Program Evaluation for Educational Leaders
EDLD 732: Syllabus
Western Kentucky University
Summer 2022 (CRN 41530)
June 6 – July 22
(reserve the right to make changes that will reflect on the class Website)
<mark>**CLASS F2F Days 9:00am – 2:00pm (GRH 1002)**</mark>
<mark>**June 11; June 25; July 9**</mark>

General information
Instructor: Lester A. C. Archer, Ph.D.
Office: Gary Ransdell Hall 3078
Office hours: By appointment
Email: lester.archer@wku.edu
Phone: 270-745-7088

Course Description: Program evaluation theory, methods, and practices with a focus on the practical craft of evaluation research; discussion of theoretical and strategic issues of program evaluation; application of quantitative and qualitative research methods to program evaluation contexts.

Course Overview: This course serves as an introduction to program evaluation theory, methods and practices. Educators, policy makers, organizational leaders and stakeholders have an interest in understanding how programs work and how they succeed or fail. Program evaluation is the process through which one gains this understanding. You will become familiar with the concepts, methods, and applications of evaluation research; learn how to read evaluation research critically; understand how to use evaluation results to anticipate or improve program performance; and be able to propose an appropriate evaluation plan to assess the implementation and effectiveness of a program. The primary focus of the course is the **practical craft of evaluation research**. The emphasis is on *knowledge about*, as well as the *how to* of, conducting and using program evaluation. This course will use a **problem-based team learning approach**. <mark>You will need to settle quickly on a program you are interested in evaluating in this course so that you can use it as the context for your thinking about the course content.</mark> Evaluation planning, design, and data collection methods will be the core of the course. You will recognize and be able to apply a variety of methodological tools (quantitative, qualitative, and/or mixed methods) to understanding complex evaluation research questions through reading, discussion, application, and hands-on experience developing a "real" evaluation proposal.

Prerequisites: This course is designed to build on research methods and statistics classes that students have completed. Prerequisite courses are Educational Statistics (EDFN 501) or the equivalent and Survey Methods for Educational Leaders (EDLD 722).

Course Objectives: Upon completion of this course, you will be able to:

1. Describe evaluation purposes, uses, key stakeholders and their needs.
2. Formulate meaningful evaluation research questions
3. Develop a program evaluation plan to address these questions effectively.
4. Apply a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods in evaluation research.
5. Select or develop appropriate measurement tools.
6. Report, use, and evaluate evaluation information.
7. Identify, social, political, and cultural issues confronted by program evaluators.

Required Textbooks:

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019). *Program evaluation theory and practice: A comprehensive Guide (2ⁿᵈ ed)*. Guilford Press.

Christie, C. A., Inkelas, M., & Lemire, S. (2017). *Improvement science in evaluation: Methods and uses.* Jossey-Bass. (ISBN 978-1-1193-7866-2)

Textbooks you can consult (optional):

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Rossi, P., Freeman, H., & Lipsey, M. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Sage.

Software: You should have access to software for data analysis. Such software includes STATA, SPSS, etc. which you should have on your own computer. Even though software is available in labs on campus, you may need to use this software to finish an assignment in this course and to analyze your own dissertation data later.

REQUIRED READINGS

Note: General Readings come from the required textbook(s). *Supplemental* readings are posted on Blackboard. See Blackboard for more information.

UNIT 1: Syllabus Review and Course Overview

General Readings

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019).	Chapters 1-4
Christie, C. A., Inkelas, M., & Lemire, S. (2017).	Chapters 1 & 2

Evaluability Assessment

Astbury, B., & Leeuw, F. L. (2010). Unpacking black boxes: Mechanisms and theory building in evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *31*(3), 363-381.

Rogers, P. J., Petrosino, A., Huebner, T. A., & Hacsi, T. A. (2000). Program theory evaluation: Practice, promise, and problems. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *2000*(87), 5-13.

Program Theory and Logic Model

Alkin, M. C., & Christie, C. A. (2004). An evaluation theory tree. *Evaluation roots: Tracing theorists' views and influences*, 12-65.

McLaughlin, J. A., & Jordan, G. B. (1999). Logic models: A tool for telling your program performance story. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *22*, 65–72.

AEA Evaluator Competencies
       https://www.eval.org/About/Competencies-Standards/AEA-Evaluator-Competencies

UNIT 2: Evaluation Planning

General Readings

        Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019).   Chapters 5-8

        Christie, C. A., Inkelas, M., & Lemire, S. (2017).   Chapters 3 & 4

Evaluation Model

        Hansen, H. F. (2005). Choosing evaluation models. *Evaluation, 11,* 447-462.

Needs Assessment

Lorig, K. R., Sobel, D. S., Stewart, A. L., Brown Jr, B. W., Bandura, A., Ritter, P., ... & Holman, H. R. (1999). Evidence suggesting that a chronic disease self-management program can improve health status while reducing hospitalization: A randomized trial. *Medical Care*, 5-14.

Implementation Evaluation and Fidelity

Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *41*, 327-350.

Young, D. R., Steckler, A., Cohen, S., Pratt, C., Felton, G., Moe, S. G., Pickrel, J., Johnson, C. C., Grieser, M., Lytle, L. A., Lee, J. S., Raburn, B. (2008). Process evaluation results from a school- and community-linked intervention: The Trial of Activity for Adolescent Girls (TAAG), *Health Education Research*, 23 (6), 976–986, https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyn029

Ward, D. S., Saunders, R., Felton, G. M., Williams, E., Epping, J. N., & Pate, R. R. (2006). Implementation of a school environment intervention to increase physical activity in high school girls. *Health Education Research*, *21*(6), 896-910. *https://academic.oup.com/her/article/21/6/896/610229*

Impact Evaluation and Experiment/Quasi-experiment Designs

Moss, B. G., & Yeaton, W. H. (2006). Shaping policies related to developmental education: An evaluation using the regression---discontinuity design. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 28*(3), 215--229.

UNIT 3: Data Collection, Analysis, and Interpretation

General Readings

        Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019).   Chapters 9-12

        Christie, C. A., Inkelas, M., & Lemire, S. (2017).   Chapters 5 & 6

Quantitative Methods

        Houchens, G. W., Zhang, J., Davis, K., Niu, C., Chon, K. H., & Miller, S. (2017). The impact

of positive behavior interventions and supports on teachers' perceptions of teaching conditions and student achievement. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *19*(3), 168-179.

Weiland, C., & Yoshikawa, H. (2013). Impacts of a prekindergarten program on children's mathematics, language, literacy, executive function, and emotional skills. *Child Development, 84,* 2112-2130.

Qualitative & Mixed Methods

Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*(2), 237-246.

Sturges, K. M., & Howley, C. (2017). Responsive meta-evaluation: A participatory approach to enhancing evaluation quality. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *38*(1), 126-137.

UNIT 4: Reporting, Use, and Issues

General Readings

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019).   Chapters 13-15
Christie, C. A., Inkelas, M., & Lemire, S. (2017).   Chapters 7

Evaluation Standards and Guiding Principles

Forss, K., Rebien, C. C., & Carlsson, J. (2002). Process use of evaluations: Types of use that precede lessons learned and feedback. *Evaluation, 8*(1), 29-45.

Henry, G. T., & Mark, M. M. (2003). Beyond use: Understanding evaluation's influence on attitudes and actions. *American Journal of Evaluation, 24,* 293-314.

American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators: http://www.eval.org/About/Guiding-Principles

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation: http://www.jcsee.org/program-evaluation-standards-statements

Meta-evaluation and Contracting

Cooksy, L., J., & Caracelli, V. J. (2005). Quality, context, and use: Issues in achieving the goals Of meta-evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*(1), 31-42.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000). Lessons in contracting for evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation, 21,* 293-314.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation checklists: Practical tools for guiding and judging evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *22*(1), 71-79.

COURSE STRUCTURE AND REQUIREMENTS

The class is designed to provide opportunities for problem-solving and applying basic research tools and methods to program evaluation. Class sessions include *case studies, reflections, and presentations*.

Class preparation and participation are extremely important. All reading materials are designed to help you understand, conduct, use, and critique program evaluation. It is your responsibility *to finish the required readings* and to participate in class activities.

In addition, each student will:
1) conduct an evaluation proposal project,
2) write a critical review of a published program evaluation

Part I. Class Participation

You will be evaluated on the extent that you actively participate in discussions. Each group/individual will make an oral presentation of the final evaluation project. The final presentation will be evaluated by *your peers*. (we will work on how to coordinate this)

Part II. Program Evaluation Proposal Project

The class will require you to make steps towards evaluation of a program. Evaluation work "in the real world" is very often done in teams and the effectiveness of team learning is maximized when the group dynamics are well balanced. Clear communication among group members and competent completion of agreed upon responsibilities by each group member are crucial. The evaluation proposal project is divided into steps. You will submit one assignment for each step but keep as a continuous document because at the end you will have the steps leading up to doing an actual evaluation.

Assignment 1: Program Description (Due: June 16)
Students will submit a short description of a selected program (no more than 6 pages), including relevant history, policy and program context, stated program goals, core program activities and materials, evaluation purposes and uses, key stakeholders and needs, and key evaluation questions. The program description should also include a scholarly review of the literature relevant for the project. A minimum of *four* **empirical references** should be included. The purpose of this assignment is to settle on a program and demonstrate your understanding of program theory and relevant literature. You will need to settle on a program quickly.

Assignment 2: Initial Evaluation Plan: Design and Methods (Due: June 27)
Using the program description developed in the first assignment, you will present your program logic model (as an Appendix), the approach to be used for overall evaluation, and overall evaluation design and methods. You will also finalize evaluation purposes and audiences and key evaluation questions in the first draft of evaluation plan. Within the overall evaluation approach established for the project, you will present in some detail the specific design and methods that appropriately address the evaluation questions. Justify your methodological decisions. Also, you may wish to add an expected budget for your evaluation.

Assignment 3: Data Analysis Report (Due: July 8)
This assignment will supplement your evaluation proposal with real opportunities to practice data analysis and interpretation. Because full data collection is not expected because of the limited time for this course, quantitative and qualitative data will be needed to perform data analysis and write a brief report. *You can use existing datasets from your program upon instructor's approval.* Data analysis reports should include brief introduction, purpose, research questions, data sources, data analysis

procedures (appropriate statistical techniques), results (descriptive tables and graphs, ==and, if possible and depending on your questions, inferential statistics==), and brief interpretations. A logic model is expected.

Note that at this stage of the doctoral study, many students are still confused about when to use what statistical procedures to perform meaningful data analysis simply because they lack practice. This advanced course is built on the statistics knowledge and SPSS experiences you have gained earlier. ==If you are not familiar with the basic statistical terms (e.g., hypothesis testing, significance level) and procedures (e.g., t test, one-way ANOVA, correlation), you will find it hard to finish this assignment. In that case, it is your responsibility to shore up your skills in order to make an adequate contribution to this group assignment.==

Assignment 4: Final Evaluation Proposal (Due: Final presentation—July 22; final write-up July 22)
==Full data collection is not expected because of limited time for this course.== This component of the program evaluation proposal will require students to refine the evaluation design and present details on data collection, analysis plan, and interpretation methods. Include your sample, sampling procedure, instruments (surveys, tests, interview, and observation protocols), administration procedures, and timeline that you will use to gather your data. If there are existing data, describe how you will utilize them in your evaluation. Discuss limitations and justify anticipated evaluation uses and the criteria for making judgments of data quality.

> **Note:** ==The descriptions above are not sufficient to complete the assignments adequately. Write well and make the effort to have a high-quality document.==

Part III. Critical Review Paper (==Due: July 22==)

It is important to become a good consumer of evaluations, if not a good evaluator oneself. This critical review paper requires each student to select, summarize, and critically evaluate a published evaluation report relevant to the course content and your research interest. The selected article must be an empirical evaluation study and appear in reputable scholarly peer--- review journals. The final product must be a paper ==(no more than 5 double spaced pages)== addressing the purpose of evaluation, the adequacy of the evaluation plan design, the soundness of results, implications for the stakeholders, and suggestions for evaluation.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND GRADING

Assignments	Points
Class Participation (3 x 10)	30
☐ Journals (4 x 20)	80
☐ Final project presentation	20
Program Evaluation Project ☐ Assignment 1: Program Description (25 pts) ☐ Assignment 2: Initial Evaluation Plan (25 pts) ☐ Assignment 3: Data Analysis Report (25 pts) ☐ Assignment 4: Final Evaluation Proposal (25 pts)	100
Critical Review Paper	50
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	*280*

Grading Scale: A = 90%+; B = 80–89%; C = 70–79%; D = 60–69%; F = Below 60%

Evaluation Project

<mark>Turn in one version of each assignment and, if you work with a team, every member will receive the same grade.</mark> Make sure your contributions cover the entire evaluation process rather than just concentrate on one small part of it. Each team member has responsibility for monitoring the ongoing effort and participation of every other participant in the group. At the end of the project, you will be asked to sign a group statement that you participated and contributed actively and that each team member participated and contributed actively.

Grading criteria for the project include content of the evaluation plan (clear project description and evaluation purposes, identification of stakeholders, well developed evaluation questions, justification of the evaluation approach, data collection and analysis plan, and discussion of how findings might be used), quality of writing, quality of data sources (empirical investigations), and <mark>APA 7th edition format</mark>.

Critical Review Paper

The critical summary of a published program evaluation should include these components (among others): purpose of the evaluation, the adequacy of the evaluation design, data collection, results, implications for the evaluation stakeholders, and suggestions for improving the evaluation. (2 to 5 pages)

EXPECTATIONS

Participation – Students are expected to actively participate in class discussions, activities, and presentations.

Attendance – We meet infrequently; however, you are expected to meet the deadlines and contribute to the class as expected for a doctoral level student.

Late assignments – Note this is a collaborative project with very tight timelines; late work will NOT be accepted without penalty. Program evaluators often work on very strict timelines because projects are funded by federal or other grant agencies that dictate reporting deadlines. Missing deadlines can mean losing your funding (or in this case affecting your grade).

Written products – Written products should be typed and follow APA American Psychological Association 7th edition formatting.

Plagiarism (Important) – It is expected that each student will do his/her own work. Academic dishonesty, including any form of plagiarism or cheating will not be tolerated. Be advised that student work may be checked using plagiarism detecting software.

STUDENT POLICIES

The following sections are taken from the WKU's Faculty Handbook<mark>: http://www.wku.edu/acaemicaffairs</mark>

Plagiarism: To represent ideas or interpretations taken from another source as one's own is plagiarism. Plagiarism is a serious offense. The academic work of a student must be his or her own. One must give the author(s) credit for any source material used. To lift content directly from a source without giving credit is a flagrant act. To present a borrowed passage after having changed a few words, even if the source is referenced, is also plagiarism.

Cheating: No student shall receive or give assistance not authorized by the instructor in taking an examination or in the preparation of an essay, laboratory report, problem assignment, or other project, which is submitted for purposes of grade determination.

Disposition of Offenses: Students who commit any act of academic dishonesty may receive from the instructor a failing grade in that portion of the course work in which the act is detected or a failing grade in the course without possibility of withdrawal. The faculty member may also present the case to the University Disciplinary Committee through the Office of the Dean of Student Life for disciplinary sanctions. A student who believes a faculty member has dealt unfairly with him/her in a course involving academic dishonesty may seek relief through the Student Complaint Procedure.

Other Types of Academic Dishonesty: Other types of academic offenses, such as the theft or sale of tests, should be reported to the Office of the Dean of Student Life for disciplinary action.

Accommodation of Disabilities: In compliance with University policy, students with disabilities who require academic and/or auxiliary accommodations for this course must contact the Student Accessibility Resource Center located in Downing Student Union, 1074. SARC can be reached by phone number at 270-745-5004 [270-745-3030 TTY] or via email at sarc.connect@wku.edu . Please do not request accommodations directly from the professor or instructor without a faculty notification letter (FNL) from The Student Accessibility Resource Center.

Affirmative Action: Western Kentucky University (WKU) is committed to supporting faculty, staff and students by upholding WKU's Title IX Sexual Misconduct/Assault Policy (#0.2070) at https://wku.edu/eoo/documents/titleix/wkutitleixpolicyandgrievanceprocedure.pdf and Discrimination and Harassment Policy (#0.2040) at https://wku.edu/policies/hr_policies/2040_discrimination_harassment_policy.pdf. Under these policies, discrimination, harassment and/or sexual misconduct based on sex/gender are prohibited. If you experience an incident of sex/gender-based discrimination, harassment and/or sexual misconduct, you are encouraged to report it to the Title IX Coordinator, Andrea Anderson, 270-745-5398 or Title IX Investigators, Michael Crowe, 270-745-5429 or Joshua Hayes, 270-745-5121.Please note that while you may report an incident of sex/gender based discrimination, harassment and/or sexual misconduct to a faculty member, WKU faculty are "Responsible Employees" of the University and MUST report what you share to WKU's Title IX Coordinator or Title IX Investigator. If you would like to speak with someone who may be able to afford you confidentiality, you may contact WKU's Counseling and Testing Center at 270-745-3159.

A FEW LAST ITEMS

Course Adjustments: The instructor reserves the right to modify the course requirements, schedule, and syllabus. The syllabus and schedule for this course are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances. No change will occur, however, *unless* proper and prior notice is given to students.

(this syllabus sourced from M. Foraker and last edited: May 23, 2022 by Lester A. C. Archer)

Date	General Topics	Readings
Module 1	**NTRODUCTORY TOPICS** ☐ What is evaluation? ☐ How to describe the program? ☐ How to identify stakeholders and their needs? ☐ How to determine evaluation purpose and uses? ☐ How to formulate key evaluation questions? ☐Program theory and logic model	• Mertens & Wilson ch 1- 4 • Christie et al. 1 & 2 • Astbury & Leeuw • Rogers, et al. • Alkin & Christie • McLaughlin & Jordan • **AEA Evaluator Competencies**
Module 2	**EVALUATION PLANNING AND DESIGN** ☐ What are major approaches to program evaluation? ☐ How to choose an appropriate evaluation approach and initial design, with consideration of the evaluation standards? ☐ Needs assessment, process and implementation evaluation, outcome and impact evaluation ☐ How to choose or develop quantitative evaluation designs (experiment, quasi-experiment)? ☐ What other design options are available for evaluation (survey research, qualitative, mixed method)?	• Mertens Ch 5 – 8 • Christie et al. 3 & 4 • Hansen • Lorig, et al. • Durlak & DuPre • Young et al. • Ward et al. • Moss & Yeaton
Module 3	**DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION** ☐ How to select and develop data collection methods and instruments? ☐ How to design sampling strategies ☐ How to analyze and interpret quantitative data ☐ How to code, analyze and interpret qualitative data	• Mertens Ch 9 - 12 • Christie et al. 5 & 6 • Houchens et al. • Weiland & Yoshikawa • Thomas • Sturges & Howley
Module 4	**REPORTING, USE, AND ISSUES** ☐ What guidelines can help educational leaders improve reporting and use of evaluation results? ☐ What value issues are central regarding evaluation for decision making and leadership? ☐ How to evaluate evaluation research?	• Mertens 13, 14, & 15 • Christie et al. 7 • Forss et al. • Henry & Mark • American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators • Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation • Cooksy & Caracelli • Stufflebeam (2001, 2002)
	Critical Review Paper	