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Dr. Leanne Kallemeyn
lkallemeyn@luc.edu
Lewis Tower #1122, 820 N. Michigan Ave.
(best means to contact)
Ph: 312-915-6909

Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-100</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-89</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-85</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-82</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 80</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The goals of the course are that students will be able to:
- Compare and contrast major theories of program evaluation (Conceptual Framework 1),
- Identify, read, and meta-evaluate program evaluation reports (Conceptual Framework 1),
- Develop an evaluation plan, including data collection methods (Conceptual Framework 2),
- Integrate evaluative thinking into students' personal contexts (Conceptual Framework 6), and
- Understand the ethical, political, and social aspects of program evaluation practice (Conceptual Framework 7).

IDEA Objectives for Course Evaluation
At the end of the course, you will have an opportunity to complete an Online IDEA course evaluation. The objectives from this evaluation in bold most closely align with this course, and the other objective is also important for the course.
1. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
2. Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)
3. Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course

Required Texts


Recommended Texts

Late Assignments
Due to this course having multiple assignments, including many that build on one another, I strongly discourage late submission of assignments. Additionally, late submission of your work will result in minimal feedback from me. If you need to turn in an assignment late, please do so with the understanding of these matters. As such, if a situation occurs and the need to turn in work late presents itself, it is imperative that you contact me immediately. Rubrics for all assignments are included with descriptions at the end of this syllabus.

**Participation**
Class participation is based on attendance, timeliness of assignments, and contributions to group discussion and small group activities. Meaningful contributions to discussions and activities include insightful comments, relevant examples, thought-provoking questions, and appropriate responses to the comments/questions of others. Such participation also requires students to be sensitive to their level of participation in relation to others in the class.

**Learning Community at Loyola University Chicago and School of Education**

**Academic Honesty**
Academic honesty is an expression of interpersonal justice, responsibility and care, applicable to Loyola University faculty, students, and staff, which demands that the pursuit of knowledge in the university community be carried out with sincerity and integrity. The School of Education’s Policy on Academic Integrity can be found at: [http://www.luc.edu/education/academics_policies_integrity.shtml](http://www.luc.edu/education/academics_policies_integrity.shtml). For additional academic policies and procedures refer to: [http://www.luc.edu/education/academics_policies_main.shtml](http://www.luc.edu/education/academics_policies_main.shtml)

**Accessibility**
Students who have disabilities which they believe entitle them to accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act should register with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSWD) office. To request accommodations, students must schedule an appointment with an SSWD coordinator. Students should contact SSWD at least four weeks before their first semester or term at Loyola. Returning students should schedule an appointment within the first two weeks of the semester or term. The University policy on accommodations and participation in courses is available at: [http://www.luc.edu/sswd/](http://www.luc.edu/sswd/)

**Harassment (Bias Reporting)**
It is unacceptable and a violation of university policy to harass, discriminate against or abuse any person because of his or her race, color, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religion, age or any other characteristic protected by applicable law. Such behavior threatens to destroy the environment of tolerance and mutual respect that must prevail for this university to fulfill its educational and health care mission. For this reason, every incident of harassment, discrimination or abuse undermines the aspirations and attacks the ideals of our community. The university qualifies these incidents as incidents of bias.

In order to uphold our mission of being Chicago's Jesuit Catholic University-- a diverse community seeking God in all things and working to expand knowledge in the service of humanity through learning, justice and faith, any incident(s) of bias must be reported and appropriately addressed. Therefore, the Bias Response (BR) Team was created to assist members of the Loyola University Chicago community in
Diversity
A critical skillset for being an evaluator is an awareness of one’s own values, beliefs, and biases. We will address diversity issues (gender, race, religion, ability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, methodological preferences, etc.) throughout the course in our readings and discussions as they relate to those biases and to engaging in ethical evaluation practice. In order to foster a learning community in the classroom, openness to and respect of various perspectives and backgrounds is essential.

Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework of Loyola’s School of Education is "professionalism in service of social justice." This course contributes to the realization of this framework by engaging students in the knowledge of program evaluation, skills of inquiry, and ethics necessary to be professional and just evaluators. Certain approaches to evaluation, which will be introduced in this course, also specifically aim to address social inequities.

The following is the exact wording of the School of Education’s Conceptual Framework:

The School of Education at Loyola University Chicago, a Jesuit and Catholic urban university, supports the Jesuit ideal of knowledge in the service of humanity. We endeavor to advance professional education in the service of social justice, engaged with Chicago, the nation, and the world. To achieve this vision the School of Education participates in the discovery, development, demonstration, and dissemination of professional knowledge and practice within a context of ethics, service to others, and social justice. We fulfill this mission by preparing professionals to serve as teachers, administrators, psychologists, and researchers; by conducting research on issues of professional practice and social justice; and by partnering with schools and community agencies to enhance life-long learning in the Chicago area.

Dispositions
The School of Education has three dispositions—Professionalism, Fairness, and the Belief that all students can learn—as indicators of students’ growth for different levels in their program. For Research Methodology courses, including this one, the dispositions have been defined based on professional standards (i.e., American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles, which we will be discussing in this course). Please review a complete list of the dispositions and corresponding rubric in Livetext. Your status on these dispositions are a piece of evidence considered in your overall progress in your program of study, and they also overlap with expectations for participation in the course.

Technology
In this course, we will use power point presentations as one means of reporting evaluation findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading Due</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Intro to Evaluation | Core Reading  
Russ-Eft & Preskill Ch. 1 & 2  
Small Group Reading  
| 2     | Evaluation in Organizations | Core Reading  
Russ-Eft & Preskill Ch. 3  
Small Group Reading  
| 3     | Politics and Ethics of Evaluation Practice (ONLINE) | Russ-Eft & Preskill Ch. 4  
Morris Ch. 1  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>Focusing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 5, 15 &amp; 17, Morris Ch. 2</td>
<td>Evaluation Report Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>Evaluation Design</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 6, Morris Ch. 3</td>
<td>Draft Evaluation Question(s) and Program Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 7-11, Morris Ch. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 12</td>
<td>Logic Model for Peer Review and Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRING BREAK</td>
<td>Mar. 3-8</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Relax and Rejuvinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Pragmatic Paradigm and the Use Branch</td>
<td>Core Readings</td>
<td>Small Group Readings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>Core Readings</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>Small Group Readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pragmatic Paradigm and the Use Branch</th>
<th>Core Readings</th>
<th>Small Group Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/25</td>
<td>Core Readings</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25</td>
<td>Small Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Transformative Paradigm and the Social Justice</th>
<th>Core Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>Analyzing Evaluation Data</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ONLINE)</td>
<td>Morris Ch. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15</td>
<td>Communicating and Reporting</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morris Ch. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22</td>
<td>Evaluating the Evaluation</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morris Ch. 7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29</td>
<td>FINALS</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Assignments

Week 3: Identify and write about an evaluation practice in your workplace. (5 points)
Just like professional evaluators, most of us have an avid interest in asking and answering questions about our world and assigning value to phenomenon in our everyday experience. We want to know what is happening, why it is happening, if it is beneficial, and if so, how to replicate the phenomenon. When we perform poorly on an important test, we try to understand what caused our failure to determine what might help us do better the next time. When we taste a new flavor ice cream, we want to test it and make a judgment about whether we’ll pass the bowl to our brother or ask for a second helping. This type of everyday evaluation also occurs in businesses, organizations, and establishments. Often, even without being labeled, “evaluation,” institutions and departments collect information in order to make judgments. This assignment asks you to identify one process or policy in your place of work that you think may merit being called “evaluation.” Consider the everyday workings of your organization and identify anything that you think qualifies as an evaluation or evaluative process. Review your policy manual, think about the tasks of your organization’s workgroups and committees, consider the requirements of external agencies, and the use of ANY collected information.

Your paper will be graded on the following:
- Write half a page describing your place of work. (2 pt)
- Write one page describing an evaluation or evaluative process at your place of work. (If after you cannot identify a current evaluation or evaluative process, please suggest a possible evaluation or evaluative process that should or could occur in your place of work.) (2 pt)
- Write one page describing WHY each portion or step or section or component of the evaluation is evaluative in nature. (2 pt)
- Write one page reflecting on how the steps, sections, or components might be expanded to further the usefulness of the evaluation or evaluative process, highlighting the current benefits and drawbacks. (2 pt)
- Use of proper grammar; use of headings. (2 pt)

Week 4: Evaluation Report Paper (10 points)
The purpose of this assignment is for you to identify, read, and meta-evaluate a program evaluation report. Locate an evaluation report related to your proposal for action research, as the report you select can be added to your literature review for your final project. You may want to refer to the list of evaluation organizations posted in Sakai, which often post reports on their websites. Some evaluation studies are formally published in journals. Be sure that I approve the report prior to your completion of the assignment. PLEASE UPLOAD THE REPORT IN SAKAI student pages so your colleagues can view. Your assignment will be submitted in Sakai and only read by the instructor. Write a 3 page paper regarding the evaluation report. First, your paper should briefly summarize the evaluation, including its purpose, audience, methods, findings, and other relevant aspects of evaluation as appropriate for the particular evaluation. Second, describe and critique the evaluation report based on the four branches of Evaluation (i.e. Methods, Use, Values, Social Justice). The critique of the evaluation report should be the main focus of the paper.

Your paper will be graded on the following:
- Extent to which the summary of the report appropriately refers to the evaluation’s purpose, audience, methods, and findings and demonstrates understanding of these aspects of an evaluation (2 points);
- Extent to which the critique of the evaluation report demonstrates a clear understanding of methods, use, and values in evaluation (3 points);
• Extent to which the critique appropriately relates these three concepts to the particular evaluation report (2 points); and
• Extent to which the paper is well-organized and coherently written (2 points).

**Week 5: Draft Evaluation Question(s) and Program Description Due (no points)**

For the final project in the course, you will develop an evaluation plan to evaluate a program of your choice. To complete this assignment, first meet with at least one stakeholder from the program to learn about the program and the information needs of stakeholders. Also, access as much background information as possible, such as from websites, brochures, presentations, etc. It might be that you are a stakeholder for the evaluation. If so, be sure to also meet with another stakeholder of the program.

To organize your thoughts and steps necessary to complete your evaluation and answer your question, you will use the table provided in Sakai. Fill out the first several fields in the document titled “Evaluation Plan Table Blank: Researcher Name, Evaluation Project Title, Program Name Being Evaluated, Plan Updated On, Evaluative Questions. Filling out this table will be an on-going project throughout the course and not graded until the end. You may want to reference the file “Evaluation Plan Table Sample” as an example. You should note that although your large evaluative question may be, “Does this program work?” there are several smaller more specific questions that are necessary to answer such a larger question, so please focus, focus, focus, and be as specific as possible.

Write a description of the program and your evaluation question(s). This description may include the program goals, program activities, program theory, key stakeholders, program context, evaluation purpose, and so on. As you write the description, you will also want to consider which key stakeholders will be the audience for the evaluation project and what the primary purpose of the evaluation is. Write the program description with this audience in mind. You are welcome to include tables and figures as appropriate, in addition to the text. In a later assignment, you will also have an opportunity to put your program into a logic model format (available on Sakai), which is a highly-valued, transferable skill. Since you will be sharing your work with your colleagues, be sure your writing is well-organized, using headings to help the reader, and write clearly with proper grammar out of respect for your reader. This draft will turn into an integral part of your final proposal.

**Week 7: Draft Evaluation Indicators and Sample Due (no points)**

Continue to fill in your evaluation plan table. The feedback received on the evaluative questions should be integrated and the sample and indicators needed to answer the question(s) should be added. This will be an on-going project throughout the course and not graded until the end.

**Week 9: Draft your Logic Model for Peer Review and Feedback (no points)**

The purpose of completing a logic model for this course is to assure that you have a solid theory of change that illustrates the logical relationships between the resources, activities outputs and outcomes of a program. By clarifying the relationships between the elements of the program, you will better be able to measure the relevant processes and outcomes. It will be beneficial to learn from reviewing each other’s programs and logic models. Your colleagues will be providing you with feedback and asking for clarifications so that you can continue to work on your logic model as a living document.

**Week 10: Draft Evaluation Plan Table Complete (no points)**

This assignment builds upon the feedback previously given regarding program description, evaluation question, indicators, and sampling assignment. It will also include your evaluation methods, data
sources, data collection, and analysis. Be sure to use concise, direct language and consistent easy to follow formatting, including effective use of merging rows and columns to assure understanding.

**Week 13: Draft how evaluation theory is linked to your chosen approach and methods (no points)**

Identify the evaluation theorist(s) and or approach(es) that most influence your proposed research question, methods, and analysis plan. Be creative. In about 1 page, provide your audience with a brief introduction of the theory, highlighting the explicit connections with decisions you have made in your evaluation plan. In explicitly making these connections, also contrast your decisions with other major theories that you could have integrated, but purposefully did not. Be sure to highlight which theoretical orientations your proposed project most aligns with as well as how it is being implemented in your project.

Also, using the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principals Integrity/Honesty, Respect for People, and Responsibilities for General and Social Welfare, reflect on the process of developing your evaluation plan, your role in the evaluation, and how you anticipate conducting yourself during the project. What principles in your project exemplifies good evaluation practice? Are there principles that may raise issues of concern with your evaluation? If so, what will you do to help better address these principles in your practice? Are there principles in conflict through your project (i.e., practices that support one principle result in practices that also oppose another principle)? What is your rationale for which principles you compromise in your evaluation practice? In approximately one page, highlight your main considerations for these questions.

**Week 14 and 15: Power Point Project: Legitimize evaluation in your context (10 points)**

You may have identified that your organization as a whole or individuals within your organization are less than enthusiastic about “evaluation” as a concept and the evaluative process as experienced. Some may find “evaluation” as a term and concept to be intimidating. Others may find it to be too time consuming and unrelated to the purpose of their everyday work. Others simply view “evaluation” to be nothing more than an audit by “big brother.” This assignment asks you to consider how you might legitimize “evaluation” and evaluative processes to those in your context. Think of this Power Point presentation as apologetics for evaluation. Based on your PPT, you will provide a 5-10 minute presentation to the class.

- Consider the arguments against evaluation and evaluation processes that individuals within your context might bring up when evaluation is proposed. (2 pt)
- Identify the context and audience of your presentation. (2 pt)
- Clearly state the goals and objectives of the presentation. (2 pt)
- Communicate your arguments legitimizing evaluation in a convincing manner. (2 pt)
- Develop a Power Point presentation that is attractive in style and format. (1 pt)
- Properly cite any sources used. (1 pt)

**Week 16: Final Complete Evaluation Plan with Narrative and tools submitted on Live Text (60 points)**

For this final assignment, you will accompany your completed evaluation plan table with a written narrative explanation of your completed plan table. The narrative should include all previous work on your program description, evaluation questions, link to evaluation theory, design, planned format for reporting findings, management plan, and so on, keeping in mind your stated purposes and feedback from previous assignments. Also include electronic versions the tools for collecting the data utilizing your data based on your evaluation plan. The database in which you will enter your collected data should be prepared, explained, presented, and included as well.

- Description of the program you are evaluating and its context (4 pt)
• Logic model (3pt)
• Key stakeholders (4pt)
• Theoretical approach to evaluation (4pt)
• Evaluation purposes (4pt)
• Evaluation question(s) (4pt)
• Design (4pt)
• Data collection methods and procedures (4pt)
• Data sources (3pt)
• Sampling (3pt)
• Analysis procedures (3pt)
• Indicators; Interpretation procedures and criteria (4pt)
• Communication and reporting plan (4pt)
• Management plan (3pt)
• Electronic version of tools (3pt)
• Electronic version of database (3pt)
• Written for intended audience with Concise, direct language throughout narrative and consistent easy to follow formatting, using proper APA headings that elaborates on the table (3pt)