# SSIP Evaluation Workshop 2.0: Data Aggregation Examples

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Aggregation Method and *Example* | Considerations | Calculation |
| Percentage of practitioners with improved scores  *Scores on the HORVS-A+ assessment increased between the Fall and Spring assessments for 72% of the practitioners.* | Can provide a sensitive measure of small increments of progress, but small improvements might not be meaningful. Consider stricter criteria for labeling scores as “improved” (e.g., increase of 5 points, category change from “emerging” to “partially implementing”) | 1. Calculate change for each individual across 2 time points:   **Time 2 Summary Score minus Time 1 Summary Score** *Note that some scores will be positive and some will be negative. A positive score means that practitioners’ performance improved; negative score indicates performance declined.*   1. Calculate the percentage of practitioners with a positive score:   **# of practitioners with positive score/total # of practitioners with a score** |
| Average change scores  *Practitioners’ scores on the HORVS-A+ assessment increased by 7 points, on average, from baseline to 6 months following the baseline assessment.* | Can provide a measure of small increments of progress but can be a less reliable method, as variability among scores can range, and average can be skewed by outliers | 1. Calculate change for each individual across 2 time points: **Time 2 Summary Score minus Time 1 Summary Score** *Note that some scores will be positive and some will be negative.* 2. Calculate average change:   **Sum of change scores/total # of practitioners with score** |
| Percentage of practitioners meeting fidelity threshold  *64% of teachers were implementing the family engagement practices with fidelity* | May take time to see increases in the number of practitioners meeting fidelity; use one of the above approaches to assess progress toward fidelity | 1. Determine whether each practitioner met the threshold 2. Calculate the percentage of providers meeting the fidelity threshold:   **# of practitioners that met fidelity/total # of practitioners with fidelity score**   1. Compare this percentage to other time points to see if the percentage is increasing over time. |
| Percentage of programs meeting performance indicator for practitioner fidelity  *60% of programs had at least 75% of practitioners meeting fidelity on implementation of the Pyramid model.* | Need to set criteria for determining whether a program meets a performance indicator for the percentage of practitioners implementing with fidelity (e.g., 75% of practitioners within a program). | 1. Determine whether each practitioner met the threshold 2. Calculate the percentage of providers meeting the fidelity threshold for each program:   **# of practitioners from the program that met fidelity/total # of practitioners from the program with fidelity score**   1. Calculate percentage of programs where percentage of practitioners reaching fidelity is at least 75%:   **# of programs with at least 75% of practitioners reaching fidelity/total # of programs** |