PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR THE CLEMENTE COURSE IN THE HUMANITIES: THE DESIGN OF SURVEY AND CASE STUDY INSTRUMENTS

Prepared for:
The Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities
66 Bridge Street
Northampton, MA 01060

Maura Devlin, Xingan Ge, Melany Mendoza, Andrew Smith
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
May 9, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

This report presents two program evaluation instruments which measure how well the Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities' (MFH) Clemente Course in the Humanities is meeting its stated goals of providing a bridge to education, increasing participants' ability to improve their own and their family members lives', and increasing participants' awareness of the cultural heritage of the humanities. Of the two evaluation tools, one is a quantitative survey and the other is a qualitative case study. These tools will enable MFH to meet its short-term need of gathering data on all 142 graduates this summer and to consider its longer-term needs of measuring and assessing its outcomes over time. In the report, we make recommendations on the best methods for MFH to implement and administer these program evaluation tools, ensuring that evaluation of the Clemente Course becomes an integral part of the program itself.

Introduction

In Spring 2005, staff from the Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities (MFH) engaged our team of four graduate students from the Nonprofit Management course at the University of Massachusetts to design an instrument and a process for evaluating the outcomes of its Clemente Course in the Humanities. After meeting with Kristin O'Connell, Assistant Director of MFH, and understanding their needs, we crafted a Memorandum of Understanding (see Appendix A) between our team and MFH on the project's scope, timetable, and ultimate deliverables. Interim meetings and communication via e-mail and telephone gave our team increased understanding of the Clemente Course and its goals. To clarify the evaluation project, we documented the logic model of the Clemente Course. We undertook a review of program evaluations for similar education programs aimed at increasing self-efficacy for low-income adults, and we researched program evaluation theory, methods of surveying human behaviors, and statistical analysis techniques.

The Clemente Course, as it operates in Massachusetts, is administered under the auspices of the Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities (MFH) in three separate communities: Holyoke, Worcester and Boston. To be considered for the course, students must be at least 18 years of age and at or below 150% of the national poverty level. Participants who apply for the course are selected based upon their ability to perform college-level academic work. The course is offered free of charge in communities where there is a demonstrated need, and MFH secures funding for professors from accredited universities and colleges to teach the following subjects: writing and critical thinking, moral philosophy, American history, art history, and literature. The course is designed to be as academically rigorous as any first-year college course in the humanities. Furthermore, through a cooperative agreement with Bard College, Clemente Course participants are able, but not guaranteed, to earn six college credits for their efforts in course.

The Clemente Course's goals are: (1) to provide a bridge to continuing education; (2) to foster students' awareness and appreciation of the cultural heritage encompassed by the traditional humanities disciplines; and (3) to foster students' intellectual development with a view to promoting their engagement in political life and their ability to improve their own lives and those of their families. To that end, MFH obtains funding from various sources to ensure that the Clemente Course has a reasonable budget to run the program and to compensate qualified faculty. Though not currently pressed by their funders to quantify outcomes of the Clemente Course, MFH would like to be able to determine if the course results in changes in graduates' awareness of the humanities in their everyday lives, to assess their goals for the program, and preemptively to be able to meet funders' requests for program evaluation data.

MFH engaged the services of our team, graduate students from the Center for Public Policy and Administration's Nonprofit Management course at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, to design program evaluation instruments and an accompanying implementation process. The survey and case study instruments we created (see Appendix B and C) are the products that we promised in the Memorandum of Understanding. MFH will implement the evaluation instruments we created this summer to gauge the effectiveness of the Clemente Course in meeting its outcome goals. The results of our team's efforts are detailed in this report.

In the following sections, this report contains a section on our methodology (section II), which consists of a review of pertinent literature and pre-survey interviews we conducted with past Clemente Course graduates. Also, the methodology presents the logic model of the Clemente Course, and the outcome goals, bridging goals and activity goals that shaped the designs of the survey and case studies. This framework helps clarify the survey and the case study instruments, which are outlined in detail in sections III and IV respectively, including procedural details and recommendations. The case study is included because there are several qualitative individual changes, which may or may not be captured as a result of the quantitative survey instrument. After these sections, implementation strategies are outlined in section V to assist MFH program administrators in adopting the survey and case study instruments to their needs. In addition, the appendices present the survey and case study instruments, which allow the reader to scroll through the questions and items as he or she reads through the report.

Methodology

Seeking to understand a causal link between adult education and an enhanced ability to improve one's life, we consulted the existing body of academic literature on education factors that enable individuals without many resources to improve their situations. We found a few relevant studies that dealt with self-efficacy, which generally indicates one's ability to cope with new, unfamiliar or challenging situations. Fasko and Fasko (1998) conducted research that shows the existence of a link between low self-efficacy and low educational attainment and posits that programs that increase self-efficacy have the potential of reducing some of the limiting factors of poverty.

Based upon the findings of Bègue (2005), individuals with a higher sense of self worth are more capable of skillfully handling situations in which their individual worth has been threatened. The Clemente Course hypothesizes that if students are exposed to the body of knowledge that makes up Western ethics (such as the works of Plato, Aristotle, and Socrates), then they will be more able and inclined to respond skillfully to demoralizing situations, and thus, participation in the course enhances self-efficacy and self worth.

Bandura (1997) sees the learning environment as a place that is uniquely capable of providing individuals with opportunities of acquiring self-efficacy related skills. As Bandura indicates, the ability to regulate one's own behavior through enhancing, refining, and developing cognitive thinking skills is directly related to the ability to rein oneself in that occurs through exposure to learning-conducive environments.

The Colorado Even Start program conducted a longitudinal evaluation study of its program goal, to help break the intergenerational cycle of poverty by providing unified family literacy programming for low income families (Anderson, 2003). Anderson found that enrollees' lives changed positively as a result of their participation in the federal Even Start program. Educationally, Anderson observed that parent literacy and child literacy improved greatly when both parent and child were participating in literacy programs together. Most notably, Anderson found that "parents improved their ability to support their children's success in school" (Anderson, 2003).

Further research unfortunately yielded no additional compelling and relevant studies that linked self-efficacy rates with programs for impoverished adult learners. This potentially indicates an area that has not extensively been studied.

In our effort to design the program evaluation instrument, the next step we took was to develop the "logic model" of the Clemente Course. A logic model is an illustration of how the activity goals, bridging goals, and outcome goals could be linked together. Outcome goals are the final intended consequences of a program for its clients or society. This kind of goal has value in and of itself, not as a means to some other end, and is usually people-oriented since most public and nonprofit programs are designed ultimately to help people. Activity goals, by contrast, refer to the internal mechanics of a program, the desired substance and level of activities within the program. Falling between activity and outcome goals are bridging goals, so named because they supposedly connect activities to outcomes. In an advertising campaign designed to reduce smoking, for example, a bridging goal between advertising (activity) and reduced smoking (outcome) might be "increased awareness of the risks of smoking." That increased awareness would be a consequence of the program for society, but instead of being the final intended consequence, it is only a bridge from activity to outcome (Thomas, 2005).

We gained a clear picture of different goals through reviewing the program materials, including an existing post-course survey prepared by Bard College, talking with the staff of MFH, and group brainstorming. After the completion of the first draft of the logic model, we submitted it to MFH and received positive feedback. Overall, we believe the following is an appropriate logic model for the program:

Logic Model

Activity Goals:
1. Teach students knowledge about traditional humanities disciplines
2. Provide knowledge about reflective, critical, and political thinking and writing
3. Encourage active participation in class discussion, expression, and communication
4. Facilitate learning by providing necessary conditions
5. Provide transferable credits to eligible students

Other factors might bridging goals

Bridging Goals:
1. Promote students' intellectual development
2. Enhance students' self-esteem
3. Enhance students' self-efficacy
4. Enhance students' self-confidence
5. Increase students' awareness of importance of education
6. Foster students' appreciation of the traditional cultural heritage of the humanities

Other factors might affect outcome goals

Outcome Goals:
1. Increase students' engagement in democratic society
2. Improve students' ability to take over their own lives
3. Improve students' ability to ameliorate the lives of their families

Following the logic model design and the literature review, we then reviewed the mission, history, theory, standards, commitment, objectives, and practices of MFH and the Clemente Course. Next, we reviewed the program evaluations of similar course programs, most of which are evaluations of the impacts of adult development, family schools, and education for the poor. Most of these evaluations are conducted people into two groups – a control group and a treatment group, changes in the treatment group are examined and compared to changes in the control group and are analyzed for the impact of the treatment) for the instrument and using a longitudinal approach (which is a comparison of situations of the same or different groups at different times). Unfortunately, in our design of the program evaluation instrument, we realized we could not apply a quasi-experimental design because of the difficulty of appropriately selecting an experimental control group. The validity of the outcome of an experiment could be compromised without the proper control group. MFH also considered the significant investment of time, additional staffing needs, and financial requirements of the quasi-experimental instrument as prohibitive, so we looked at alternatives. We recognized that the longitudinal approach fits well with the evaluation instrument design, and thus designed two instruments, a quantitative survey and a qualitative case study. Our design of the survey questionnaire and the case study can be applied both as a one-shot study and as a longitudinal study.

In order to enhance the validity of our design of the survey and the case study, we engaged some of the graduates of the Clemente Course in the process of creating an evaluation tool. MFH and our team recognized the value of including program users as decision-makers in the evaluation process (Patton, 1997).

MFH provided us with the names and contact numbers of eleven (11) past graduates whom they had previously called, resulting in enhanced cooperation. We took demographic factors such as age, race, and gender into account by gathering this information from the MFH's Assistant Director and ensuring that these graduates were sufficiently diverse on these factors. We determined that phone interviews were the most efficient way to get input from graduates, since phone interviews were the most cost-effective and convenient way to communicate with past graduates from Holyoke, Worcester, and Boston. To ensure consistency among team members making the calls, we developed a list of questions aimed at eliciting the impact of the course on students' lives and education during and after the course (see Appendix D).

From the first eleven (11) names provided by MFH we succeeded in contacting six (6) of the graduates. When unable to contact a sufficient number to avoid subjectivity, we requested from MFH additional graduates whom we could contact. MFH staff provided nine (9) additional names of graduates who had not previously been informed of the reason for our call. In total we attempted to call twenty (20) people, and were able to talk with ten (10) of these graduates, which is about 7% of the graduate population. Of these ten graduates, the demographic breakdown is as follows: four (4) African American women in their 40's, one (1) African American man in his 30's, three (3) Caucasian women in their 40's, two (2) Latina women, one of whom is in her 50's and the other of whom had an undisclosed age. Of the ten (10) we did not succeed in contacting, two (2) have phone numbers that are no longer in service, and we left repeated messages for the others.

Design of the Quantitative Survey Instrument

MFH's aims for program evaluation are to measure variables that indicate whether or not the Clemente Course meets its goals. These variables can generally be classified as variables about participants' behavior, attitudes, beliefs, and opinions, characteristics, and expectations. Survey research is a type of research that is appropriate for such questions about self-reported beliefs or behaviors (Neuman, 2003). A survey tool will additionally meet MFH's need for quantifiable data that can be analyzed and reported fairly easily.

Upon determining the best tool for gathering quantitative data, we sought to apply the findings from our conversations with graduates to design of the survey questions. In these conversations, we found the following:

- Some of the students had trouble understanding the language we used for the interview questions. This served as a clear indicator that we needed to build simple and clear questions in the final instrument(s).
- The graduates were easily able to identify the impact of the course on their educational goals, but had more difficulty identifying the Course's impact on other MFH goals. This signified that these questions had to be clarified and possibly asked in many different ways in multiple questions.
- We realized that the impacts that MFH hopes to measure, such as improvements in graduates' education levels or in their lives in general, require significant time to show effects. For that reason, we determined that using an evaluation tool at various times post-graduation from the course would yield the best results.

As the questions asked in these phone interviews were directly related to the goals of the Clemente Course, the findings from these calls helped us craft the survey and case study questions.

Tasked with evaluating program outcomes, we created survey questions that primarily elicit answers for each of the logic model's outcome and bridging goals. A couple of the questions provide information for some of the activity goals as well. As we wrote the questions, we linked each question to the goal for which it seeks to provide quantitative data. The table below shows these links between the goals and the questions that correspond to each goal. Note that some of the questions correspond to more than one goal.

Bridging Goal #1 Promote students' intellectual development	12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48
Bridging Goal #2 Enhance students' self-esteem	31, 32, 33, 36
Bridging Goal #3 Enhance students' self-efficacy	30, 33, 36, 42
Bridging Goal #4 Enhance students' self-confidence	31, 32, 33, 36, 42
Bridging Goal #5 Increase awareness of importance of education	1, 2, 3, 29. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48
Bridging Goal #6 Foster appreciation of heritage of humanities	10, 11, 34, 35,
Outcome Goal #1 Increase engagement in democratic society	16, 17, 18, 19, 5, 26
Outcome Goal #2 Improve students' ability to control own lives	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 20, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30
Outcome Goal #3 Improve ability to ameliorate families' lives	23, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42
Activity Goal #1 Teach students knowledge about humanities	34
Activity Goal #5 Provide transferable credits to eligible students	1, 2, 3

In the process of creating the survey instrument (see Appendix B), we attempted to reduce bias and spuriousness by avoiding slang, vagueness, emotional language, double-barreled questions that ask two things at once, leading questions, double negatives, and unbalanced responses (Neuman, 2003). As the survey attempts to measure participants' future goals as a result of the course compared to past goals prior to the course (such as education goals), we were particularly careful to avoid questions that asked about intentions too far into the future or that asked for recollections from too long ago in the past. Additionally, the administration of the survey three times post-course is designed to guard against relying on participants' distant future intentions.

Sample Selection. In considering the use of the survey instrument, the population of all graduates of the course in Massachusetts is 142, and the number of participants each year in each of the three sites is relatively small (about 20 students). Since it is possible and financially manageable to contact all graduates and students, we suggest that the selected sample for the one-shot survey be the entire population of graduates and the sample for the longitudinal survey to be the entire population of students in the next three class years. This will allow MFH to prevent to the greatest extent possible challenges to validity by under-representation of any particular subgroup with in the sample.

MFH should note, however, that even using the entire population as the sample for the one-shot survey could yield responses that are not entirely representative of all graduates. There may be a self-selection factor. It is likely that graduates who feel as though their lives are satisfactory, whether or not the course impacted that satisfaction, will respond in greater numbers than those who do not feel satisfied with their lives. It is also likely that students who did well in the course and earned the six transferable credits from Bard College will respond more frequently while those who did not may choose not to respond. Respondents whose lives are relatively stable, suggesting long-term residency and long-term telephone numbers, will respond more than those whose lives are in flux. For these reasons, we believe that in using the longitudinal survey in the future, surveying graduates three times post-course, immediately afterward, one year out and three years out, will minimize threats to validity.

Survey Approach. Though an experiment or a quasi-experiment would capture causality with more validity than other types of evaluation instruments, they are often practically difficult to implement. We considered MFH's need for a means of gathering data on graduates for whom there is no corresponding pre-treatment data. A one-shot attempt to gather data has validity challenges in that it cannot be shown that any notable variable is caused by the treatment and not by external factors. Recognizing these limitations, we designed the survey so that MFH will be able to use the Section III, to contact all 142 current graduates of the Clemente Course in Massachusetts immediately or as they are able. The data collected will be based on the respondents' recollection or subjective interpretation of the causes of any changes to their education plans, self-efficacy, or their ability to improve their lives and those of their families.

Through discussion with MFH staff, we mutually determined that there is value to the employment of a survey instrument for future Clemente Course sessions that gathers both pre- and post-course data. Therefore, we have designed two additional sections of the survey. Section I will be given to all participants on the first day of the program. Section II will be given to all program participants on the last day of the program. Section III, which contains the same questions as Section II, will be used longitudinally; we recommend that MFH use it at one year and three years after course completion. Our conversations with past graduates suggest that some of the impacts that MFH hopes to determine, since they involve changes to individuals' lives and personal situations, require significant time to process.

The survey is designed to provide mainly quantitative data that trained MFH staff can compare pre- and post-treatment (which is the course itself) and over time. Quantitative data will be helpful as MFH will be able to create reports determining the relative frequency with which respondents answered questions in a certain way. Many of the questions were created to show the impact, via a range of intensities, of certain factors that might influence outcomes. Quantitative data will be useful to MFH, but as validity is enhanced with the inclusion of both quantitative and qualitative data, and as our conversations with graduates point to the usefulness of qualitative questioning techniques, we have added a qualitative case study tool to our quantitative survey instrument. The case study design is detailed in the next section.

We offer a cautionary note to MFH on the inclusion of a couple of the questions. In Section I, the survey attempts to gather demographic data and some personal data. Our inspiration for including these questions was the existing post-course survey that was created by Bard College, currently administered but not analyzed or used for program evaluation purposes. We used the same racial categories that the Bard College surveyors used, believing that their categories appropriately reflected the racial demographic breakdown of program participants. We also considered that one question (Question 7 in all three Sections) about how program participants support themselves is controversial. We recognize that some may find this question offensive. However, it is our belief that since a similar question is being asked on the Bard College survey, and since the data gathered from this question may be important to MFH for comparison purposes, we decided to include it, being careful to phrase the question and corresponding response categories without judgment. If MFH staff or board members find that the question is too controversial, they may want to omit it.

For the one-shot data collection of past graduates, we recommend that MFH conduct telephone surveys. Telephone surveys typically yield higher response rates than mail surveys and allow for greater interviewer control if a respondent is confused about a question. Additionally, MFH has expressed a desire to hire an intern this summer to facilitate data collection as quickly and as efficiently as possible. Training will be necessary so that the intern-interviewer does not inject any bias into his or her tone during questioning and so that the intern will gather data appropriately. (Further information about required training and skills for interviewers is detailed in the Implementation Instructions section of this report.)

For the future administration of the instrument, we recommend that MFH administer the survey to all program participants in person at the beginning and again at the end of the course. For the data collection at one year and three years post-course, MFH staff could either conduct telephone surveys or mail the survey. Telephone surveys are possible since the number of graduates at each of the three sites is approximately 20 per year. This would possibly yield a higher response rate than mailing the survey, but would be more time-consuming. Mail surveys would possibly be a more effective use of time but would likely yield a lower response rate.

Survey Data Analysis. Both the one-shot and the longitudinal applications of the survey can be analyzed using the same methods. The survey was designed to enhance analysis; most questions were crafted so that the responses are numerical values, which can fairly easily be used to understand the findings (Patton, 1997). We recommend that MFH staff responsible for the data analysis follow these steps:

1) The first step would be to look at each question in the survey, and assign a numerical value to each category of ranges for the responses. This can be done for all questions except the qualitative ones, the ones that require respondents to fill in the blank provided. For example, on Question 2 in Section I, MFH staff could assign a “1” to the age range “17 – 25”, a “2” to the age range “26 – 35”, a “3” for “36 – 45”, and so on. Yes or no questions can easily be changed to numerical values using “1” for “yes” and “2” for “no”.
2) The next step would be to create a spreadsheet with each column indicating respondents’ numerical answers, and each row indicating a question asked on the survey.
3) Quantitative answers can then be easily entered into the appropriate cell on the spreadsheet.
4) Qualitative responses (such as the inclusion of “other” in categorical responses to allow for atypical or unique answers) should also be placed in the column in short, accurate phrasing. Question 39 is the only potentially long qualitative response on the survey. MFH staff might want to consider summarizing these findings at the bottom of the spreadsheet, not in the column format.
5) On a separate worksheet in the same file, MFH staff could create the reporting form in which the analysis would be placed.

When the answers are converted to numbers, it is tempting to calculate measures of central tendency, such as the average, the mode, and the median responses. MFH staff should be careful to remember that for certain questions, the values correspond to categories and do not have meaning in and of themselves. Therefore, measures of central tendency need to be interpreted carefully. The most common statistical tools for summarizing and analyzing univariate (one variable) data relate to concepts of frequency, indicating how frequently respondents answered a certain way. Spreadsheet software such as Microsoft Excel has the capability to calculate relative frequencies. Frequencies can be displayed as raw numbers (indicating, for example, that 3 respondents answered in a certain way) or as relative frequencies (indicating, for example, that the 3 respondents comprise 20% of the total responses for that question). Relative frequencies can also be displayed in various graphs using Microsoft Excel.

MFH will want to look at how responses to a certain question relate to responses to another question, or bivariate data. This can be done with cross tabulations. For example, MFH would be able to indicate how frequently respondents living in homeless shelters agreed with the question, “Since taking the Clemente Course, I believe in my abilities much more.” Software such as Excel has the capabilities to create cross tabulations with pivot table functions.

In-depth statistical analysis of the data would yield other interesting findings. However, these techniques require some advanced statistical training. If MFH needs such analysis, staff might want to consider outsourcing this piece to consultants or to graduate school programs. We list here a few statistical techniques so that MFH staff will understand the possibilities with the data.

Hypothesis testing would allow MFH staff to show with statistical significance whether or not a hypothesis that they hold is supported by the data (Mendenhall, Beaver, and Beaver, 2003). This may be a particularly useful technique for MFH as they implement the one-shot survey this summer, but MFH should recognize that the concerns about the validity of the data gathering process are not mitigated by a favorable hypothesis test result. For example, if MFH believes that the Clemente Course raises students' self-esteem; this hypothesis would be considered the alternative hypothesis, H_a. In the one-shot application of the survey, MFH might find that the mean response to Question 33 (which relates to the goal of increased self-esteem) is 1.25. On the surface, this indicates a score that might support MFH's hypothesis, since a mean of 3 would indicate a neutral response and a mean response lower than 3 tends towards more self-esteem. The null hypothesis, H_0, that the course has no effect on self-esteem, would be set to equal 3. H_a, therefore, would be set to equal any number less than 3. A test statistic, rescaled to Z-scores, and a Z-score table would be used to see if the variable 1.25 falls into the rejection region, which would be determined by the probability level that MFH would be willing to accept. The formula for rescaling to Z is: $Z = \chi - \mu$ / (s / the square root of n), where χ is the variable, μ is the neutral response (the null hypothesis), s is the sample standard deviation, and n is the number of responses. If Z falls in the rejection region, the null hypothesis would be rejected, and the data would support (but not prove) the alternative hypothesis.

MFH may want to look at measures of association. For example, the calculation of a correlation coefficient can show how much two variables "go together" or covary (Neuman, 2003). Additionally, when looking at the longitudinal data, matched pairs can be used to compare each question over time, and thus would be useful in comparing students' responses over time. Matched pair analysis can be conducted on an individual's responses or on the entire population's responses to determine if there is statistically significant difference between responses.

For example, MFH could match individuals' pre- and post-course responses on Question 29 about whether or not respondents have education goals, by the code number. Averaging the difference between each student's matched responses would yield a mean difference for the sample. If this figure were 3.6 pre-course, for example, this response would indicate that most respondents disagree with the statement. Post-course, if the mean response were 1.8, this would indicate that most respondents agree with the statement. Whether or not the difference between the matched pair of responses to Question 29 is statistically significant can be determined with hypothesis testing. The null hypothesis, H_0, would be that there is no difference; the alternative hypothesis, H_a, which MFH staff hopes to show, is that there is a difference between the two means. The test statistic would be calculated by the formula: $Z = \chi_1 - \chi_2$ / (the square root of $(s_1^2 / n_1) + (s_2^2 / n_2)$), where χ_1 is the pre-course variable (3.6), χ_2 is the post-course variable (1.8), s_1 is the standard deviation of pre-course sample, s_2 is the standard deviation of the post-course sample, n_1 is the number of responses pre-course, and n_2 is the number of responses post-course). Z-score tables would indicate whether or not to reject the null hypothesis. The major benefit of the matched pairs with survey responses to this same question before and after the course is that MFH would be able to state, with a calculated confidence interval, whether or not the difference caused by the course is statistically significant. If such an alternative hypothesis were to show statistical significance, this would strongly support that the treatment (the Clemente Course) yielded the outcomes MFH thought it would.

The inclusion of these examples and formulas in our report is not intended to overwhelm MFH staff, but rather to indicate the possibilities that statistical analysis offers. An on-line resource for these concepts is available at http://mathworld.wolfram.com/topics/StatisticalTests.html, but

MFH should realize that these concepts require some time before they are mastered. MFH might want to consider the benefit of these statistical techniques, and determine their internal capabilities to perform these calculations or seek external expertise.

Design of Qualitative Case Study Instrument

Social science researchers (Neuman, 2003; Patton, 1997) underscore the enhanced validity to program evaluation when both quantitative and qualitative tools are used. One of our findings from our surveys on some past graduates also confirms this point. Case studies can also be used illustratively to support findings of quantitative analysis. For these reasons, in addition to the quantitative survey, we created a qualitative case study instrument (see Appendix C). Case study research is a type of research that examines, in depth, many features on many people or units, either at one time period or across time periods. A case study can be a one-shot study if it examines features at one time period or a longitudinal study if it examines features across time periods. The data derived from case studies are usually more detailed, varied, and extensive, and most involve qualitative data. In a case study, researchers will intensively investigate one or two cases or compare a limited set of cases, focusing on several factors (Neuman, 2003). Researchers can find the common patterns and connect the actions of individual people to large-scale social structures and processes.

Population and Sample Selection. In the case study, our target population is the students who graduated from the Clemente Course at the Holyoke, Boston, and Worcester sites, 1999 – 2004. As for the sample selection, we suggest that MFH generate a stratified sample. A stratified sample requires that MFH divide the population into different groups according to age, rage, and gender, creating two matrices representing the combination of different groups (see Appendix E). Then, MFH would select the samples from two matrices through random assignment. The number of selected samples depends on the number of group types. The other alternative for MFH is to select graduates through a random assignment process. Random assignment is very simple and easily achieved. MFH could give each student in the population a fixed number, and then select the number with a random process, such as throwing dice or asking people to count off. But this process could impose a serious weakness on the case study. If the randomly selected samples had the same or similar backgrounds – for example, if all the selected samples are African American – then the validity of our case study would be discounted for other groups, such as Asian or Caribbean American participants. The reason this problem occurs is that some factors that might affect the case study are not taken into account in the random assignment. We recommend that MFH select eight (8) to ten (10) samples after taking into account the group types and the limitations of time, staff, and financial resources.

Case Study Approach. We recommend that MFH conduct case studies through face-to-face interviews because of the significant advantages of this approach. Face-to-face interviews have the highest response rates and permit a relatively long interview. Interviewers can control the sequence of questions and can ask probing questions. Especially, interviewers can observe the surroundings and use nonverbal communication and visual aids. Sometimes interviewers can be easily permitted to ask some private questions which are not properly asked when using other kinds of approaches. These advantages are very useful in our case study because MFH needs the detailed, extensive, and various personal responses from the interviewees. But the disadvantages of this approach are also obvious. Training, traveling, and personnel costs for interviews can be high. Interviewer bias is also greatest in face-to-face interviews. The appearance, tone of voice, and question wording of the interviewers may influence respondents' answer to questions. But since the sample is not large, the interview time would be limited, and travel costs would not be very high (since all students are located in three sites in Massachusetts), we strongly recommend that MFH employ face-to-face interviews in the case study.

If MFH cannot adopt face-to-face interviews because of limitations on time, personnel, or other factors, we suggest MFH use telephone interviews as the second option. Quickly reaching many people, lower costs, and a certain level of control over the sequence of questions are the advantages of telephone interviews. But this approach usually does not allow a long interview. The interviewers cannot see the surroundings and the visual expression of the interviewees, although they can notice the tone of voice of the respondents. These two disadvantages might reduce the breadth and depth of the interview, thus resulting in interviewers not collecting extensive and detailed information. This is the primary reason that we recommend the face-to-face interviews and see telephone interviews as the second alternative.

Case Study Data Analysis. Case study data are qualitative data, which are in the form of text, written words, phrases, or symbols describing or representing people, actions, and events in social life (Neuman, 2003). When researchers analyze the case study data, they usually do two kinds of actions in the process of analysis: conceptualization and coding (Neuman, 2003). Conceptualization means researchers form new concepts or refine concepts, which are grounded in the data. For MFH, the researchers should derive various concepts from the information collected from the case studies. For example, what is the concept of "awareness" or "appreciation"? What kind of changes should be linked to the enhancement of "awareness" or "appreciation"? The action of conceptualization would be repeated throughout the analysis. Coding refers to researchers codifying data in three stages.

(1) **Open coding.** Researchers read the recently collected data slowly, looking for critical terms, keys, or themes, and then note them. Next, researchers write preliminary concepts or labels along these notes. Through this process, researchers identify meaningful and useful concepts out of data and put them under the scrutiny of the future analysis (Neuman, 2003).

(2) **Axial coding.** In this stage, researchers review and examine the initial codes based on the concepts generated by open coding: researchers remove some relatively unrelated concepts or add new concepts; identify the key concepts in analysis; organize and link different concepts or themes; raise new questions about whether should gather data in more depth. After this stage, the concepts should be connected and structure of concepts should become clear (Neuman, 2003). For MFH, the data collected from question 1 and 2 could be linked to the concepts contained in bridging goals 1 and 5; question 3 could be linked to the concept in bridging goal 6; question 7, 10, and 11 could be linked to the concept in bridging goal 3; question 4, 5, and 6 could be linked to the concept in bridging goal 4; and question 8 and 9 could be linked to the concept in bridging goal 2. The combination of bridging goals impacts on each outcome goal.

(3) **Selective coding.** After the data is complete and concepts are well-organized, researchers selectively look for cases that illustrate the key concepts and organize them

around several core generalizations or ideas (Neuman, 2003). For example, MFH is looking for the impact of its program on the students. In selective coding, MFH should go through the data and coding, looking for data that are related to the outcome of traditional humanities disciplines, such as changes in life goals and behavioral changes.

In order to evaluate the program, we intend to find similarities and differences in outcomes of students, make comparisons, and try to find whether the reasons that lead to the similarities and differences link to the Clemente Course. The data analysis technique should also be related to this goal and facilitate it. Thus, we recommend that MFH adopt "analytic comparison" as its analytic technique, which consists of "method of agreement" and "method of difference" (Neuman, 2003). The method of agreement focuses researchers' attention on what is common across cases. The researchers establish that cases have a common outcome, and then try to locate a common cause, although other features of the cases may differ. For example, MFH may find that all the cases share the common outcomes that students changed their education goals and became more confident in controlling their lives, but that they differ in levels of change and in other features. MFH could look for one or more common causes to explain these shared outcomes, despite the differences in levels of the outcomes and other features. Then MFH staff could use the method of difference to reinforce the analysis conducted using the method of agreement. A famous example of these techniques is a study of the causes of revolutions done in 1979. The social researcher used the method of agreement to identify common causes in three countries' revolutions. She then used the method of difference to analyze why five other nations did not experience a revolution during the same time period. In using both methods, the author was able to identify two primary causes of revolutions (Neuman, 2003). Applying this method to the Clemente Course, for example, MFH may find that students have different levels of changes in their behavior and look for other factors to explain this outcome.

Summary of Design of Survey and Case Study Design. In summary, in addition to the one-shot survey conducted in this summer, we recommend that MFH evaluate the Clemente Course longitudinally through the implementation of our evaluation instruments beginning in Fall 2005 and ending in 2009. We recommend that the 2005 - 2006 class be given the most comprehensive set of surveys: pre-course, immediately post-course, one year after completion, and three years after completion. The 2006 – 2007 class should be given the pre-course survey, the post-course survey, and the survey after one year post-completion. The 2007 – 2008 class should complete the pre-course and the post-course survey. A sampling of eight to ten case studies should be conducted from each of the three class years at each of these four timeframes. We believe that the amount of program evaluation data collected over these three years in this method will allow for MFH to evaluate whether their program goals are being met and to generate reports that they will be able to share internally and externally.

Implementation Instructions

Guidelines for Interviews. Both the survey and the case study require the involvement of professional-quality interviewers. The program evaluation cannot be convincing and useful without the good performance of interviewers. Since MFH will employ one or more undergraduate or graduate student(s) to conduct surveys this summer, we suggest some guidelines for MFH about the management of interviewer(s) and the process of the interview.

Role of Interviewers. In addition to being critical, the role of the interviewers is also difficult. MFH interviewers need to gain cooperation and build rapport with the interviewees, while at the same time they should remain neutral and objective. Respondents may treat them unfairly because interviewers encroach on the respondents' time and privacy for information that may not directly benefit the respondents. They should be able to deal with embarrassment, fear, and suspicion of the respondents and try to build an environment of trust so that respondents feel comfortable revealing information (Neuman, 2003). They cannot make judgment on the respondent's answer and not reveal their own opinions verbally or nonverbally. The selection and training of interviewers, especially if a team of interviewers is used, are particularly important for MFH.

Selection, Training, and Supervision of Interviewers. Good interviewers are the outcome of both careful selection and training. In selecting the prospective interviewers, we suggest that MFH choose candidates who are pleasant, honest, accurate, mature, responsible, stable and motivated. They should have a non-threatening appearance, have good communication skills, have experience with many types of people, and possess poise and tact (Neuman, 2003). MFH also needs to take into account the age, race, sex, languages spoken, and even the voice of prospective interviewers.

Professional interviewers typically take a one- to two-week training course, which will instruct them how to do in the interview. The training courses could be developed in-house or by asking active, experienced, and knowledgeable social researchers in universities. The course usually includes lectures and reading, observation of expert interviewers, mock interviews in the office or in the field that are recorded and critiqued, many practice interviews, and role playing. MFH could substitute this structured type of training program with a more flexible, customized training program if only hiring one or a few interviewers at once, but the interview concepts remain the same despite the training format. The interviewers also need to learn some knowledge about what survey or case study research is and what the role of interviewers is in this research. In addition, in the training period, they should become familiar with the purposes of surveys or case studies and what each question means in the questionnaire, although not with the answers expected (Neuman, 2003). They also will be taught about how to write down the answers in the case study and how to record them. Two other important things should be instructed for interviewers. One is to instruct interviewers about interview bias is and how to reduce or avoid it. The other is to instruct the interviewers on the kinds of behavior that is not permitted, offensive to respondents, or unethical.

If hiring multiple interviewers at one time, we suggest that MFH appoint one interview supervisor to monitor the other interviewers. This supervisor can be a MFH staff person with some level of knowledge of interviews, or can be a trustworthy interviewer from the pool of the interviewers. Regardless of who acts as the supervisor, he or she should be familiar with the survey or case study areas, have the ability to assist when some unintended problems happen, oversee the interviewers, and ensure that work is completed on time. For telephone interviewing, the responsibility of the supervisor includes helping with calls, checking when interviewers arrive and leave, and monitoring interview calls. In face-to-face interviews, supervisors should check whether interviews actually took place as reported by interviewers. This requires the supervisor calling back or sending a confirmation postcard to some respondents. He or she can also check the response rate and incomplete questionnaires to see whether interviewers are obtaining cooperation, and may personally interview a few of the respondents, analyze answers, or observe interviews to see whether interviewers are accurately asking questions and recording answers (Neuman, 2003).

Stages of Interview. The interview proceeds through different stages, beginning with an introduction and entry. In a telephone interview, the interviewer greets the respondent, introduces himself or herself, provides a brief description of the context of interview, and gets the cooperation from the respondent. In face-to-face interviews, the interview gets in the door, shows authorization, and reassures and secures cooperation from the respondent. At the beginning, respondents usually have some questions about the selection of respondents and the purpose of interview (Neuman, 2003). Therefore, interviewers should be prepared for such common questions: “How did you pick me?”, “What good will this do?”, and “What’s this about, anyway?”

The main job of the interviewers is to ask questions and record answers. The interviewer should use the exact wording on the questionnaire -- no added or omitted words and no rephrasing when asking questions. He or she will also need to ask all applicable questions in order, without returning to or skipping questions. The interviewer should be careful about the pace he or she is going -- not too fast, not too slow, and one that is comfortable for the respondent -- and should not give directive feedback to maintain interest. One of the important skills for professional-quality interviewers is that they know how and when to use probing questions. A probing question is a neutral request to clarify an ambiguous answer, to complete an incomplete answer, or to obtain a relevant response. When interviewers recognize that an irrelevant or inaccurate answer exists, they should use probes as needed. For example, the interviewer might ask "any other reasons?" to generate other factors that might affect responses but have not been noticed by the respondent. Other common probing questions include "Can you tell me more about that?", "Could you explain more for me?", and "Could you be a little bit more specific?" In addition to asking questions, the interviewer accurately records answers. This is an easy job for survey interviews, because all the questions are closed-ended questions, where interviewers simply need to mark the correct box. For the case study, the interviewer's job is more difficult because the questions are open-ended questions, which means there is no standard answer to it but rather depend on the personal experience and wording of respondents. Thus, the interviewer should listen carefully, must have legible writing, and must record what is said verbatim without correcting grammar or slang. Especially important, the interviewer should never summarize or paraphrase what the respondent answers, because this causes a loss of information or distorts answers (Neuman, 2003).

After completing the questions or in-depth interview, comes the last stage -- the exit. The interviewer thanks the respondent for his/her time and cooperation and hangs up the phone or leaves. Then the interviewer should go to a quiet, private place to make the answers clean and clear and record other details such as the date, time, and place of the interview; a brief sketch of the respondent and interview situation; the respondent's attitude (for example, comfortable, serious, angry, or laughing); and any unusual circumstances (for example, "other people knocked the door at question 20 and respondent talked for five minutes before the interview started again"). The interviewer notes anything disruptive that happened during the interview. The interviewer also records personal feelings and anything that was suspected (for example, "respondent took few minutes thinking about this question before answering it" or "respondent became confident when answering one question") (Neuman, 2003).

Supervision of Program Evaluation Tools. Before implementation, the Executive Director, Assistant Director, or designated manager will discuss the importance of the evaluation to MFH's overall mission in an organization-wide meeting. After everyone in the organization understands the relationship of data collection to the success of the mission, management should designate a staff person or a team responsible for handling the evaluation tasks. Those tasks need to be carefully delineated by management in a comprehensive training. The training is critical to the success of the evaluation tool and should not be undervalued. Key training and implementation points include the following considerations.

Essential to record keeping are the maintenance of data integrity and the preservation of privacy. For that reason, our team suggests that when a participant is accepted into the Clemente Course, an Evaluation Record Sheet be completed (see Appendix F). This sheet is intended to help the evaluation staff keep track of when evaluation elements are to be administered. Participants' records would be separated by the year the student started the course. To maintain confidentiality, a code number should be assigned to every participant on the first date of class, and a staff member would create a folder that includes the Evaluation Record Sheet and blank copies of the three evaluation sections with the code number of the participant. Having the copies in advance in each folder will help the staff to keep track of the three sections. The responsible staff person or evaluation team member should follow up with staff to ensure that surveys are given as prescribed at appropriate times. If not, the person responsible should determine the cause and consider re-training if necessary. Attention to the details of the process needs to be carefully maintained over time.

In order to preserve the quality of the survey, deliberate attention should be paid to avoiding bias in the administration. It is important to retain objectivity, fairness, or impartiality in every part of the process. Evaluation staff needs to be sure not to impart judgment or influence through body language or tone when communicating with students. Any additions or alterations to the questionnaire should be done with an eye towards objectivity.

Upon the completion of periodic data collection, data should be tabulated to provide a collective view of the results. Management should then analyze data to provide a report of successes, failures, and inconclusive results. This report should be considered with the organizational mission to evaluate progress. When viewing the data in the context of the mission, it may become evident that changes are necessary in the operation of the organization. MFH decision-makers should use the data to make program changes and advance the mission of the organization.

The evaluation will not be completed until a report has been written and the results have been communicated to the appropriate administrators, decision-makers, and board members. In preparing the report, the writer should be clear about the audience for whom the report is being prepared. Two broad questions need to be considered: (1) What does the audience need to know about the evaluation results? and (2) How can these results be best presented? (Fleischman and

Williams, 1996) Additionally, sharing quantitative, positive results with funders can increase MFH's capacity to generate funds for the Clemente Course.

Personnel Requirements. In terms of personnel, MFH will need to incorporate survey and case study administration and data analysis into the job description of a designated staff person (such as an evaluation program administrator) or team of people. The program administrator or team will be responsible for gathering the information throughout this process and for seeing the entire project through to its completion. There is little chance that a three-year project will require 40 hours a week from a single employee, but there will be cyclical period of enhanced activity alternating with long periods of program dormancy.

In a support role, MFH should consider hiring experienced interviewers during the periods of increased program activity. These could either be professional graduate students enrolled in data-rich research programs (such as public policy, statistics or education programs) or undergraduates enrolled in advanced programs of a similar nature.

To meet staffing needs for the program evaluation, the program administrator or evaluation team should consider available sources of affordable expertise, such as the Center for Public Policy and Administration at the University of Massachusetts, the Education Departments at the University of Massachusetts, and various other data-rich social science programs and student resources within the Five-College area. The program administrator would be well served to cultivate relationships before survey and analysis periods with these centers of knowledge to secure the use of students who could perform internships doing the survey and case study interviews for MFH.

Expertise Requirements. In addition to good interpersonal and organizational skills, the program administrator or evaluation team would need to be experienced with Microsoft Excel and Microsoft Access (for maintaining a database of Clemente Course graduates). Similar spreadsheet and database programs would also most likely be able to be substituted for these Microsoft products. Our evaluation instruments have been designed to work with Excel (or comparable spreadsheet applications), and the program administrator or evaluation team will need to be able to create spreadsheets (for data entry of the survey responses) and be able to use the statistical function capabilities and the pivot tables within Excel. The ability to create graphs in Excel from the survey data would be another important skill. Using the statistical functions, the pivot tables, and the graphing capabilities in Excel is not very difficult, and an astute user with an understanding of the data that he or she is manipulating can be trained or use the help function successfully.

Software, Hardware, and Financial Support Requirements. The program administrator or evaluation team should have access to Microsoft Access, Excel and Microsoft Word (or another word processing software). As MFH has these products, software needs will not incur additional costs. Other than a personal computer and a printer, no other software or hardware will be necessary. Financial support for the evaluation program may be needed to pay for telephone calls, additional stationary and postage, the hiring and training of temporary interviewers for in-depth data analysis, and for travel costs.

Conclusion

Through our research and experience, we were able to develop two evaluation tools to meet the needs of MFH for both a short-term and a long-term assessment of the Clemente Course. These tools include MFH's original concept of a one-shot evaluation of past students and also an ongoing evaluation through pre- and post-course surveys. Through our interviews with past graduates, we discovered that survey information should be collected through a dual approach of case studies and surveys. This will facilitate a more complete picture of the course results by providing both qualitative and quantitative data. This dichotomized view reveals quantified results without neglecting anecdotal data.

An element of this process that should not be underemphasized is the application of the results. After gathering, tabulating, and evaluating the results, MFH should use the data to improve their effectiveness in practical ways, while also strengthening their position for potential funding. Although simple to orate, this may prove to be the most difficult step to effectuate.

While we believe that the process outlined in this report is the optimal method, we also realize that the constraints of the "real world" may dictate deviation from this path. However, we encourage MFH to apply the evaluation tool as accurately as possible, as there is a clear link between the quality of the results and the efficacy of the outcome in advancing the organization's mission.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Beckie. 2003. "Colorado Even Start Follow-up Study." *Colorado Department of Education.* Denver: Trinidad State Junior College. Retrieved March 9, 2005 from www.cde.state.co.us/cdecare/care_downloads/pdf/2002ColoradoEvenStartFollowUpStudyTrinidad2.pdf.

Bandura, Albert. 1997. *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control.* New York: W. H. Freeman.

Bègue, Laurent. 2005. "Self-Esteem Regulaton in Threatening Social Comparison: The Roles of Belief in a Just World and Self-Efficacy." *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal.* 33: 69 – 75.

Davey, Lynn. 1991. "The Application of Case Study Evaluations." *ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests Measurement and Evaluation*. Retrieved April 16, 2005 from http://www.ericdigests.org/1992-5/study.htm

Fasko, Sharla Nichols and Daniel Fasko Jr. 1998. "A Systems Approach to Self-Efficacy and Achievement in Rural Schools." *Education:* 119: 292-300.

Fleishman, Howard L. and Laura Williams. 1996. "An Introduction to Program Evaluation for Classroom Teachers." Arlington, VA: *Development Associates, Inc.* Retrieved March 25, 2005 from http://teacherpathfinder.org/School/Assess/assess.html.

Kegan, Robert, et. Al. 2001. "Adult Development Study." *National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy (NCSALL)*. Cambridge, MA. Retrieved March 9, 2005 from http://gseweb.harvard.edu/~ncsall/research/adultdev.htm.

Mendenhall, William, Robert J. Beaver and Barbara Beaver. 2003. *Introduction to Probability and Statistics.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole – Thompson Learning.

McNamara, Carter. 1998. "Basic Guide to Program Evaluation." Retrieved March 10, 2005 from http://www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/fnl_eval.htm#anchor1316141.

Murray, Vic. 2005. "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Nonprofit Organizations." In *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management,* ed. Robert D. Herman & Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. 2003. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, 5th Ed.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 1997. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation, The New Century Text, 3rd Ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Scott, Kerrilyn. 2005. "Strategies for Evaluating Your Program." *US Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools Mentoring Program, Regional Training.*

Thomas, John Clayton. 2005. "Outcome Assessment and Program Evaluation." In *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management,* ed. Robert D. Herman & Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

TO: KRISTIN O'CONNELL

FROM: MAURA DEVLIN, ANDREW SMITH, MELANY MENDOZA, AND XINGAN GE

SUBJECT: EVALUATION DESIGN: IMPACT OF THE CLEMENTE COURSE IN THE HUMANITIES IN MASSACHUSETTS

DATE: 2/22/05

CC: BRENDA BUSHOUSE

AIM

To design a program evaluation instrument and process to assess the long-term impact of the Clemente Course in the Humanities for the Massachusetts Foundation of the Humanities.

FOCUS

This project will provide consulting services to the Clemente Course on how to evaluate its objectives: to provide a bridge to continuing education, to foster students' awareness and appreciation of the cultural heritage encompassed by the traditional humanities disciplines, and to foster students' intellectual development with a view to promoting their engagement in political life and their ability to improve their own lives and those of their families. The team will conceptualize these objectives into a longitudinal evaluation instrument. Additionally, the team will provide guidance on how to the MFH staff could administer the instrument, gather data, and analyze data. This project will allow MFH to measure the ways in which the Clemente Course supports MFH's overall mission.

TASKS

Engage past students in the design process through interviews to guide inquiry and to enhance the instrument's validity.

Interview MFH staff and other parties as necessary to gain an understanding of relevant data and MFH capacity.

Research similar programs to learn best practices of program evaluation when conducting longitudinal studies.

Design the data-gathering instrument for MFH to gather necessary information for the program.

Advise MFH staff how to administer these instruments to secure the desired information.

RESOURCES

MFH will provide information and documentation on the Clemente Course. Additionally, MFH will facilitate access to past and present students, faculty, and appropriate MFH staff. Kristin O'Connell, Assistant Director of the MFH, will serve as the project team's liaison to MFH staff.

PRODUCT

The research team will provide consulting services, a program evaluation instrument, and an implementation plan. To this end, the project team will provide a working schedule and a methodology to MFH, and will review the protocols for meeting with Clemente Course students, the evaluation instrument, and the draft of the implementation plan with MFH. The team will present this project on May 9, 2005 and provide a written report to Kristin O'Connell by May 16, 2005.

I have read this memorandum of understanding and agree with its contents.

Kristin O'Connell Maura Devlin Andrew Smith Melany Mendoza
Xingan Ge
MFH *Consultant* *Consultant* *Consultant* *Consultant*

THE CLEMENTE COURSE IN THE HUMANITIES
QUESTIONNAIRE

Please help us improve this program by answering the following questions. All information will be kept confidential and used only by the Clemente Course staff to improve the program.

SECTION I: To be completed by all participants prior to the start of the program.

1) Code #:_________________

2) How old are you?
❒ 17 – 25 ❒ 26 – 35 ❒ 36 – 45 ❒ 46 – 60 ❒ 61 and over

3) Are you: ❒ male ❒ female

4) How would you describe yourself:
❒ Caucasian ❒ Latino/a ❒ Native American ❒ African ❒ African American
❒ African Caribbean ❒ Asian American/Pacific Islander ❒ other _______________

5) Are you currently in school (not including this course)? ❒ yes ❒ no

6) If you answered yes to Q5, what is the name of the school?
____

____

7) If you answered yes to Q5, what kind of school do you attend?

❒ high school ❒ community college ❒ adult education (not for credit)
❒ four-year college or university ❒ trade school ❒ vocational program
❒ certificate program ❒ Graduate Equivalency Degree program (GED)
❒ Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System program (MCAS)

8) How many hours do you currently work each week? ❒ 0 ❒ 1 – 19 ❒ 20 – 30 ❒ 31+

9) How do you support yourself? Please check all that apply.

❒ regular work ❒ occasional work ❒ public assistance ❒ retired
❒ Social Security ❒ spouse/parents/family ❒ friends ❒ unemployment benefits
❒ other: ____

10) With whom do you live? Please check all that apply.

❒ spouse/partner ❒ one parent ❒ two parents ❒ brother(s)/sister(s)
❒ children ❒ friend(s)/roommate(s) ❒ alone ❒ other: ________________

11) What kind of housing do you live in now?

❒ apartment ❒ house ❒ temporarily with someone else ❒ shelter
❒ group home ❒ homeless ❒ other: ____

12) Thinking about your travel to the location where The Clemente Course is held, how difficult is it for you to get to The Clemente Course?

❒ very easy ❒ easy ❒ a little difficult ❒ very difficult

For Q13 – Q22, think about how often you are involved in the activities in each question.

13) If you attend cultural activities, please check all that apply:

❒ theater ❒ art museum/gallery ❒ music/concerts ❒ dance ❒ film festival
❒ author readings ❒ book groups ❒ lectures ❒ other: ______________________

14) Every six months, I attend cultural activities:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

15) If you read in your free time, please check all that apply:

❒ newspapers ❒ novels ❒ poetry ❒ non-fiction ❒ other:_________________

16) Every six months, I read:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

17) If you write in your free time, please check all that apply:

❒ journal ❒ poetry ❒ stories ❒ letters ❒ opinions ❒ other: ________________

18) Every six months, I write in my free time:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

19) If you participate in your community, please check all that apply:

❒ politics ❒ church ❒ social services ❒ volunteering ❒ education ❒ sports
❒ other: ____

20) Every six months, I participate in my community:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

21) If you are politically active, please check all that apply:

❒ local voting ❒ national voting ❒ working on campaigns/polls
❒ reading newspapers ❒ discussing political topics with friends/family
❒ attending lectures ❒ volunteering ❒ other: ______________________________

22) Every six months, I participate politically:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

For Q 23 – Q34, please answer the level with which you agree with the statement:

23) I am satisfied with my living situation.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

26) I am satisfied with my career.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

27) I am satisfied with my education.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

28) I am satisfied with my ability to help my children's education
(If applicable; if not please check: ❒ NA).
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

29) I am satisfied with how I engage in cultural activities.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

30) I am satisfied with how I engage in my community.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

31) I am satisfied with how I engage in politics.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

32) I am satisfied with how I support myself.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

33) I have an awareness of what the humanities are.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

34) I have education goals for myself.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

If you have not yet begun The Clemente Course, PLEASE STOP HERE. Thank you!

SECTION II: To be completed by all program participants after completion of the course.

1) Are you currently in school (not including this course)? ❒ yes ❒ no

2) If you answered yes to Q1, what is the name of the school? ______________________________

____

3) If you answered yes to Q1, what kind of school do you attend?

❒ high school ❒ community college ❒ adult education (not for credit)
❒ four-year college or university ❒ trade school ❒ vocational program
❒ certificate program ❒ Graduate Equivalency Degree program (GED)
❒ Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System program (MCAS)

4) How many hours do you currently work each week? ❒ 0 ❒ 1 – 19 ❒ 20 – 30 ❒ 31+

5) Is your job the same job you had at the beginning of the Clemente Course? ❒ yes ❒ no

6) If you answered no to Q5, did participating in the Clemente Course influence your decision to change your job? ❒ yes ❒ no

7) How do you support yourself? Please check all that apply.

❒ regular work ❒ occasional work ❒ public assistance ❒ retired
❒ Social Security ❒ spouse/parents/family ❒ friends ❒ unemployment benefits
❒ other: ____

8) With whom do you live? Please check all that apply.

❒ spouse/partner ❒ one parent ❒ two parents ❒ brother(s)/sister(s)
❒ children ❒ friend(s)/roommate(s) ❒ alone ❒ other: ________________

9) What kind of housing do you live in now?

❒ apartment ❒ house ❒ temporarily with someone else ❒ shelter
❒ group home ❒ homeless ❒ other: ______________________________________

For Q10 – Q19, think about how often you are involved in the activities in each question.

10) If you attend cultural activities, please check all that apply:

❒ theater ❒ art museum/gallery ❒ music/concert ❒ dance ❒ film festival
❒ author readings ❒ book groups ❒ lectures ❒ other: ____________________

11) Every six months, I attend cultural activities:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

12) If you read in your free time, please check all that apply:

❒ newspapers ❒ novels ❒ poetry ❒ non-fiction ❒ other:________________

13) Every six months, I read:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

14) If you write in your free time, please check all that apply:

❒ journal ❒ poetry ❒ stories ❒ letters ❒ opinions ❒ other: _______________

15) Every six months, I write in my free time:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

16) If you participate in your community, please check all that apply:

❒ politics ❒ church ❒ social services ❒ volunteering ❒ education ❒ sports
❒ other: ____

17) Every six months, I participate in my community:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

18) If you are politically active, please check all that apply:

❒ local voting ❒ national voting ❒ working on campaigns/polls
❒ reading newspapers ❒ discussing political topics with friends/family
❒ attending lectures ❒ volunteering ❒ other: ___________________________

19) Every six months, I participate politically:
❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

For Q20 – Q29, please answer the level with which you agree with the statement:

20) I am satisfied with my living situation.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

21) I am satisfied with my career.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

22) I am satisfied with my education.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

23) I am satisfied with my ability to help my children's education.
(If applicable; if not please check: ❒ NA).
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

24) I am satisfied with how I engage in cultural activities.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

25) I am satisfied with how I engage in my community.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

26) I am satisfied with how I engage in politics.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

27) I am satisfied with how I support myself.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

28) I have an awareness of what the humanities are.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

29) I have education goals for myself.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

For Q30 to Q37, think about how each factor changed as a result of The Clemente Course. Circle the number of the answer that you think is the most true.

30) Since taking the Clemente Course, which of the following is most true?
1. I feel much more in command of my personal life.
2. I feel a little more in command of my personal life.
3. I feel the same amount of command of my personal life.
4. I feel a little less in command of my personal life.
5. I feel much less in command of my personal life.

31) As a result of the Clement Course, which of the following is most true?
1. I know much more about myself
2. I know a little bit more about myself.
3. I myself the same amount.

4. I know less about myself.
5. I know a lot less about myself.

32) As a result of the Clemente Course, which of the following is most true?
    1. I like myself much more.
    2. I like myself a little bit more.
    3. I like myself the same.
    4. I like myself a little bit less.
    5. I like myself a lot less.

33) Since taking the Clemente Course, which of the following is most true?
    1. I believe in my abilities much more.
    2. I believe in my abilities a little bit more.
    3. I believe in my abilities the same.
    4. I believe in my abilities a little bit less.
    5. I believe in my abilities a lot less.

34) Since taking the Clemente Course, which of the following is most true?
    1. I am much more aware of culture in my world.
    2. I am a little bit more aware of culture in my world.
    3. I have the same amount of awareness of culture in my world.
    4. I am a little bit less aware of culture in my world.
    5. I am a lot less aware of culture in my world.

35) Since taking the Clemente Course:
    1. I appreciate culture much more.
    2. I appreciate culture a little bit more.
    3. I appreciate culture the same.
    4. I appreciate culture a little bit less.
    5. I appreciate culture a lot less.

36) Since taking the Clemente Course:
    1. I feel like usually do the right thing.
    2. I feel like I sometimes do the right thing.
    3. I feel the same about how often I do the right and the wrong things.
    4. I feel like I sometimes do the wrong thing.
    5. I feel like I usually do the wrong thing.

37) Since taking the Clemente Course:
    1. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education much more.
    2. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education a little bit more.
    3. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education the same amount.
    4. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education a little bit less.
    5. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education a lot less.

38) Have you used anything you learned in the course to help your family? ❒ yes ❒ no

39) If you answered yes to Q37, what kind of knowledge did you use to help your family?________

____

____

____

40) Since taking the Clemente Course, have you discussed with your family and/or friends your life goals, your personal development, or your dreams? ❒ yes ❒ no

41) If yes, did you use the knowledge learned from the course during the discussion? ❒ yes ❒ no

42) Since taking the Clemente Course, do you feel more confident in dealing with issues that your family faces? ❒ yes ❒ no

43) Before taking the Clemente Course, did you think education was important for fulfilling your personal goals? ❒ yes ❒ no

44) Since taking the Clemente Course, have you changed your ideas about the importance of education as a means of fulfilling your personal goals? ❒ yes ❒ no

45) If you had education goals before taking the course, do you think the Clemente Course helped you achieve your original education plan? ❒ yes ❒ no

46) If you did not have any education goals before taking the Clemente Course, have you developed any plans for your education since taking the Course? ❒ yes ❒ no

47) If you had enrolled in school before taking the course, do you think the Course had a positive impact on the course(s) in which you enrolled? ❒ yes ❒ no

48) If you had not enrolled in school before taking the Clemente Course, have you changed your ideas about schooling since taking the course? ❒ yes ❒ no

PLEASE STOP HERE. Thank you for taking the survey!

SECTION III: To be completed by program participants one and three years after completion of the course.

1) Are you currently in school (not including this course)? ❐ yes ❐ no

2) If you answered yes to Q1, what is the name of the school? ______________________________

____

3) If you answered yes to Q1, what kind of school do you attend?

❐ high school ❐ community college ❐ adult education (not for credit)
❐ four-year college or university ❐ trade school ❐ vocational program
❐ certificate program ❐ Graduate Equivalency Degree program (GED)
❐ Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System program (MCAS)

4) How many hours do you currently work each week? ❐ 0 ❐ 1 – 19 ❐ 20 – 30 ❐ 31+

5) Is your job the same job you had at the beginning of the Clemente Course? ❐ yes ❐ no

6) If you answered no to Q5, did participating in the Clemente Course influence your decision to change your job? ❐ yes ❐ no

7) How do you support yourself? Please check all that apply.

❐ regular work ❐ occasional work ❐ public assistance ❐ retired
❐ Social Security ❐ spouse/parents/family ❐ friends ❐ unemployment benefits
❐ other: ____

8) With whom do you live? Please check all that apply.

❐ spouse/partner ❐ one parent ❐ two parents ❐ brother(s)/sister(s)
❐ children ❐ friend(s)/roommate(s) ❐ alone ❐ other: ________________

9) What kind of housing do you live in now?

❐ apartment ❐ house ❐ temporarily with someone else ❐ shelter
❐ group home ❐ homeless ❐ other: ____________________________________

For Q10 – Q19, think about how often you are involved in the activities in each question.

10) If you attend cultural activities, please check all that apply:

❐ theater ❐ art museum/gallery ❐ music/concert ❐ dance ❐ film festival
❐ author readings ❐ book groups ❐ lectures ❐ other: ______________________

11) Every six months, I attend cultural activities:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

12) If you read in your free time, please check all that apply:

❒ newspapers ❒ novels ❒ poetry ❒ non-fiction ❒ other:________________

13) Every six months, I read:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

14) If you write in your free time, please check all that apply:

❒ journal ❒ poetry ❒ stories ❒ letters ❒ opinions ❒ other: _______________

15) Every six months, I write in my free time:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

16) If you participate in your community, please check all that apply:

❒ politics ❒ church ❒ social services ❒ volunteering ❒ education ❒ sports
❒ other: ____

17) Every six months, I participate in my community:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

18) If you are politically active, please check all that apply:

❒ local voting ❒ national voting ❒ working on campaigns/polls
❒ reading newspapers ❒ discussing political topics with friends/family
❒ attending lectures ❒ volunteering ❒ other: ___________________________

19) Every six months, I participate politically:

❒ never ❒ once ❒ 2- 5 times ❒ 6 – 9 times ❒ 10 – 12 times ❒ 13 + times

For Q20 – Q29, please answer the level with which you agree with the statement:

20) I am satisfied with my living situation.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

21) I am satisfied with my career.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

22) I am satisfied with my education.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

23) I am satisfied with my ability to help my children's education.
(If applicable; if not please check: ❒ NA).
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

24) I am satisfied with how I engage in cultural activities.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

25) I am satisfied with how I engage in my community.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

26) I am satisfied with how I engage in politics.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

27) I am satisfied with how I support myself.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

28) I have an awareness of what the humanities are.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

29) I have education goals for myself.
❒ strongly agree ❒ somewhat agree ❒ somewhat disagree ❒ strongly disagree

For Q30 to Q37, think about how each factor changed as a result of The Clemente Course. Circle the number of the answer that you think is the most true.

30) Since taking the Clemente Course, which of the following is most true?
1. I feel much more in command of my personal life.
2. I feel a little more in command of my personal life.
3. I feel the same amount of command of my personal life.
4. I feel a little less in command of my personal life.
5. I feel much less in command of my personal life.

31) As a result of the Clement Course, which of the following is most true?
1. I know much more about myself
2. I know a little bit more about myself.
3. I myself the same amount.
4. I know less about myself.
5. I know a lot less about myself.

32) As a result of the Clemente Course, which of the following is most true?
6. I like myself much more.
7. I like myself a little bit more.
8. I like myself the same.
9. I like myself a little bit less.
10. I like myself a lot less.

33) Since taking the Clemente Course, which of the following is most true?
6. I believe in my abilities much more.
7. I believe in my abilities a little bit more.
8. I believe in my abilities the same.
9. I believe in my abilities a little bit less.
10. I believe in my abilities a lot less.

34) Since taking the Clemente Course, which of the following is most true?
6. I am much more aware of culture in my world.
7. I am a little bit more aware of culture in my world.
8. I have the same amount of awareness of culture in my world.
9. I am a little bit less aware of culture in my world.
10. I am a lot less aware of culture in my world.

35) Since taking the Clemente Course:
6. I appreciate culture much more.
7. I appreciate culture a little bit more.
8. I appreciate culture the same.
9. I appreciate culture a little bit less.
10. I appreciate culture a lot less.

36) Since taking the Clemente Course:
6. I feel like usually do the right thing.
7. I feel like I sometimes do the right thing.
8. I feel the same about how often I do the right and the wrong things.
9. I feel like I sometimes do the wrong thing.
10. I feel like I usually do the wrong thing.

37) Since taking the Clemente Course:
6. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education much more.
7. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education a little bit more.
8. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education the same amount.
9. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education a little bit less.
10. I encourage friends and/or family to pursue education a lot less.

38) Have you used anything you learned in the course to help your family? ❐ yes ❐ no

39) If you answered yes to Q37, what kind of knowledge did you use to help your family?________

___

___

___

40) Since taking the Clemente Course, have you discussed with your family and/or friends your life goals, your personal development, or your dreams? ❒ yes ❒ no

41) If yes, did you use the knowledge learned from the course during the discussion? ❒ yes ❒ no

42) Since taking the Clemente Course, do you feel more confident in dealing with issues that your family faces? ❒ yes ❒ no

43) Before taking the Clemente Course, did you think education was important for fulfilling your personal goals? ❒ yes ❒ no

44) Since taking the Clemente Course, have you changed your ideas about the importance of education as a means of fulfilling your personal goals? ❒ yes ❒ no

45) If you had education goals before taking the course, do you think the Clemente Course helped you achieve your original education plan? ❒ yes ❒ no

46) If you did not have any education goals before taking the Clemente Course, have you developed any plans for your education since taking the Course? ❒ yes ❒ no

47) If you had enrolled in school before taking the course, do you think the Course had a positive impact on the course(s) in which you enrolled? ❒ yes ❒ no

48) If you had not enrolled in school before taking the Clemente Course, have you changed your ideas about schooling since taking the course? ❒ yes ❒ no

PLEASE STOP HERE. Thank you for taking the survey!

Appendix C

THE CLEMENTE COURSE IN THE HUMANITIES
CASE STUDY QUESTIONS

To be used on a sampling of graduates immediately after finishing the Clemente Course, and again at 1-year and 3-years after completion of the course.

Please help us improve this program by answering the following questions. All information will be kept confidential and will be used only by Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities staff to improve the program. Reports created from case studies will not include names. Please listen carefully to each question and think about how the factor being asked about in each question may have changed as a result of the Clemente Course.

1) Code #:__________________

2) Did the Clemente Course change how you think about education? If so, how?

3) Did the Clemente Course encourage you to pursue more education? If so, how? If so, please describe the education plans you are pursuing.

5) Did the Clemente Course change how you interact with your community? If so, how?

6) Did the Clemente Course change how you feel about your ability to improve your own life? If so, how?

6) As a result of the Clemente Course, have you made any changes to improve your life? If so, please describe these changes.

7) Did the Clemente Course change how you feel about your ability to improve the lives of your family members? If so, how?

8) As a result of the Clemente Course, have you made any changes to improve the lives of your family members? If so, please describe these changes.

9) Since taking the Clemente Course, are you more aware of the humanities in your life than you were before taking the course? If so, please describe your awareness of the humanities in your life.

10) Has this awareness of the humanities made a difference in your life? If so, please describe the difference.

11) Did the Clemente Course change how you feel about your role as a citizen? If so, how?

Thank you very much for taking time to speak with me. Your responses will give us a better understanding of how our program has benefited participants and will help us to improve it.

Appendix D

Questions for Clemente Course Graduates
To Guide Development of Evaluation Instrument

The goals of the Clemente Course are to: provide a bridge to continuing education, to foster students' awareness and appreciation of the cultural heritage encompassed by the traditional humanities disciplines, and to foster students' intellectual development with a view to promoting their engagement in political life and their ability to improve their own lives and those of their families. We are designing an evaluation tool (a survey) that will measure how well the Clemente Course is meeting these goals.

1. What was your attitude towards education prior to taking the course? Did your attitude towards education change as a result of the course? How?

2. Have you pursued other education (courses) after taking the Clemente Course? Have you encouraged any friend(s) or family member(s) to pursue education as a result of your experience in the course?

3. What was your understanding of the humanities prior to taking the course? Did your attitude towards the humanities change as a result of this course? How?

4. Did your personal goals change as a result of the course? How?

5. In what ways, if any, has the Clemente Course impacted your life?

6. In what ways, if any, has the Clemente Course impact your self image?

7. Have your attitudes towards other people changed as a result of the course?

8. Has the Clemente Course prompted you to become more involved in your community? If so, how?

9. What was your involvement in political activism (voting, reading the newspaper, following the governance of your town, state, country) prior to taking the course? Has this changed as a result of the course?

10. How do you feel about your ability to improve your own life and the lives of your family members? Did the Clemente Course impact this feeling?

11. Looking back at the time that has passed since you completed the course, what aspect of your life would you say has been the most impacted by the course and how?

12. Is there anything else that our research team should include in our survey instrument? Is there anything else that MFH should ask graduates about the effects of the course on participants' lives?

Appendix E
Case Study Matrices

Male Graduates

Age	Race							
	Caucasian	Latino	Native American	African	African American	African Caribbean	Asian American/ Pacific Islander	others
17-25								
26-35								
36-45								
46-60								
61+								

Female Graduates

Age	Race							
	Caucasian	Latino	Native American	African	African American	African Caribbean	Asian American/ Pacific Islander	others
17-25								
26-35								
36-45								
46-60								
61+								

Appendix F
Record Keeping Cover Sheet

Massachusetts Foundation for The Humanities
Clemente Course
Program Evaluation
Evaluation Record Sheet

Site:____________________

Name of student: ________________________________Code #:_________________

Address: ____

Telephone number: ____

Start date: __________________________Ending date:_________________________

	Section I	Section II	Section III	Case Study
Date to be completed				
Date that was completed				
Reported by:				

- Section I – To be completed by all participants prior to the start of the program
- Section II - To be completed by all program participants after completion of the Course.
- Section III – To be completed by all graduates one year and three years post-course.