Course Overview

This course provides students with an overview of program evaluation, particularly as it relates to the field of education. Throughout the course, students will be able to practice program evaluation. These practices include determining which evaluation approach to use in a given context, developing an evaluation plan, identifying the various roles of the evaluator, understanding the social and political dynamics of an evaluation context, generating and collecting data, establishing reporting processes, and considering the ethical issues surrounding the role of the evaluator. Students will also be introduced to major evaluation theorists and theories, given the historical development of program evaluation within the social sciences.

The goals of the course are that students will be able to:

- Identify, read, and meta-evaluate program evaluation reports (Conceptual Framework 1),
- Carry out an evaluation, including working with stakeholders, identifying the evaluation purpose(s) and question(s), designing the evaluation and data collection tools, analyzing evidence, and communicating findings (Conceptual Framework 2)
- 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 that most closely align with this course include:

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


Additional readings will be posted on Sakai.

Recommended Texts

Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-100</td>
<td>Evaluation Practice Paper</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94</td>
<td>Evaluation Report Paper</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-89</td>
<td>Case Scenario Discussion</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-85</td>
<td>Legitimize Evaluation Presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-82</td>
<td>Final Evaluation Practice Project</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 80</td>
<td>Class participation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOLD indicates group assignments

Class participation is based on the rubric assessment for dispositions, which is included at the end of the syllabus. A point for class participation will be allocated for the following: timeliness, timeliness of assignments, attendance, accountability, collegiality, integrity/honesty, interpersonal integrity/honesty, social equity, respectful communication, and respect for persons. Refer to the section on dispositions at the end of the syllabus for the rubric.

Late assignments: I strongly discourage turning in assignments after the due date. Given how assignments build on one another in the course, turning in assignments late will hinder progress in the course. I will accept late assignments and do not reduce points for late assignments, but I will provide less feedback and will not as rapidly return your graded assignment to you. If you know in advance that you will be gone when an assignment is due, please plan ahead and submit it early. If you have an unexpected personal circumstance, please talk to me about your concerns with completing course obligations.
RMTD 406 Course Schedule with Readings & Assignments

**Week 1: Introduction to Evaluation (Jan. 15)**


**Week 2: Working with Stakeholders (Jan. 22)**


*Evaluation Practice Paper DUE*

**Week 3: Evaluation Purposes, Types, and Questions (Jan. 29)**

**Required Readings**


**Recommended Readings**


*Evaluation Report Paper DUE*

**Week 4: Stakeholder Meeting—Identifying Purpose, Stakeholders and Questions (Feb. 5)**


**Week 5: Evaluation Designs (Feb. 12)**

**Required Readings**


Additional readings to be determined.


**Recommended Readings**

Part II: Feasability (p. 71—104)

*Draft of Evaluation Plan and Data Collection Tools DUE*

**Week 6: Data Collection Strategies and Indicators (Feb. 19)**

**Required Readings**


Additional readings to be determined.


**Recommended Readings**


**Week 7: Stakeholders, Participants, and Sampling (Feb. 26)**

**Required Readings**


**Recommended Readings**


*Draft of Evaluation Plan and Data Collection Tools DUE*

**Week 8: Stakeholder Meeting—Feedback on Design and Methods (Mar. 12)**

**Required Readings**


**Recommended Readings**

**Week 9: Data Analysis and Interpretation; Project Management (Mar. 19)**

**Required Readings**


**Recommended Readings**

Part IV: Accuracy (p. 157—224)

**Week 10: Communication and Utilization of Findings (Mar. 26)**

**Required Readings**


**Recommended Readings**

**Easter Break—No Class (Apr. 2)**

**Week 11: Meta-Evaluation (Apr. 9)**

**Required Readings**


**Recommended Readings**

*Data Collection and Analysis DUE*

**Week 12 (Apr. 16) Wrap-up**


*Legitimize Evaluation Presentations DUE*

*Draft of Preliminary Report DUE*


**Week 14: Final Report (Apr. 30)**

*FINAL PROJECT DUE*
Evaluation Practice Paper (10 points) DUE Jan. 22

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 current or past 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)

Evaluation Report Paper (10 points) DUE JAN. 29

Locate an evaluation report in your own area of interest. You may want to refer to the list of evaluation organizations, which often post reports on their websites. Some evaluation studies are formally published in journals. You may use the list of journals to identify an appropriate article. Be sure that I approve the report prior to your completion of the assignment. PLEASE UPLOAD THE REPORT IN SAKAI BY THURS. JAN. 22.
Write a 3—4 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). Refer to Ch. 2 in the Mertens text and Calden & Alkin (2012) article. 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, values, and social justice 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).

**Case Scenario Discussion (10 points) Feb. 12, Feb. 19, Mar. 19, Mar. 26, or Apr. 9**

With small group, you will choose a week that you and colleagues will be responsible for leading the discussion of the case scenario (Refer to * by Morris readings). You will have 30-40 minutes to lead the class in a presentation includes a brief introduction of the scenario (5-10 minutes), and then a related interactive activity, such as a whole group discussion, small group activity, etc. Be creative. You are more than welcome to contact me with questions regarding readings and the course presentation.

Your presentation will be graded on the following:

- Extent to which the presentation accurately represents the scenario and its issues (4 points),
- Extent to which the presentation is effectively organized and communicated (3 points), and
- Presence of the two required components (brief introduction and interactive activity) (3 points).

**Legitimize Evaluation Presentation (10 points) April 16**

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)

**Evaluation Practice Assignments**

**Program Component Description and Evaluation Questions (10 points) DUE Feb. 12**
For the program component your group is evaluating, write a description of the program component. This description may include the program goals, program activities, program theory, logic model, key stakeholders, program context, and so on. As you write the description, you consider which key stakeholders will be the audience for the evaluation. Write the program description with this audience in mind. You are welcome to include tables and figures as appropriate, in addition to the text. Next, given the description of the program and the key stakeholders, develop 1-2 evaluation questions that will guide your component of the evaluation.

Your program description will be graded on the following:

- Includes description of program goals, activities, and/or program theory related to this component (2 points)
- Identifies and describes key stakeholders (2 points)
- Describes the program context (2 points)
- Proposes 1-2 evaluation questions (2 points)
- Well-organized, clearly written (2 points)

**Evaluation Plan with Data Collection Tools; DUE February 26**
Utilizing the template provided in Sakai, complete the evaluation plan table for the program component. Be sure to also attach all data collection tools that you intend to use, and a management plan that details the remaining activities for the semester and who is responsible for them. I will provide formative feedback on this assignment.

**Data Collection and Analysis; DUE April 9**
By this date you must complete all data collection assigned as your responsibility, and make it available to the rest of the team. Be sure to also share preliminary analysis, as relevant. I do not grade or provide feedback on this assignment.

**Preliminary Evaluation Report; DUE April 16 & 23**
With your group, you will integrate a preliminary evaluation report on your component of the program into a single oral and/or written report to stakeholder(s) of the course.
evaluation project. The format of the report will be determined in collaboration with the stakeholders. At a minimum, this report will include:

- Description of the program component you are evaluating and its context
- Logic model
- Theoretical approach to evaluation
- Evaluation purposes
- Evaluation question(s)
- Overview of the evaluation plan
  - Design
  - Data collection methods and procedures
  - Data sources
  - Sampling
  - Analysis procedures
  - Indicators; Interpretation procedures and criteria
- Preliminary findings
- Discussion questions to facilitate stakeholders’ interpretation of findings, development of recommendations or next steps, and responses to the report and how the program is represented

Be sure that the report is written for intended stakeholder audience(s) with concise, direct language throughout the narrative and consistent easy to follow formatting, using proper APA headings that elaborates on the table. I will provide formative feedback on this assignment after the meeting.

**Final Evaluation Report (40 points); DUE April 30**

**Group Component**

With your group, you will integrate an evaluation report on your component of the program into a single oral and/or written report to stakeholder(s) of the course evaluation project, revising based on any input from stakeholders on the preliminary report. The exact format of this report will be developed over the course of the semester in collaboration with the stakeholders. At a minimum, it will include the following:

- Description of the program component you are evaluating and its context
- Logic model
- Theoretical approach to evaluation
- Evaluation purposes
- Evaluation question(s)
- Overview of the evaluation plan
  - Design
  - Data collection methods and procedures, including copies of all data collection tools developed and/or utilized
  - Data sources
  - Sampling
  - Analysis procedures, including any databases or tools to facilitate analysis
- Indicators; Interpretation procedures and criteria
  - Findings
  - Proposed recommendations and/or next steps for the evaluation

As the project takes shape during the course of the semester, I will provide you with a detailed rubric for how I will grade the final.

**Individual Component**

First, provide a bulleted list of the key contributions you made to the evaluation project, in relation to the project management plan. Be sure to include at least one time when you had direction interactions with a program stakeholder (e.g., observing an activity, interviewing a participant, visiting the school, stopping by to collect data).

Next, provide a 1-2 page critical reflection on your experiences working on the team using the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles OR the Joint Committee Standards on Educational Evaluation. Considering the following questions might facilitate your reflection. How did you (and/or the team) conducted yourself during the evaluation? Are there principles that your project exemplifies good evaluation practice? Are there principles that may raise issues of concern with the evaluation? If so, what did or could you do to help better address these principles in practice? Are there principles in conflict through the project (i.e., practices that support one principle result in practices that also oppose another principal)? What is the rationale for which principles to compromise in the evaluation practice?

**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)

**Electronic Communication Policies and Guidelines**

The School of Education faculty, students and staff respect each other’s rights, privacy and access to electronic resources, services, and communications while in the pursuit of academic and professional growth, networking and research. All members of the university community are expected to demonstrate the highest standards of integrity, communication, and responsibility while accessing and utilizing technology, information resources, and computing facilities. A link to the Loyola University Chicago and School of Education official policies and guidelines can be found at: [http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/education/pdfs/SOE_Cyberbullying_Policy.pdf](http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/education/pdfs/SOE_Cyberbullying_Policy.pdf)
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/

EthicsLine Reporting Hotline
Loyola University Chicago has implemented EthicsLine Reporting Hotline, through a third party internet & telephone hotline provider, to provide you with an automated and anonymous way to report activities that may involve misconduct or violations of Loyola University policy. You may file an anonymous report here on-line or by dialing 855-603-6988. (within the United States, Guam, and Puerto Rico)

The University is committed to the highest ethical and professional standards of conduct as an integral part of its mission of expanding knowledge in the service of humanity through learning, justice and faith. To achieve this goal, the University relies on each community member's ethical behavior, honesty, integrity and good judgment. Each community member should demonstrate respect for the rights of others.

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.

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.

Technology
In this course, we will use power point presentations as one means of reporting evaluation findings.

Dispositions
All School of Education dispositions will be assessed in this course, with a particular emphasis on professionalism. The following table provides a rubric on how these dispositions are assessed. An asterisk(*) indicates that the disposition aligns with the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for professional evaluators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispositions</th>
<th>Target (0 pt)</th>
<th>Acceptable (0 pt)</th>
<th>Unacceptable (0 pt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systematic Inquiry IL-LUC-DISP.1</strong></td>
<td>Candidate communicates effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.</td>
<td>Candidate is working on communicating effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.</td>
<td>Candidate is unable to communicate effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare IL-LUC-DISP.1</strong></td>
<td>Candidate’s written work is appropriate and effective for the course.</td>
<td>Candidate’s written work is sometimes appropriate and effective for the course.</td>
<td>Candidate’s written work is inappropriate and ineffective for the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence IL-LUC-DISP.1</strong></td>
<td>Candidate provides appropriate assistance to tutoring or consulting clients.</td>
<td>Candidate sometimes provides appropriate assistance to tutoring or consulting clients.</td>
<td>Candidate does not provide appropriate assistance to tutoring or consulting clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness IL-LUC-DISP.1</strong></td>
<td>Candidate is able to meet all deadlines.</td>
<td>Candidate is sometimes able to meet all deadlines.</td>
<td>Candidate is unable to meet all deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability IL-LUC-DISP.1</strong></td>
<td>Candidate attends all classes and fulfills all professional obligations.</td>
<td>Candidate sometimes attends classes and fulfills professional obligations.</td>
<td>Candidate’s attendance to class is inconsistent and is unable to fulfill all professional obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegiality IL-LUC-DISP.1</strong></td>
<td>Candidate is able to work with peers.</td>
<td>Candidate sometimes respects the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty respecting the viewpoints of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Example Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity/Honesty IL-LUC-DISP.2*</td>
<td>Candidate respects the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Integrity/Honesty IL-LUC-DISP.2*</td>
<td>Candidate sometimes respects the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity/Honesty IL-LUC-DISP.2*</td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty respecting the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing Benefits &amp; Reducing Harm IL-LUC-DISP.3*</td>
<td>Candidate recognizes potential conflicts and handles them appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity IL-LUC-DISP.3*</td>
<td>Candidate sometimes recognizes potential conflicts and handles them appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting Communication IL-LUC-DISP.3*</td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty recognizing potential conflicts and handling them appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for People IL-LUC-DISP.3*</td>
<td>Candidate respects the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate sometimes respects the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty respecting the viewpoints of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate recognizes potential conflicts and handles them appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate sometimes recognizes potential conflicts and handles them appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty recognizing potential conflicts and handling them appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate appropriately represents procedures, data, and findings – attempting to prevent misuse of their results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate sometimes represents procedures, data, and findings in a manner that is likely to allow the misuse of their results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty representing procedures, data, and findings. There is minimal attempt to prevent misuse of their results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate understands the cost-benefit ratio of particular research designs for addressing important research questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate sometimes understands the cost-benefit ratio of particular research designs for addressing important research questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate does not understand the cost-benefit ratio of particular research designs for addressing important research questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates appropriate empathy for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate sometimes demonstrates appropriate empathy for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate has difficulty demonstrating appropriate empathy for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate communicates research in a manner that respects stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate attempts to communicate research in a manner that respects stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate makes no clear efforts to communicate research in a manner that respects stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate respects differences when planning, conducting, analyzing, and reporting research results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate attempts to respect differences when planning, conducting, analyzing, and reporting research results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate does not respect differences when planning, conducting, analyzing, and reporting research results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>