



---

## Program Evaluation

---

*Sherry Williams & Cathy Rimm  
Quality Assurance & Research Department  
Motorcycle Safety Foundation*

---

At some point in every program,  
someone asks:

**How's It Going?**  
**Does Training Work?**

---





- What is Program Evaluation?
- Why engage in Program Evaluation?
- Types of Program Evaluation
- The status of Program Evaluation in Motorcycle Safety Programs
- Examples of Motorcycle Safety Program Evaluation Techniques



# What is Program Evaluation?

- “Program evaluation is carefully collecting information about a program or some aspect of a program in order to make necessary decisions about the program.”
- “Evaluation is the process of determining whether programs – or certain aspects of programs – are appropriate, adequate, effective, and efficient and, if not, how to make them so.”
- “The key to success is in the preparation – depends directly on the effort you put into the program’s design and operation.”
- “Without evaluation, we cannot tell if the program benefits or harms the people we are trying to help.”



# *Why engage in Program Evaluation?*

1. Tell the GOOD NEWS! To inform your stakeholders.
2. To make a case for continued or expanded funding.
3. To have an early warning system for problems.
4. To monitor whether programs are producing desired results.
5. To understand why or why not (related to context or to implementation factors).
6. To learn whether programs have any unexpected benefits or problems.
7. To demonstrate program effectiveness.
8. To establish future benchmarks.



# What Program Evaluation is NOT

- A useless activity that generates lots of boring data with useless conclusions.
- Only able to show the program's failures.
- A proof of success or failure of a program.
- Complex and for experts only.
- A process that only produces what we expect.



# Types of Program Evaluation

- 35 different types according to some
- Formative
  - Research conducted (usually while the program is being developed) on a program's proposed materials, procedures, and methods
  - Understand how the program was implemented or feasibility
- Process
  - Shows how well a program is operating – can give the hows and whys
  - Often overlooked



# Types of Evaluation

- **Impact Evaluation**

- Research that shows the degree to which a program is meeting its intermediate goals
- Shows changes in knowledge, beliefs & attitudes in stakeholders and community

- **Outcome Evaluation**

- Research that shows the degree to which a program has met its ultimate goals
- Generally conducted at specified intervals
- Includes changes in mortality, morbidity





# Program Evaluation in Rider Education

- The type of evaluation you undertake to improve your programs depends on what you want to learn about the program
- Essential to a successful grant application
  - NHTSA – from 20 to 30% of evaluation criteria
  - 15% of total budget
- Everyone in rider education must shoulder a share of the responsibility for ensuring quality in rider education programs
- Evaluation is an ongoing process





# Program Evaluation in Rider Education

- **Results of Previously Published Study**
  - Winn & McPherson, Dept. of Safety Studies, West Virginia University, 1990
- **Study Conclusions**
  - Most states did not plan to perform impact evaluations
  - Effectiveness of training programs could not be defended
  - Funding could be lost
- **Recommendations**
  - Administrators should consider the benefits of program evaluation
  - Motorcycle program specific evaluation criteria should be established & tested



# Program Evaluation in Rider Education

## *MSF continued with review*

- *Interviews with program managers*
- *Reviewed MSF State Reports / State web pages*
- *Reviewed motorcycle program evaluation presentations and literature*



# Interviews with program managers

- *Twenty-four interviews completed*
  - *53% of available program managers reporting*
- *Various regions of the country*
- *Various delivery models*
- *Various program sizes*



# Various Delivery Models

- *State-administered*
- *Privately administered, State-regulated*
- *State-administered with private programs allowed*
- *State-administered with independent contractors*
- *MSF-administered*
- *Privately administered – no State Coordinator*



# Data collected states/programs

- *Pass/fail totals*
- *Dropped/counseled out*
- *Student evaluations*
- *Website availability*
- *Ongoing training for RCs and RCTs*
- *Policy and Procedure manuals*
- *Quality Assurance Visit process*
- *Student and RC complaint process*
- *Incident reporting*



# *Results from Interviews*

- All programs record pass and failure rates
- All programs have student & RC complaint process
- All programs have ongoing training for RC & RCT
- Almost all programs have websites
- 67% have Policy & Procedure manuals
- 63% have standardized forms and/or reports
- 33% track training incidents



# *Results from Interviews*

- *Formal – usually large programs*
  - *Set # of site visits*
  - *Standardized forms/reports*
  - *Training incident tracking*
  - *PDW's held several times annually*





# *Results from Interviews*

- *Informal – usually small programs*
  - *Little or no documentation of visits*
  - *Site visits “as needed”*
  - *Corrections by “nudging”*
  - *Annual PDW’s, (some smaller programs hold more frequent PDW’s as needed)*



# Results from Interviews

## ● *Complaints*

- *All programs actively follow up on negative complaints*
- *Severe complaints usually arrive at the State Coordinator's desk*
- *Often generate topics for PDW's*



# Current Examples of Program Evaluation

- Maryland Program Web Page
- Ohio
  - Peer Observers Web Page
- Indiana
  - Course graduate comments
- Massachusetts
  - Training Numbers
- Texas



## Reviewed other program web pages

California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin



# MSF-Sponsored Process Evaluation

## ● MSF Process

- 1999 - MSF Student Focus Group Research
- 2002 - Rider Education and Training System Online Resource Guide (RETSORG)
- 2003, 2004, 2005 - MSF Learning Centers
- Ongoing - RETS Courses and Training Opportunity Additions

## ● CMSP Process

- Policies and Procedures Manual
- Professional Development Update Meetings
- Quality Assurance Team Meetings
- Student Feedback Tracking Process



# MSF-Sponsored Impact Evaluation

## ● MSF Impact

- 2002 - BRC RiderCoach Survey
- 2003 - Curriculum Expert Evaluation
- 2003 – BRC Student Evaluation Analysis
- 2004 – BRC Student Evaluation Analysis
- 2005 – BRC RiderCoach On-line Survey

## ● CMSP Impact

- Training Stats
- RiderCoach Stats & RiderCoach Survey Results
- Quality Assurance Visit Analysis
- Student Feedback Forms (Qualitative & Quantitative)
- Ongoing Random Checks of Completed Students



# Available Tools to Collect Data

QAV - Microsoft Internet Explorer

Address: https://online.msf-usa.org/CMSP/QualityAssuranceVisit/QAV.aspx?QAID=0

**CMSP** California Motorcyclist Safety Program

## CMSP Quality Assurance Visit (QAV) Form

Status: [0] [v]

RERP#: [ ]

Site Name: AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO.  
BAY AREA MOTORCYCLE TRAINING, INC.  
BEALE AIR FORCE BASE  
CABRILLO COLLEGE EXTENSION  
CALIFORNIA RIDER EDUCATION  
CAMP PENDLETON - USMC  
CENTRAL COAST MOTORCYCLE TRAINING  
CERRITOS COLLEGE COMMUNITY EDUCATION  
COACHELLA VALLEY MOTORCYCLE TRAINING  
CYCLE LLOYD'S  
GAVILAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE-COMMUNITY EDUCATION  
GRANT ADULT EDUCATION M/C SAFETY PROGRAM  
IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE  
IN GEAR MOTORCYCLE TRAINING  
LOS ANGELES AFB  
MARCH AFB  
MARINE AIR GROUND COMBAT - 29 PALMS  
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - MIRAMAR  
MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE  
MORENO INSTITUTE OF MOTORCYCLING  
MOTORCYCLE RIDER EDUCATION  
MOTORCYCLE TRAINING CENTER  
MOTORCYCLE TRAINING INSTITUTE (MTI)  
MOUNTAIN VIEW - LOS ALTOS ADULT ED  
MSF - CMSP  
MT. SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE  
NAVAL BASE VENTURA COUNTY  
NAVAL REGION S.W.  
NELSON MOTORCYCLE TRAINING CENTER INC.

Date: [mm/dd/yy]

Contact Person: [v]

RiderCoaches Observed: [v]

Classroom Visit

# of Students in Classroom: [0]

1. Overall Condition of the Site: [ ]

**A. Overall Comments:**

Save Done

\*VSD=Very Strongly Disagree  
VSA= Very Strongly Agree

**Classroom:**

2. Classroom environment was learner-centered activities (large comfortable, appropriate furniture). [ ]

3. The use of AV equipment was appropriate (available, operational). [NA v]

4. There was a high level of student involvement in the classroom instruction. [NA v]

5. The RiderCoach demonstrated appropriate communication skills in the classroom. [NA v]

6. [ ]

7. Objectives were accomplished within an appropriate amount of time. [NA v]

8. The RiderCoaches appeared to have prepared sufficiently for the class. [NA v]

9. Administrative aspects of the program are handled effectively (registration, student eligibility, liability forms). [NA v]

SA=Strongly Agree; [ ]

Done



# Available Tools to Collect Data

QAV - Microsoft Internet Explorer

File Edit View Favori » Back - - - Search Favorites Media - - -

Address <https://online.msf-usa.org/CMSP/QualityAssuranceVisit/QAV.aspx?QAID=0>

### COMPLIANCE ISSUES

19. The range is Standard or Adjusted ?	Stan	Exercise adjustment have filed with CMSP?	No
20. The range markings were clear and visible.	No		
21. The range was equipped with a first aid kit, fire extinguisher and emergency instructions.	No		
22. The range was clear of debris and contained no safety hazards.	No		
23. Motorcycles were clean, well maintained, in working condition and posed no safety hazard.	No		
24. Students and RiderCoaches wore the appropriate protective gear when on the motorcycles.	No		
25. Participant/RiderCoach 6:1 ratio was observed.	No		
26. The exercises were conducted in the prescribed sequence.	No		
27. The RiderCoaches follow the instructional sequence of the Range Cards.	No		
28. The security of the range area, classroom and student property was maintained.	No		
29. BRC MSF Completion cards were given to successful students at the completion of the skill test.	No		
30. CHP course evaluation forms were given to each student at the completion of the skill test.	No		
31. If applicable, RiderCoaches completed MSF Incident reports appropriately.	No		

### Site Comments

Done



# Effective Model for Any Size Program

- *Should include the following:*
  - *Regular QA visits with documentation*
  - *Open flow of communication between stakeholders*
  - *Provide opportunities for professional development*
  - *Identify and improve weaknesses*
  - *Recognize strengths*
  - *Monitor progress and growth*
  - *Identify emerging challenges*
  - *Multiple methods / measurements*





# Resources

- Demonstrating Your Program's Worth
  - <http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/demonstr.htm>
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook
- American Evaluation Association
  - Find an Evaluator
  - <http://www.eval.org/consultants.htm>
- Motorcycle Safety Foundation




---

## Program Evaluation

---

**Thank You!**

[www.msf-usa.org](http://www.msf-usa.org) 

[swilliams@msf-usa.org](mailto:swilliams@msf-usa.org) 

[crimm@msf-usa.org](mailto:crimm@msf-usa.org)