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Intermountain STEM is a network of STEM educators and leaders across six states working to support STEM equity at key transition points (middle school to high school and high school to college)

https://napequity.org/stem/stem-equity-project/imstem/
We framed our evaluation design around the 5 core conditions of collective impact.


Designed survey and interview protocols around 5 core conditions of collective impact

Wilder Collaborative Factors Inventory (WCFI)

Collaboration Assessment Tool (CAT)

- Mapped WCFI & CAT onto CI framework and decided which items to include on our survey
- Reported evaluation findings by each CI element

Developed set of early performance indicators with project team

### IM STEM Project Metrics (Sources)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Metrics (Evidence outcomes have been achieved or will be achieved)</th>
<th>Source of Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Steering Committee members are actively involved in IM STEM effort | • Steering Committee members attend meetings regularly (at least 75% of meetings) and are engaged in working groups  
• Steering Committee meetings are attended by at least one representative from each IM STEM state  
• Evidence of network building (e.g., communication that occurs directly between states outside of formal IM STEM meetings)  
• Working Groups produce tangible products (e.g., asset maps)  
• Steering Committee members engage (potential) new members to join the IM STEM Network | • Steering Committee meeting notes  
• Year 2 Survey  
• Year 3 Survey  
• Review docs in IM STEM Google Drive |
| IM STEM states regularly share data to monitor progress in closing equity gaps (Metrics, Data Collection and Reporting) | • A set of common metrics developed for identifying gaps in STEM participation and achievement at each critical juncture  
• A pilot dashboard has been created for one IM STEM state using Perkins data  
• Determine the feasibility of developing a common data dashboard developed for continuous monitoring and annual updating  
• State data contacts report IM STEM has provided a value-add in the process for conducting a gap analysis for Perkins state planning | • Year 2 Survey  
• Review Working Group meeting notes (work in progress)  
• Interview PI during monthly evaluation check-in  
• Interview with ID data contact, Heather Lachter  
• N/A during timeframe of evaluation  
• Tent.: Evaluator attends Working Group meeting |
| IM STEM Network is growing and engaged (Outreach and Communications Workgroup) | • Attendance at Network meetings  
• Number and affiliations of State Network members  
• Social media metrics (Twitter, LinkedIn)  
• Newsletter recipients open links included in IM STEM Network newsletter | • Review Working Group meeting notes  
• IM STEM Network meeting notes  
• IM STEM Network meeting notes  
• Internal project tracking [evaluation will not report]  
• Internal project tracking [evaluation will not report] |
| IM STEM has influenced implementation of best practices effective | • A rubric has been created that helps administrators, funders and others evaluate STEM-related programs or organizations to determine the degree to which it is inclusive and supports access and success for students who historically have not engaged in STEM | • Year 2 Survey  
• Review Working Group meeting notes  
• Review docs in IM STEM Google Drive  
• Informal, short “survey” at Leadership Summit workshop session on rubric (asking for feedback, expected uses, etc.) |
Reflections of a shoestring evaluator

• Challenge to **balance desire** to conduct developmental evaluation, collect and analyze qualitative data, and provide rich contextual description **with realities of budget**

• Tough decisions about **what to include and exclude**

• Use or adapt **existing tools** measuring collaborations

• Share role of collecting data with project team (**“Shared Measurement”**


Look for an *upcoming article* on NAPE’s website later this year about what we learned using a collective impact approach for a multi-state effort (https://napequity.org/)