Now it's built, will they come? Learnings from Evaluating Reach

AEA Evaluation 2017 Conference: Evaluation – From Learning to ActionNovember 10, 2017

This document began as a summary of key discussion points from a roundtable on evaluating reach at the AEA evaluation conference in November 2017.

Which Reach evaluation questions are used most often and why?

- As per the session handout¹ how many are participating, who they are, access barriers, etc.
- As well:
 - o Who is <u>not</u> coming (but is eligible)?
 - o Are these participants unique/duplicates?
 - o Are they new/repeat participants?

How easy/challenging/useful are different metrics or methods?

- As per the session handout² much of the data was from administrative databases or participant surveys also program documents, stakeholder interviews or analytics
- Data from tracking uptake of promotions may be reliable data for each promotion but it can be difficult to translate this into reach across promotions
 - May also have an awareness measure e.g., heard about it through alumni at events but not be able to break it out by different events (to determine which events, or alumni, may have encouraged participation more)
- Data from applications lots of data, lots of noise, how to find the people?
 - Using action analytics clicks, shares etc. is better as people are taking these actions
 - Log file analysis downloaded info on 10 people and did an analysis on how they were participating (some were "hummingbirds" and some were more focused but visiting in more depth)
- Use segmentation to look at the overall target population (e.g., the general public) and then segments of target groups (e.g., disadvantaged/underserved groups, professionals)
 - o professionals are harder to get in the door and are used to incentives
- When organizations rather than individuals are participants may evaluate "engagement" as participation

¹ http://www.atrimonta.com/evaluating-reach.html

² http://www.atrimonta.com/evaluating-reach.html

- Surveying what works
 - Survey once a year very short, let them know how long and how many (only once a year) – we achieve response rates of 50%-55% with researchers this way
 - Survey response rates can be up to 100% if in person hand them out and get them back e.g., at the end of training workshops
 - Real time at events can work well participants like the interactivity when they see the responses right away
 - The challenge is how to be streamlined and ask without overburdening
- External approvals e.g., IRB, OMB issues are the process and the time required to fulfill the requirements
 - What works is an overarching approach/agreement and consistency in requests
 - Need to ensure consent is truly <u>informed</u>
- Be clear in the evaluation about why/what metrics you need and link this back to the evaluation matrix and the program's goals

How relevant/similar are themes in the findings?

- What works is:
 - Using multiple channels
 - o Webinars can be good as they get people in the door who then continue to participate
 - Champions have influence/can encourage participation
 - Referrals may be fewer in quantity but have high impact in terms of encouraging participation
 - Events can encourage participation, though it can be challenging to break out impacts
 of individual events (vis a vis events as a category)
- Sub-populations can differ:
 - Younger participants are a better fit with online incl. social media channels and older participants more through webinars and in-person relationship channels
 - o Website users can be of different types e.g., hummingbirds and in-depth visitors

Evaluating session reach

How did you become aware of this session?

- Conference program (incl. app)

What prompted you to come to this session?

- Working on an evaluation(s) which cover reach a lot and/or have reach challenges
- Came with someone else

How easy/difficult was it to access this session?

- Easy was in the program
- Difficult finding the room, choosing between so many sessions (in the same timeslot)