Digital Preservation Management (DPM)
Continuing Education Program Impact Assessment (CEPIA) Model

Background

The DPM team completed a scan of continuing education and training assessment methodologies and approaches (see Resources section for representative examples). The results of this scan informed the development of the preliminary Continuing Education Program Impact Assessment (CEPIA) Model. In addition, the original model the DPM workshops used in developing our program provided a starting point for discussion and developing the CEPIA Model.
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**Figure 1. DPM Model for Curriculum Development, 2001**

Outline of Continuing Education Program Impact Assessment (CEPIA) Model

Assessment factors with examples:

**Program**
- **Validity** – indicators: e.g., vetted, evidence of influence, reflect standards and practice
- **Quality Control** – indicators: e.g., instructors, knowledge, reviewers, feedback
- **Currency** – indicators: e.g., topical, timely, extensible, reflects community discussion
- **Sustainability** – indicators: e.g., continuity – instructors, content, hosting, benefits

**Content**
- **Coverage** – indicators: e.g., criteria, reflects expected content, perspective, balance of core/new
- **Incorporates change** – indicators: e.g., supplemental materials, openness
- **Responsiveness** – indicators: e.g., adaptability, tailored to institutional needs, specific needs
- **Relevance** – indicators: e.g., definition of real-world problem program addresses, delivery
Development
- **Continual improvement** – indicators: e.g., systematic updates, identify/remove outdated content
- **Enduring Framework** – indicators: e.g., necessary changes but recognizable, core principles
- **Ancillary components** – indicators: e.g., requisite tools for post-training available and current
- **Durable** – indicators: e.g., instructors (develop: topical to utility to anchor), levels of content

Audience
- **Demand** – indicators: e.g., evidence of filling a need, subscriptions, word of mouth
- **Comprehension** – indicators: e.g., demonstrate understanding – class project, next steps
- **Follow up** – indicators: e.g., post-workshop support, passive to active, review/respond
- **Measurable impact** – indicators: e.g., 1st year enthusiasm (50% of attendees), 3rd year (20%), ...

Delivery
- **Replicability** – indicators: e.g., take-up, re-use examples, imitation
- **Modes** – indicators: e.g., configurable to in-person and virtual, duration, frequency
- **Fidelity** – indicators: e.g., concepts applicable in range of contexts, recognizable in any format
- **Track Record** – indicators: e.g., modularity, repeated use, continuing interest

Representative resources

In addition to examples of assessment approaches from continuing education providers in the digital preservation and curation community (US-based programs), these are representative examples of curriculum assessment methods based on a scan of training assessment and evaluation that informed the development of our preliminary Continuing Education Program Impact Assessment (CEPIA) Model:

- **Curricula Assessment Tool (CAT)**, University of Maryland Extension, April 2013: “The CAT is a criterion-referenced assessment tool that permits multiple individuals to make judgments using common criteria with common definitions.”
- **Continuing education and training models and strategies: an initial appraisal**, National Vocational Education and Training Research Program, Australia, 2012: “the authors evaluate a number of potential training models and strategies that might constitute a national approach to continuing education and training.”
- **Evaluation of Adult Education and Training Programs**, Dublin City University, Dublin, Republic of Ireland, 2010 – citing:
  - Kirkpatrick’s Model - results or goal-based evaluation; criticisms: question value of prepackaged, standardized process
  - Jacobs' Model - built-in evaluations using negotiated and iterative process
- **Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning**, American Association for Higher Education’s, 1996 with updates
- **Principles for Effective Assessment of Student Achievement**, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2013
- **OAPA Handbook Program-Based Review and Assessment**, UMass Amherst, 2001
- **PART III Building Capacity: Curriculum, Competencies, and Careers**, by Nancy McGovern in *The Open Data Imperative: How the Cultural Heritage Community Can Address the Federal Mandate*, July 2016 citing:
  - Preparing the Workforce for Digital Curation (NRC 2015)
  - Data Curation Education: A Snapshot (Keralis 2012)
  - The Problem of Data: Data Management and Curation Practices Among University Researchers (Jahnke and Asher 2012)
  - A New Value Equation Challenge: The Emergence of eResearch and Roles for Research Libraries (Luce 2008)