How, if at all, does the department orientation help you?
6. How, if at all, could the department orientation be improved?
7. How satisfied are you with how the department is preparing you in the following areas:
   (Options: Very satisfied, Satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Not satisfied, Not applicable)
   • Orientation toward publication
   • Conference preparation
   • Professional networking
• Job searching
• Teaching experience
• Mentoring in pedagogy
• Securing research funding
• Training in linguistic research methods

8. What are your top three ideal career options post graduation? Please rank your top three options (1 = most ideal of the three options, 2 = second ideal of the three options, 3 = third ideal of the three options)
   □ Tenure track position, research university
   □ Tenure track position, small liberal arts college
   □ Higher education teaching position (community college, vocational)
   □ Higher education teaching position outside of the United States
   □ Primary / secondary school teaching position
   □ Nonprofit / NGO
   □ Other (text box__________________)

9. In general, do you feel the department is preparing you for your future career? (Options: Yes, Somewhat, No) *Please explain your answer in the space provided:

Research and Teaching Balance

10. How many hours do you spend on your teaching per week?
    □ 5-10
    □ 11-20
    □ 21-30
    □ 31-40
    □ 41+

11. How many hours do you spend on your research / coursework per week?
    □ 5-10
    □ 11-20
    □ 21-30
    □ 31-40
Please use the space below to describe your perceptions of departmental expectations about balancing your research and teaching workload.

13. How, if at all, does the department support you in balancing your responsibilities with research and teaching?

**Coursework**

14. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the methods course, SPPT XXXX. (Options: Very satisfied, Satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Not satisfied, Not applicable)

15. How, if at all, could the department improve the methods course, SPPT XXXX?

**Departmental Culture**

16. If applicable, please describe the current culture of the 4th floor graduate student workspace (Select your top three items)
   - Inclusive
   - Non-inclusive
   - Collegial
   - Social
   - Productive
   - Distracting
   - Hostile
   - Welcoming
   - Competitive
   - Supportive

17. Does the graduate student workspace on the 4th floor meet your needs as a graduate student? (Options: Yes, Somewhat, No, Not applicable). Please explain your answer in the space provided:

18. If applicable, please use the space below to describe your experience as a mentor / mentee in the peer mentor program.

19. How, if at all, could the peer mentor program be improved?
Relationships with Advisor

Please rate your level of satisfaction with your advisor-advisee relationship (Options: Very satisfied, Satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Not satisfied). Please explain your rating in the space provided:

20. What, if any, expectations do you have of your advisor?
21. Has your advisor met your expectations? (Options: Yes, Somewhat, No, Not applicable)
22. What, if anything, would you change about your relationship with your advisor?

Department Activities

23. How often do you attend the following events per semester? (Options: Never, Occasionally, Often, Very often, Always)
   - Department-sponsored speakers, symposia, and research talks related to your track
   - Departmental-sponsored speakers, symposia, and research talks unrelated to your track
   - Non-department-sponsored speakers, symposia and research talks related to your track
   - Pedagogy related workshops
   - SPRG
   - HaLLA

24. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the annual review process (Options: Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Not satisfied, Not applicable)
25. How, if at all, could the annual review process be improved?

Section Header: Moving Forward

26. What recommendations do you have for the Department of Spanish & Portuguese Studies in preparing you for completion of your graduate degree and for your future career?
27. Please use the space below to share any additional comments about your experience
as a graduate student in the Department of Spanish & Portuguese Studies.

*Please enter your email address in the space below if you would like to be entered in the drawing for one of four Bordertown Coffee gift cards. Your email address will not be associated with your responses to this survey.*

-- End of Survey --
Appendix E: Sample Focus Group Protocol

Nutrition Graduate Program GRIP Focus group Protocol

INTRODUCTION OF THE MODERATOR

Thank you for taking the time to talk with us today. You have been invited to this discussion because you have valuable insight that will help us improve graduate education in this program. Your input will help us gain a better understanding of the experiences you have had in the Nutrition Graduate Program. We are also interested in ways that the program can better serve students like you in the future. We want you to share anything that you think is relevant to your experience and how it has impacted you in a meaningful way. The conversation will be recorded but your personal information will remain confidential. Please be mindful of others while they are speaking and keep your responses constructive. Also, please make sure to turn off or silence your cell phones at this time. Thanks again for participating in this discussion. My name is ______and I will be the moderator today. This is _______ who will be our note-taker today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Question / Description</th>
<th>In person Time (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>• Let’s start with some introductions. Tell us your name, and your main motivation for pursuing a degree from the Nutrition Graduate Program?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Monday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Question 2</td>
<td>• What has been your most positive experience in the Nutrition Graduate Program?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Monday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Type</td>
<td>Question / Description</td>
<td>In person Time (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Question 3 (Monday)</td>
<td>• What has been your most challenging experience in the Nutrition Graduate Program?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: Now I’d like to talk about the specific things that have moved you forward in your graduate student career. I want you to reflect on what has made you feel like your time here has been well spent, and what has frustrated you or slowed you down. (classes, advisor, research, career preparation, program support, professional development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question 3 (Tuesday)</td>
<td><strong>Classes</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How would you describe the usefulness of the courses you have taken in your program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Probe for quality of curriculum and teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question 4 (Tuesday)</td>
<td>• How would you describe your relationship with your peers in the program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Probe: satisfaction with how you interact with your lab group? Satisfaction with funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diversity Question: How do you feel about the level of diversity in the pool of students in the Nutrition Graduate Program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question 5 (Wednesday)</td>
<td>• Mentoring/relationship with advisor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How would you describe your relationship with your advisor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question 6 (Wednesday)</td>
<td>• Career preparation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Probing for research opportunities / practical / professional opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall, how do you think the program is doing in preparing you for your career goals? How could it improve?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Type</td>
<td>Question / Description</td>
<td>In person Time (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>• Program support</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Probing for research opportunities / practical / professional opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall, how do you think the program is doing supporting you as a graduate student in the Nutrition Graduate Program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>How would you like to be connected to Nutrition Graduate Program alumni through the following:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thursday)</td>
<td>• Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>How would you like to be connected to Nutrition Graduate Program faculty through the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thursday)</td>
<td>• Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have learned quite a bit about the experiences of students in Nutrition Graduate Program from your insightful and engaging comments. On behalf of the program and myself, I want to thank you for taking the time to participate in this discussion with me this week. Your feedback and suggestions will be used to help understand and improve the Nutrition Graduate Program now and into the future. Before answering the final two questions of the forum, please take a moment to reflect on your experience in the program, focusing on the topics we have covered in the last week.

- If you could do one thing to improve your graduate student experience, what would you do? How would you do it?
- What could the Nutrition faculty do to improve your experience here?
- Is there anything that I missed that you would like to share?

Thanks again and good luck with your semester!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Question / Description</th>
<th>In person Time (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ending Question 10 (Friday)</td>
<td>I have learned quite a bit about the experiences of students in Nutrition Graduate Program from your insightful and engaging comments. On behalf of the program and myself, I want to thank you for taking the time to participate in this discussion with me this week. Your feedback and suggestions will be used to help understand and improve the Nutrition Graduate Program now and into the future. Before answering the final two questions of the forum, please take a moment to reflect on your experience in the program, focusing on the topics we have covered in the last week. - If you could do one thing to improve your graduate student experience, what would you do? How would you do it? - What could the Nutrition faculty do to improve your experience here? - Is there anything that I missed that you would like to share?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>85 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix F: Sample PowerPoint Slides, Results

**Methods**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Faculty Survey</th>
<th>Preliminary Student Survey</th>
<th>Town-Hall Event</th>
<th>Follow-Up Student Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabulated Results</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Ended Response</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Courtesy of Michelle Gensinger, Grip Consultant*
ALMOST ALL RESIDENTS WANT:
- Experience w/ patients
- Clinical proficiency (esp. in their specialty)
- Multidisciplinary, well-rounded experiences

AND VALUE:
- Research, Evidence, Literature
- One-on-One Faculty Attention

BUT WOULD LIKE:
- Structured, didactic courses in their specialty
- Efficiency: patient flow & clinic operations;
- Relevant courses & flexibility to prioritize choices

Key Findings

STUDENTS GET INFORMATION FROM EACH OTHER

Make sure key & senior students have correct information about events, timelines, requirements, opportunities, and policies, and can share with new & junior students.

STUDENTS IDENTIFIED A NEED FOR:
- More time to conduct their own research
- Standard, regular, and earlier feedback re: progress
- More support to develop research ideas, attend conferences, practice presentation
skills

- Clearer & more consistent communication
Appendix G: Sample Evaluation Plan One

Year One: The Graduate Student Experience

KEY QUESTIONS:

- What are emerging themes and key variables that influence student experiences and learning in OLPD? (facilitators and challenges)
- What are the goals and objectives of OLPD as defined by masters and doctoral students in OLPD?
- How do student expectations align with faculty expectations in OLPD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLPD Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>• To remind faculty and staff what we have been doing in GRIP</td>
<td>• Retreat: Introduction and Overview of “OLPD GRIP Evaluation Overview Grid”</td>
<td>August-September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To highlight what we are doing well, and what we can improve</td>
<td>• Presentation of focus group findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To measure “where we are” compared to where we want to be</td>
<td>• Living Into Our Mission Survey (Administered to faculty and P&amp;A staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To inform faculty and staff of the GRIP Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent OLPD Graduate Student</td>
<td>• Allows faculty to engage in gauging and reaching a better understanding of authentic student experience before beginning GRIP process.</td>
<td>• Interviews via video recording</td>
<td>Mid July-Mid August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Method(s)</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming OLPD Graduate Students</td>
<td>• To gain feedback on student expectations of themselves as Grad. students and of the department</td>
<td>• Online new student orientation survey</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEHD Advisory Board (one faculty and one student representative from each department)</td>
<td>• To ensure department voice/feedback</td>
<td>• Semester Meetings</td>
<td>Meeting once during Fall and Spring semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLPD Student Interest Group</td>
<td>• To ensure student voice/feedback</td>
<td>• Meeting once during Fall semester, twice during Spring semester</td>
<td>Meeting once per semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s and doctoral part time and full time students in OLPD</td>
<td>• To assess what is working and what needs improvement</td>
<td>Online / in person focus groups</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To garner recommendations for improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year Two: The Faculty Experience

KEY QUESTIONS:

- What are the goals and objectives of OLPD as defined by faculty and staff of OLPD?
- What are the progress indicators used to measure how the program meets these goals and objectives?
- What kinds of experiences do students need to move toward intended learning outcomes? (Curricular and co-curricular – draw on survey data)
- How do faculty expectations align with student expectations of OLPD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLPD Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>• To remind faculty and staff what we have been doing in GRIP&lt;br&gt;• To highlight what we are doing well, and what we can improve&lt;br&gt;• To measure “where we are” compared to where we want to be&lt;br&gt;• To inform faculty and staff of the GRIP</td>
<td>• Retreat: Overview of “OLPD GRIP Evaluation Overview Grid”&lt;br&gt;• Presentation of focus group findings&lt;br&gt;• Living Into Our Mission Survey (Administered to faculty and P&amp;A staff)</td>
<td>August-September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming OLPD Graduate Students</td>
<td>• To address issues that emerged in student feedback based on GRIP evaluation 2011-2012 findings</td>
<td>Redesigned new student orientation (more interaction with new and current students and faculty, student group activities and events requested by students in evaluation 2011)</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming OLPD Graduate Students</td>
<td>Online student survey</td>
<td>September -October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To address issues that emerged in student feedback based on previous GRIP evaluation findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLPD Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>Faculty mid-year retreat</th>
<th>February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To review and revise curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To review GRIP data and inform faculty and staff of process and progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus groups with faculty of OLPD</th>
<th>In person focus group with tracks</th>
<th>March-April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To assess what is working and what needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To garner recommendations for improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year Three: Alumni and Community

KEY QUESTIONS:

- What are emerging themes and key variables that influence student experiences in graduate school and OLPD? (Facilitators and challenges)
- What are the goals and objectives of OLPD as defined by alumni of OLPD?
- What are key elements of department/ experiences that are valuable to alumni? (Indicators of successful and positive experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OLPD Faculty and Staff | • To remind faculty and staff what we have been doing in GRIP  
• To highlight what we are doing well, and what we can improve  
• To measure “where we are” compared to where we want to be  
• To inform faculty and staff of the GRIP Process | • Retreat: Overview of “OLPD GRIP Evaluation Overview Grid”  
• Presentation of focus group findings  
• Living Into Our Mission Survey (Administered to faculty and P&A staff) | August-September |
| OLPD Alumni         | • To build connections (for funding/professional networking/tracking of careers)  
• To better understand student experience upon graduation  
• To learn what factors contribute to positive and successful graduate student experience in OLPD | • Online survey  
• Interviews / Focus Groups  
• Social media connections (Linked-In)  
• OLSA alumni gathering | Spring |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community and business</td>
<td>• To gain information regarding connections, impact and influence of</td>
<td>• Group Interviews</td>
<td>Fall: with education and nonprofit community members / organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>community as it relates to partnerships with OLPD students and faculty</td>
<td>• Online survey</td>
<td>Spring: Corporation partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Sample Evaluation Plan Two

**Anthropology GRIP: Evaluation Plan, Spring 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Lead</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRIP leadership team</td>
<td>Meet to conduct evaluability assessment</td>
<td>February 20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIP leadership team</td>
<td>Meet to continue evaluability assessment discussion and survey development</td>
<td>March 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIP leadership team</td>
<td>Meet to finalize survey</td>
<td>March 26th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student volunteers and (DGS)</td>
<td>Comments on survey draft sent to Leah (GRIP consultant)</td>
<td>April 10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>Obtain permission to use 100&amp; gift card as incentive for the survey</td>
<td>April 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>Will send out email - to inform students that they will be getting a survey and encouraging them to fill it out</td>
<td>April 10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student volunteers</td>
<td>Send out survey by the anthropology graduate student team on the GRIP leadership team (online via Qualtrics)</td>
<td>April 14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student volunteers</td>
<td>Send out reminder to Anthropology students to complete the survey</td>
<td>April 22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIP leadership team</td>
<td>Meet to discuss preliminary results of the survey and develop PowerPoint for GRIP celebration on May 6th</td>
<td>April 30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIP participating program representatives</td>
<td>GRIP celebration and presentation</td>
<td>May 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIP consultant</td>
<td>Finalize executive summary</td>
<td>End of May / beginning of June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix I: GRIP Programs and Outcomes

## GRIP Programs and Outcomes: 2011 - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) of Participation</th>
<th>Department or Program / College</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2011-2012                | Organizational Leadership, Policy, & Development / College of Education and Human Development | • Redesigned the OLPD new student orientation to include more interaction with faculty, staff and students  
• Created specific sessions during the new student orientation for financial aid, students of color, specific program tracks and an area to engage with current and new OLPD students  
• Remodeled a space in Walling Hall dedicated to a new OLPD student lounge.  
• Created more career building and exploration opportunities with alumni and professionals around the University of Minnesota and the Minneapolis community  
• Restructured OLPD new student pro-seminar |
| 2012-2013                | Nutrition Graduate Program / College of Food, Agricultural and Resources Sciences | • Developed advising principles and advising guidelines  
• Created committee to review curriculum and research methods  
• Created graduate student nutrition program student organization |
|                          | Civil Engineering / College of Science and Engineering | • Updated Civil Engineering website  
• Developed department online newsletter  
• Revised and enhanced graduate student handbook |
|                          | Public Policy / Humphrey School of Public Affairs | • Developed of core competencies for students  
• Collaborated with Humphrey student organization  
• Developed department online newsletter |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) of Participation</th>
<th>Department or Program / College</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration / Carlson School of Management</td>
<td>• Addressed teaching load issues with students and faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | Experimental Clinical Pharmacology / College of Pharmacy | • Provided workshops to improve skills in research and grant writing  
• Highlighted ECP in Alumni Magazine – to connect current and former students |
|                         | College of Veterinary Medicine | • Reviewed teaching experience for students  
• Developed methods to improve peer support and mentoring |
|                         | School of Dentistry | • Developed committee to review policy that requires some students to earn Masters to practice dentistry  
• Increased flexibility in courses to ensure relevance to students |
|                         | Organizational Leadership, Policy, & Development / College of Education and Human Development | • Increased academic, research and career skill-building workshops  
• Continued to revise student handbook  
• Continued to restructured OLPD new student pro-seminar  
• Initiated stronger OLPD online presence (linked-In, Facebook, Twitter)  
• Developed a student learning intentions document that informed the development of graduate student learning outcomes in their department |
| Full Year participation: 2013 - 2014 | Curriculum & Instruction / College of Education and Human Development | • GRIP results provided a way for ongoing and continued discussion about core courses, advising load and advising expectations  
• Used GRIP data to inform the development of graduate student learning outcomes  
• Used GRIP data to inform an external review conducted in Spring 2014 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) of Participation</th>
<th>Department or Program / College</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                          | Youth Development & Leadership / School of Social Work / College of Education and Human Development | Seminar  
  - Developed intended student outcomes using GRIP data  
  - Provided an orientation and scaffolding on how to design a seminar  
  - Created a template that explains what is required and expected for a successful graduate experience  
  - Discussed how to support staff that support seminars  
  
Curriculum  
  - Reviewed courses and syllabi and explicate intended student outcomes  
  - Reviewed relevant topics in youth work “state of the field” and incorporate or augment the curriculum to include these topics  
  - Ex: social media, diversity issues  
  
Fieldwork  
  - Created resource list of people student can connect with for fieldwork  
  - Reviewed the language of “fieldwork” and decide whether to use this term in program literature  

| Half-year participation: Spring 2014 | Anthropology / College of Liberal Arts | Revised handbook-more specific regarding student responsibilities  
  - Developed alternative to Grad calendar  
  - Began process to create advanced student mentor group  

|                           | Architecture / College of Design |  
|                           | Computer Science / College of Science and Engineering |  


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) of Participation</th>
<th>Department or Program / College</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                          | Entomology / College of Food, Agricultural and Resources Sciences | • Used GRIP survey results to develop the Goals and Outcomes document  
• DGS finds GRIP data information useful when meeting with students and faculty to discuss goals and outcomes of our program  
• Based on GRIP data, department is exploring the possibility to arrange a half-day “retreat” to discuss program goals and curriculum |
|                          | Masters in Liberal Studies / College of Liberal Arts | • Created a new course  
• Created new information sheets for students  
• Implemented new processes in student orientation and student reviews  
• DGS met with students regarding some of the issues raised in GRIP data about professional and academic development and student groups  
• “GRIP Responses” are part of many conversations when the department talks about program changes |
|                          | Nursing / School of Nursing | • Used GRIP results to make decisions regarding funding students  
• Currently using GRIP survey results to revise advising / mentoring practices  
• Developed ongoing assessment plan for evaluating students |
|                          | Water Resource Sciences / College of Food, Agricultural and Resources Sciences | • Used GRIP data to determine which issues were most pressing to students  
• Used GRIP data to prioritize efforts to improve program from a student perspective |
<p>|                          | Security Technologies / College of Science &amp; Engineering | |
|                          | Design | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) of Participation</th>
<th>Department or Program / College</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half-year participation:</td>
<td>Spanish and Portuguese Studies / College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>In process of developing action plan for addressing issues that emerged from student survey (redesign of research methods course, provide more mentorship opportunities for teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Epidemiology / School of Public Health</td>
<td>Developed survey instrument for alumni, to be implemented in Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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