Educational Evaluation
RMTD 406

Dr. Tania Rempert
trempert@luc.edu
Lewis Tower #1124, 820 N. Michigan Ave.
(best means to contact) Office Hours by appointment only
Ph: 708-404-0559

Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-100</td>
<td>A Evaluation practice in workplace.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94</td>
<td>A- Evaluation Report Paper</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-89</td>
<td>B+ PP of your theory approach and methods</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-85</td>
<td>B PP Legitimizing evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-82</td>
<td>B- Final Complete Evaluation Plan</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 80</td>
<td>C Participation</td>
<td>26</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

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.
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.

Technology
In this course, we will use power point presentations as one means of reporting evaluation findings, as well as a variety of tools to facilitate online learning. You are required to have access to (at least) a DSL Internet connection and Loyola Email Account with reliable access. You are required to be familiar with downloading and attaching files. Including creating and open a Zip File. You must also have access to Microsoft Word, Microsoft Excel, Microsoft PowerPoint. Additionally, you must have access to the following Software – All are available for free download if needed this semester: Adobe Flash Player, Adobe Reader, Adobe Shockwave, Java Software, QuickTime, RealPlayer.

In addition to hardware access and software utilization, the following represent factors that facilitate a productive and effective online learning experience. (Material adapted from the University of Wisconsin Online website on Online Etiquette. http://online.uwc.edu/technology/Etiquette.asp)

• Tone down your language. Given the absence of face-to-face clues, written text can easily be misinterpreted. Avoid the use of strong or offensive language and the excessive use of exclamation points. If you feel particularly strongly about a point, it may be best to write it first as a draft and then to review it, before posting it, in order to remove any strong language.

• Keep a straight face. In general, avoid humor and sarcasm. These frequently depend either on facial or tone of voice cues absent in text communication or on familiarity with the reader.

• Be forgiving. If someone states something that you find offensive, mention this directly to the instructor. Remember that the person contributing to the discussion is also new to this form of communication. What you find offensive may quite possibly have been unintended and can best be cleared up by the instructor.

• The recorder is on. Think carefully about the content of your message before contributing it. Once sent to the group, there is no taking it back. Also, although the grammar and spelling of a message typically are not graded, they do reflect on you; your audience might not be able to decode misspelled words or poorly constructed sentences. It is a good practice to compose and check your comments in a word-processor before posting them.

• Test for clarity. Messages might often appear perfectly clear to you as you compose them, but turn out to be perfectly obtuse to your reader. One way to test for clarity is to read your message aloud to see if it flows smoothly. If you can read it to another person before posting it, then even better.

• Netspeak. Although electronic communication is still young, many conventions have already been established. DO NOT TYPE IN ALL CAPS. This is regarded as shouting and is out of place in a classroom. Acronyms and emoticons (arrangements of symbols to express emotions) are popular, but excessive use of them can make your message difficult to read.
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 bringing incidents of bias to the attention of the university. If you believe you are subject to such bias, you should notify the Bias Response Team at this link: [http://webapps.luc.edu/biasreporting/](http://webapps.luc.edu/biasreporting/)

**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.*

**Class Participation Policies:**
To achieve full benefit of participation, this course requires approximately 8 hours per week. This time is mainly spent reading course materials, viewing online presentations, communicating with colleagues via e-mail and course forums, and completing assignments. Inability to meet this time requirement will reduce a participant’s benefit from the course, or, in some cases, fulfillment of assignments needed to complete and receive credit for the course. I have designed the course to require that a student login to the course at least 2 times per week. Failure to meet this minimum requirement will result in a reduction of grade. Class participation in course forum discussions and replies is equal to 2 points per week. You will be expected to contribute actively to the class discussions, at times agreeing with colleagues and adding complementary arguments, and at other times disagreeing with colleagues and providing a rationale for doing so. I seek a lively class where arguments and ideas are presented and debated. It is important that we all remain respectful of each other’s views and offer constructive criticisms when disagreeing with a colleague.

In order to earn class participation points, each student should write AT LEAST one original Discussion posting and AT LEAST one Reply posting per week when Discussions and Replies are called for in the coursework schedule (see below). The purpose of writing a Discussion is to have you think more deeply about the readings, and to kick-start class interactions. **Your Discussion is NOT a summary of the readings. It is your own reflection of the readings or of the instructor’s lesson. Discussions are typically one or two paragraphs in length. At the end of each Discussion, please provide either issues that you would like others to discuss or specific questions that we could discuss which would clarify, elucidate, or extend the readings. The purpose of writing Reply postings is to respond to your colleagues’ ideas.**

Discussion postings are to be made on the course website by Friday at 5pm of that week with Reply postings concluding by Sunday at 5pm. This deadline allows us all enough time to read the postings before moving onto the next week’s topic, at which time the newly assigned readings will be the topic of class Discussion and Reply postings. Feel free to begin posting Discussions and Replies during the week when you are reading the assignments.

When you post, to prevent random thoughts without a coherent thread, it helps to take a position (e.g., this was interesting because; I disagree with this because; this was difficult for me to read because, etc...) and to defend it based on other evidence or your personal experiences. It will also help the flow of class interactions if you title your Discussion posts with a short descriptive title that will help me and your colleagues distinguish your thread from another. Likewise, to help the flow of class interactions, when you Reply with a point that extends upon another person’s Discussion posting, please reply to the original post, keeping the same title, rather than starting a new thread.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading Due</th>
<th>Assignment Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Intro to Evaluation | Russ-Eft & Preskill Ch. 1 & 2  
| 2     | Evaluation in Organizations | Russ-Eft & Preskill Ch. 3  
Preskill, H., & Torres, R. (1999). Building capacity for organizational learning through evaluative inquiry. *Evaluation, 5*(1), 42—60. | Upload proposal for your action research project & Bring over their home pages to this course website |
| 3     | Politics and Ethics of Evaluation Practice | Russ-Eft & Preskill Ch. 4  
Morris Ch. 1  
Post Discussion and Reply |
| 4     | Focusing the Evaluation | Russ-Eft & Preskill Ch. 5, 15 & 17  
Morris Ch. 2 | Evaluation Report Paper  
Post Discussion and Reply |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/2/10</td>
<td>Evaluation Design</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 6</td>
<td>Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morris Ch. 3</td>
<td>Research Question and Program Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Discussion and Reply e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/17</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 7-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morris Ch. 4</td>
<td>Post Discussion and Reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/24</td>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 12</td>
<td>Draft Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators and Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Discussion and Reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SPRING BREAK Mar. 3-8</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Relax and Rejuvinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Methods Branch</td>
<td>statement on evaluation.</td>
<td>Peer Review and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Educational</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research, 35, 492-501.</td>
<td>Provide feedback to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theory-based evaluation: Past, present, and future. In Mathison, S., New Directions for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Paradigm and the Branch</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Reading Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>Analyzing Evaluation Data</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 13 Morris Ch. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>Communicating and Reporting</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 14 Morris Ch. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4/21</td>
<td>Evaluating the Evaluation</td>
<td>Russ-Eft &amp; Preskill Ch. 16 Morris Ch. 7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4/28</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Final Complete Evaluation Plan with Narrative and tools submitted on Live Text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Assignments

Week 2: Upload proposal for your action research project & Bring over your home page to this course website. (no points)
I am interested in directly linking the content of this course to your action research projects into which you have already put so much time and effort. Toward this end, I would like to become familiar with the direction of your work as soon as possible. The rest of the assignments in this course will be directly linked to making this proposal into a reality. This first assignment is not graded, but rather marked as complete.

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. (1 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.) (1 pt)
• Write one page describing WHY each portion or step or section or component of the evaluation is evaluative in nature. (1 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. (1 pt)
• Use of proper grammar use of headings. (1 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. Be sure that I approve the report prior to your completion of the assignment. Possible sources for evaluation studies/reports include: Journals in which you may find evaluation articles:
• Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis
Examples of Evaluation Organizations that may have evaluation reports available for you:
- Western Michigan Evaluation Center
- Mathematica
- WestEd
- RAND Corporation
- SRI International
- Education Matters
- McREL
- Chicago Public Schools, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment

PLEASE UPLOAD THE REPORT IN SAKAI forums 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 (3 points); and
- Extent to which the paper is well-organized and coherently written (2 points).

Week 5: Draft Research Question and Program Description Due (no points)
In this class, you will develop an evaluation plan to satisfy your action-research requirement for this degree program. You likely have already worked on this with your advisor during fall semester, but this will be an opportunity to further refine and start your research plan through the use of a table (as provided in Sakai) to organize your thoughts and steps necessary to complete your research and answer your question. Fill out the first several fields in the document titled “Evaluation Plan Table_ Blank”: Researcher Name, Action Research 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 like 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 action research question you have chosen for your action research project. This description may include the program goals, program activities, program theory,
key stakeholders, program context, and so on. As you write the description, you may also want to consider which key stakeholders will be the audience for the evaluation/action research project. 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)**

Make corrections and updates based on feedback received on your week 5 assignment. 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 ongoing project throughout the course and not graded until the end.

**Week 9: Post 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 11: Develop a Power Point Presentation that highlights how evaluation theory is explicitly linked to your chosen approach and methods. (12 points)**

Identify the evaluation theorist(s) and or approach(es) that most influence your proposed research question, methods, and analysis plan. Be creative. Using no more than 10 slides, prepare a Power Point Presentation that includes a brief introduction of the theory, highlighting the explicit connections with decisions you have made in your own action-research project. 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. 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 action research 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? Your presentation will be graded on the following:
• Extent to which the presentation accurately represents the theorists’ main ideas and contributions to the field of evaluation (2 points),
• Extent to which the presentation is creatively and effectively organized and communicated (2 points), and
• Extent to which the connection between theory and research decisions (2 points).
• Extent to which presentation describes why contrasting approaches were not included (2 points).
• Extent to which the presentation clearly demonstrates the student is able to integrate the AEA guiding principles into their professional decision-making of evaluation practice. (2 points)
• Extent to which the paper clearly demonstrates the student is able to integrate the AEA guiding principles into the moral and ethical decisions of their evaluation practice. (2 points)

**Week 14: Power Point Project: Legitimize evaluation in your context (7 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.

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

**Week 16: Final Complete Evaluation Plan with Narrative and tools submitted on Live Text (40 points)**
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, question, theory, approach, presentation of variables, levels of measurement, analysis techniques, and planned format for reporting findings, 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.

• Concise, direct language throughout narrative and consistent easy to follow formatting, using proper APA headings in narrative and effective use of merging rows and columns on evaluation table to assure clear understanding. (10 points)
• Program description / logic model (2 points), identification of stakeholders and purpose of evaluation is clear (2 points), evaluation question (2 points), indicators (2 points), and sampling / assignment (2 points) evaluation methods (2 points), data sources (2 points), data collection (2 points), and analysis (2 points).
• Narrative including presentation of variables, levels of measurement, analysis techniques, and format of findings, keeping in mind your stated audience (7 points)
• Electronic versions of your tools and database (5 points)