

Syllabus

Program Development in Adult Education (EADU 7030)

Spring 2007

Master's of Adult Education Degree Program

*Sections of the content and format of this course were designed
by Dr. Ronald M. Cervero*

Instructor:

Glenn Palmer, Ed.D.

The Department of Adult Education

River's Crossing 410

The University of Georgia

Athens, Georgia 30602

Direct voice: (706) 542-3342; fax: (706) 542-4024; Toll-free: (800) 816-3382

E-mail: gappalmer123@msn.com

Location:

WebCT address: <http://webct.uga.edu>

Schedule:

Classes will run in two-week sessions (Sessions) beginning January 9, 2006 through May 1, 2006. Your assignments for each two-week session are located in the Course Content icon on the homepage of the WebCT course.

Course Description: Guided study and practice in developing educational programs for adults in selected institutions. Includes identifying needs, establishing objectives, and critically designing and evaluating programs in continuing education.

Texts:

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Caffarella, R.S. (2002). Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Articles: You can find these on reserve with the UGA library.

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (1996). Management education at the Phoenix Company. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia, Department of Adult Education.

Cervero, R. (1994). Evaluating workshop implementation and outcomes. In T.J. Sork (ed.), Designing and implementing effective workshops. (pp. 55-67). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, no. 22. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (1994). The politics of responsibility: A theory of program planning practice for adult education. Adult Education Quarterly, 45, 249-268.

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (1998). Working the planning table: The political practice of adult education. Studies in Continuing Education, 20, 5-21.

Course Goals:

Upon completion of this course you will be able to:

1. Understand how social and organizational contexts affect planning of educational programs.
2. Develop a process to define the needs that stakeholders have for the program.
3. Develop program and learning objectives that specify the expected outcomes of the program.
4. Develop an instructional program that is effective for adult learners.
5. Develop the financing and marketing components of the program.
6. Develop an evaluation process to assess the program and learning objectives.
7. Articulate an integrated perspective of what matters for planning educational programs.

Course Topics:

Session #1

January 8 ----12, 2007:

January 15 ----19, 2007:

- Introduction to the course, other participants, and overview of syllabus
- Guidelines for writing your planning story
- What is good program planning? "Management at the Phoenix Company"
- Theoretical perspectives

Session #2

January 22 -- 26, 2007:

January 29 – Feb. 02, 2007:

- Understanding the social and organizational contexts for program planning

Session #3

February 05 --- 09, 2007:

February 12 --- 16, 2007:

- Negotiating the needs for the program

Session #4

February 19 --- 23, 2007:

February 26 --- March 02, 2007:

- Negotiating the program and learning objectives

Session #5

March 05 --- 09, 2007:

March 12 --- 16, 2007 (NO CLASS --- NO ACTIVITY ----- SPRING BREAK)

March 19 --- 23, 2007:

- Negotiating the development of the instructional program

Session #6

March 26 --- 30, 2007:

April 02 --- 06, 2007:

- Negotiating the financing and marketing of the program

Session #7

April 09 --- 13, 2007:

April 16 --- 20, 2007:

- Negotiating the evaluation of the program

Session #8

April 23 --- 27, 2007:

- What is good program planning revisited

May 04, 2006: Final Project Due.

Course Organization in WebCT

The course is divided into segments and each part is located within an icon on the Homepage of your WebCT course. You will find your course assignments within the Course Content icon. Each two-week session contains a short overview of the topics, your discussion area assignments, your readings, and your written assignments with due dates.

Course Procedures and requirements: (2 parts)

Part 1: One part of your course assignment is to construct and analyze a written plan for developing an educational program for adults. The program must meet two conditions: 1) it must be an educational program for adults that you have already planned or are now planning and 2) the planning must have been within an organizational or social context that involves other people. It is not important that your planning went well since we can usually learn more from making mistakes than from doing things well. What is important is that you: 1) describe the decisions you made, and 2) critique those decisions.

Your final project is a document containing eight sections (see below). Sections one through seven will comprise a detailed program description and analysis and section eight will be a paper where you synthesize your thoughts about what good program planning is. Drafts of sections one through seven will be turned in on the dates listed below. The finished document is due no later than **May 4, 2007 at 11:00 PM**. Each section should respond to questions detailed in each sections' assignments. The questions are intended to prompt you to explain the reasons behind the planning decisions you made. The final document should be organized so that each section is clearly identified.

At the end of each two-week session (*Session*) a written assignment or part of the "Final Project" will be due and should be sent electronically as an attachment through e-mail. (see course requirements). All papers should follow the American Psychological Association Guidelines for citations and reference lists.

Section Due Date

1. Planning story (draft) January 19, 2007, 11 p.m.
2. Organizational/social context (draft) February 2, 2007, 11 p.m.
3. Needs (draft) February 16, 2007, 11 p.m.
4. Program and learning objectives (draft) March 2, 2007, 11 p.m.
5. Instructional program (draft) March 23, 2007, 11 p.m.
6. Financing and marketing (draft) April 6, 2007, 11 p.m.

7. Evaluation plan (draft) April 20, 2006, 11 p.m.
8. What is good programming revisited
9. Final Project (Due May 4th)

Part 2: At the beginning of each two-week session, topics for discussion will be posted on the bulletin board. Since we have no on-campus class meetings, this is a very important aspect of the course. This is where we will express our ideas and reactions to the readings for each particular two-week session. You should have at least 4 meaningful and well-thought out postings per week. I would suggest that you check into the course and your e-mail both morning and evening to avoid falling behind in the discussions and issues that arise during the course. Topics for discussion will be posted on the bulletin board in the discussion section of WebCT which you can locate by clicking the discussion icon on the homepage of EADU7030.

The first two week session is divided into three different assignments. We will discuss the case study of the Phoenix Company, we will look at the historical program planning models found in your readings, and then examine and discuss the models of Cafferella and Cervero and Wilson. (Directions on how we will do this are included in your first session assignment located in the Course Content icon) The Phoenix Company case is a real life example of what can and often happens in planning situations and the case will provide us with a good starting point for discussions throughout the course.

Grading Process:

- Section one (program description) and each first draft that is turned in on time receives **Five points** toward your final grade (Late papers receive Two points). Each paper will receive a written feedback. If you have not submitted an paper, you will not receive any points.
- Final drafts may be rewritten or resubmitted unchanged.
- The quality and quantity of your online responses determine your grads. Each response should reflect your knowledge and understanding of the subject matter and show a willingness to engage in "educational communication" with your classmates. No fewer than three "postings" per week should be made in the discussion areas, however, you are encouraged to make as many as you want since this will be our primary means of communication.

Sections: Points

Items	Points
On-time drafts of sections 1 through 7 (5 points each) (Five points per draft (Late papers receive Two points))	35
Weekly on-time postings for discussion	20
Final Paper (all eight sections)	30
Final Essay (Your advise on program planning)	15
TOTAL POINTS	100

Grading criteria and standards:

Criteria:

- " Did you address the questions?
- " Did you consider the readings in answering the questions?
- " How well organized is your response?

Standards:

"A" = 91 to 100

"B" = 81 to 90

"C" = 71-80

My policy is not to give a grade of "I" (incomplete) except in the rare case of a medical emergency. You should turn in whatever you have written on the due date and your grade will be based on that document.

Persons with Disabilities: I am committed to doing whatever is necessary to make this learning experience as fulfilling as possible for people who have special need due to a disability. If there is anything I can do, please take the time to discuss your concerns with me early in the semester. Please know that anything you discuss with me in this regard will be held in the strictest confidence. You may also contact the UGA Department of Disability Services Adaptive Technology Resource Center.

General Writing Guidelines for Assignments

- Double-space type all academically written material (i.e. research papers, literature reviews, etc.).

- Use business writing style as needed (when writing is stylized to appeal to stakeholders in the organization you are working with). Business writing is generally single-spaced with an appropriate use of headers, bullets and blank space that enhances the communication of your message. Even when using "business style," it is still expected that you will follow APA (American Psychological Association) Manual rules. There is some guidance on the website, but it is also advisable to purchase the APA 5th Edition style manual.

- Follow the APA Manual, 5th Edition for style and citation guidelines.

- Use inclusive language (that means avoiding the exclusive use of masculine pronouns when referring to men and women) in your writing.

- Do not use slipcover or protector pages on written work. It makes providing written feedback difficult.

- Ensure that the quality of your written work reflects the quality of your paper's content. Correct grammar and spelling errors, as well as awkward or unclear sentences and paragraphs before the final paper is submitted.

- Quality written assignments generally meet the following criteria:
 - Includes the title and name of the author at the beginning of the paper.
 - Clearly identifies the question being addressed or the purpose of the paper.
 - Provides an overview of the structure and organization in the introductory section of the paper.
 - Defines key terms, concepts and slogans.
 - Gives examples when they enhance the understanding of the concept being discussed.
 - Applies theory from the assigned readings or elsewhere.
 - Demonstrates the ability to self-reflect and discover core values and beliefs.
 - Considers implications and/or consequences.
 - Provides a strong summary and conclusion

List Of Written Assignments

Written Assignment: Final Project Part 1 (Draft, due January 19, 2007)

Tell a story about your planning of a specific educational program for adults. The planning you choose to focus on may be of several varieties. It may be one that went unusually well or one in which things did not go as planned, one that is very typical of program planning, or one that was particularly demanding. The story should have three parts:

1. A description of the organizational setting and your role in the planning process. Be sure to include who was involved in the planning and what their responsibilities were with regard to the program.
2. A description of the key events of the planning process (including optional dialogue that illustrates a key moment in the planning or how things typically worked in the planning process).
3. A brief description of the program (purpose, content/objectives, audience, and format) and outcome of the story.

Written Assignment: Part 2 (Draft, due February 2, 2007)

1. Map the stake holders for the program by answering the question, "Who had a stake in the program?" Explicitly name these people/categories of people and their relationship to the program.
2. Explicitly define and discuss the political relationships that had an impact on planning the program. Given the power relations in your setting, who had the Most impact on the program?

Written Assignment: Part 3 (Draft due February 16th 2007)

3. What processes did you use to determine needs for the program (if applicable, what data did you collect) from the various stakeholders (learners, instructors, organizational leadership, affected public, planners)?
4. Whose needs should have had a substantive impact in planning the program and why? Whose needs were effectively represented at the "planning table"?
5. What were the needs for the stakeholders identified above?

Written Assignment: Part 4 (Draft due March 2, 2007)

6. Using the list of needs in Question 6, write the 3-5 program objectives that had the most influence in the development of the program? Discuss each objective using the following criteria: a) was it achievable through the program, b) was it supposed to be measurable; if so, was it?
7. List the 3-5 primary learning objectives for the program? Evaluate each objective using the following criteria: a) was it clearly related to an educational need, b) was it stated in terms of learner achievement, c) was it practical and doable in the time frame, and d) was it supposed to be measurable; if so, was it?

Written Assignment: Part 5 (Draft due March 23, 2007)

8. Use the model of an instructional plan given by Caffarella on page 194 to describe your instructional plan.
9. Evaluate the selection of content based on the relationship of each element to achieving the learning objectives (is it a "must know", or "nice to know"), the participants knowledge and experience, and the demands of the social and organizational context.
10. Evaluate the selection of methods based on the learning objectives, the participants' knowledge and experience, and the demands of the social and organizational context.
11. What were the three most significant barriers to the participants transferring the learning to their settings? What would be three effective strategies you used/could have used to increase the likelihood that the participants would transfer their learning to their settings?

Written Assignment: Part 6 (Draft due April 6, 2007)

12. Analyze the financing of your program by providing an estimate of the cost of the 10 budget items (Exhibit 14.1) and the revenue from the six income sources (Exhibit 14.2). Explain whether and why you did or did not prepare a written budget for the program.
13. Five dimensions of program marketing are audience analysis, product, price, place, and promotion. In your response, 1) put these five dimensions of marketing in their order of importance for affecting the number of people who participated in your program, and 2) explain what you did in each dimension and how this affected participation.
14. How did the factors in your social and organizational context affect the financing and marketing of your program?

Written Assignment: Part 7 (Draft due April 20, 2007)

15. Which stakeholders had an interest in the achievement of which the primary program objectives (Question 6) and learning objectives (Question 7) and what evidence did they need to evaluate the achievement of the objective?

16. Based on your response in Question 15 describe the information you would collect to evaluate the program objectives and learning objectives and how you would collect it.

17. What factors in your social and organizational context affected the evaluation of the program?

Final Project: Educational Program For Adults (Due May 4th 2007)

Written assignment: Essay (7 to 10 pages) (Due May 8th 2007) You have been asked to give advice to a group of people who are taking on their first program planning assignment. You need to tell them, in your own words, how to plan educational programs for adults. Please write this in the second person as if you were speaking to this group of people. In giving this advice, feel free to illustrate your points using examples from your planning of the program for EADU 7030 (this may be things that went well or things that didn't go well). Although you may cite publications in your response, it is not necessary that you do so. This essay will be evaluated on the basis that its' points are clearly stated and explained and internally consistent with each other.

Addendum To Syllabus

Program Development in Adult Education (EADU 7030)

Spring 2007

Master's of Adult Education Degree Program

*Sections of the content and format of this course were designed
by Dr. Ronald M. Cervero*

Instructor:

Glenn Palmer, Ed.D.

The Department of Adult Education

River's Crossing 410

The University of Georgia

Athens, Georgia 30602

Direct voice: (706) 542-3342; fax: (706) 542-4024; Toll-free: (800) 816-3382

E-mail: gappalmer123@msn.com

Location:

WebCT address: <http://webct.uga.edu>

Session #1

January 8 ----12, 2007:

January 15 ----19, 2007:

- Introduction to the course, other participants, and overview of syllabus
- Guidelines for writing your planning story
- What is good program planning? "Management at the Phoenix Company"
- Theoretical perspectives

Working the planning table: A theory for practice

Planning education programs for adults is a social practice that requires technical, political, and ethical action.

Theories don't plan programs, people do

This course is about the guided study and practice of developing educational programs for adults. The focus of the course will be the development of an educational plan in the context of a real organizational setting. Throughout the course we will go over each of the major issues and decisions program planners normally make by using the resources available to us in our readings and from the knowledge and experience each of us has.

There are theories and a great deal of research on the subject of program planning which we will cover and of which you will become familiar by the end of the semester. More importantly, you will have the opportunity to practice and test these ideas based on your experiences and those of your classmates.

The entire course is directed toward identifying good program planning practice.

The course is developmental in nature, building on your knowledge through class activities.

You will need to identify a program that you have planned, are planning, or could plan in a real organizational context. The program can come from your professional or personal life.

The readings each week will directly tie to the kinds of decisions you will discuss with your group during the weeks in the discussion area of WebCT.

First Class Assignment: Part 1

"What is Good Program Planning?" The Phoenix Company

January 8 --- 12, 2007

To begin the course we are going to review a case study that is grounded in reality and will provide a common reference point for our discussions. As you read the case study pay close attention to how the program is planned, who is involved in the planning, and what aspects of the planning you do/do not think were good program planning. I realize that at this time you have not read the literature on program planning, but this gives us a real-life example with which to begin thinking about the topic and some practice with the discussion area of Web CT.

Locate and click on the icon on the home page labeled "The Phoenix Company."

Group Discussion Topics: (January 8th through January 19th 2007)

After you read the case study, click the communications icon on the home page and then discussion on the next page.

You should see a list of topics in the discussion area.

Click the topic "The Phoenix" and respond to the sentence I posted: "Pete was/was not a good program planner because..."

Beginning January 15, 2007 we will begin our discussion about the classical, naturalistic, and critical program planning models found in your readings. Each model gives us different answers to the question "What is good program planning" and each theory tells us different ways to act.

Beginning January 15th through January 19th we will also look at another model of program planning, the interactive model developed by Caffarella (2002). According to Caffarella, "The key to using the model is flexibility. In essence, the model should be tailored to meet the demands of the specific planning situation" (p. 19). People may use the model in a variety of ways and may either use all of the model or choose to begin at any given point. This model outlines what steps may or may not be involved in program planning and can be a good resource to those who are new to the process. For this discussion, remain in your groups and find ways in which the interactive program model relates to the Phoenix Case study of program planning.

Written Assignment: Final Project Part 1 (Draft, due January 19, 2007)

Tell a story about your planning of a specific educational program for adults. The planning you choose to focus on may be of several varieties. It may be one that went unusually well or one in which things did not go as planned, one that is very typical of program planning, or one that was particularly demanding. The story should have three parts:

4. A description of the organizational setting and your role in the planning process. Be sure to include who was involved in the planning and what their responsibilities were with regard to the program.
5. A description of the key events of the planning process (including optional dialogue that illustrates a key moment in the planning or how things typically worked in the planning process).
6. A brief description of the program (purpose, content/objectives, audience, and format) and outcome of the story.

Readings:

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). *Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 1 & 2

Caffarella, R. (2002). *Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 1, 2, & 3

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (1994). The politics of responsibility: A theory of program planning practice for adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 45, 249-268.

Session #2

January 22 -- 26, 2007:

January 29 – Feb. 02, 2007:

- Understanding the social and organizational contexts for program planning

Themes:

A) Planning adult education is a social activity in which you negotiate personal and organizational interests within socially-structured political relationships to construct the program. People (with interests and power) plan educational programs.

B) These negotiations are about both substantive issues (related to the instructional program) and meta issues (related to the wider social and organizational agendas).

It is a truism that educational program planning does not occur in a vacuum, but rather in social and organizational contexts that dramatically affect the planning process. Because of this, Caffarella identifies "Establishing a Basis for the Planning Process" as a key component in her model and suggests that you address this early in the planning process. Likewise, Cervero and Wilson formulate educational planning as a "political practice" in which the power relationships and interests of people in the social and organizational setting are central to the planning process. The purposes of this module are to offer: 1) the conceptual tools to name what is really happening in your social and organizational context and 2) the practical tools to help you act responsibly to plan programs in that context. The central issue that we will address is how to deal with power relations and interests that structure what we can do as adult educators. This issue will carry through entire course but we start discussing it here.

Many theories of program planning assume that learners are the only group of people that are relevant to be considered in the planning process. However, anyone who has been in practice knows that there are many people who have a stake in your program (in terms of their personal and organizational interests) and who will try to use their power to influence the planning process (political relationships). Thus, to fully grasp the dynamics of your organizational setting, it is critical that you are able to identify the stakeholders for the program you are planning. Question 1 on the written assignment asks you to name these people. Caffarella identifies several groups, such as potential participants, their supervisors, senior management, and other groups inside and outside the organization. Cervero and Wilson suggest five groups who have a stake in any program: learners, teachers, planners, organizational leadership, and the affected publics.

The political relationships among these stakeholders (including yourself) will determine who is at the planning table (both the literal table and the metaphorical table). These political relationships and the interests that people bring to the table, therefore, will

determine the specific features of the program you are planning, such as the purpose, content, audience, and format. Question 2 on the written assignment asks you to discuss these political relationships and the impact they had on the planning process and the resulting program.

This analysis should show you that education conducted in a social and organization setting benefits many different people in many different ways. Thus, whenever we plan we are negotiating about the instructional program (substantive issues) and also the wider agendas of the multiple stakeholders (meta issues). Often, these are termed "hidden agendas" because they are not directly related to the instructional program. For example, Pete and Joan negotiated the specific features of the management retreat. At the same time, they were attempting to meet other agendas, such as strengthening the visibility and power of the Human Resource unit at the Phoenix Company.

In sum, Cervero and Wilson have theorized planning as a social activity whereby people construct educational programs by negotiating personal, organizational, and social interests in contexts marked by socially structured relations of power. Envisioned in this way, the planning of educational programs can be seen as a fundamentally political process that occurs in a turbulent world of multiple, and often conflicting, pressures. Negotiating interests constitutes the political process by which power is exercised in program planning. As a result, people's interests are causally related to all features-including content and audience-of any educational program. In this world, program planning is not merely a process of meeting the needs of adult learners. Rather, a body of research has demonstrated that adult educators represent many interests in addition to those of the potential learner in their planning and that these various interests inevitably form the basis of whatever programs are eventually produced. Educational planners negotiate about both substantive issues (instructional program) and meta issues (wider social and organizational agendas) when planning programs.

Group Discussion Topics: (January 22nd through February 2nd 2007)

We will be discussing the topics listed below:

" The most important things to know about the politics of my social and organizational context in relation to planning this program are...

" The consequences of ignoring, overlooking, or misinterpreting the politics of my social or organizational setting were/would have been...

" When planning in a social or organizational context, the most important things to know or do are...

Written Assignment: Part 2 (Draft, due February 2, 2007)

3. Map the stake holders for the program by answering the question, "Who had a stake in the program?" Explicitly name these people/categories of people and their relationship to the program.
4. Explicitly define and discuss the political relationships that had an impact on planning the program. Given the power relations in your setting, who had the Most impact on the program?

Readings:

Caffarella, R. (2002). Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapter 4

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 3&5

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (1998). Working the planning table: The political practice of adult education. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 20, 5-21.

Session #3

February 05 --- 09, 2007:

February 12 --- 16, 2007:

- Negotiating the needs for the program

Themes:

C) All stakeholders have needs in relation to the program, which have been assessed in some way.

D) Program planners should seek to have stakeholders' needs substantively represented at the planning table.

Needs assessment is one of the most discussed, but misunderstood, terms in the entire literature of program planning. The standard view of needs is that: 1) it is the discrepancy between learners' current knowledge/attitudes/performance and some desired knowledge/attitudes/performance; 2) empirical data must be collected to verify this discrepancy; and 3) the needs-assessment process must be done as the first step in any program planning process. Many planning theorists, including Caffarella and Cervero and Wilson, reject this narrow view of basing programs solely on documented learner discrepancies. The purpose of this module is to offer a different view of needs-assessment, one which argues that every program has had a needs-assessment. The fundamental issue, then, becomes conducting a responsible needs-assessment.

Caffarella rejects the standard view, saying that needs-assessments "are only one of many ways ideas are formulated for educational programs; in actual practice, a formal needs-assessment may not be necessary or even useful in terms of time or money spent." For example, you might get a mandate to do a program from a funding agency. She also thinks that "educational needs" can be a limiting way to identify ideas for programs for a variety of reasons. Two problems are that this term implies that: 1) something is wrong with the person or organization and 2) planning is a reactive rather than a proactive process. Further, opportunities for programs might just "present themselves" because a speaker is in town and available or your organization has a new facility that must be used. Given these realities, she provides eight methods for generating ideas for educational programs. However, if you are interested in doing a "formal needs- assessment" she offers whichever process you used and, 1) sort the ideas into those solvable through education and those not solvable through education, and 2) prioritize the former as a basis for your program.

Cervero and Wilson also reject the standard view, but for different reasons. They also offer a different understanding than Caffarella about needs and needs-assessment. In our view, 1) data collection and needs-assessment are not the same thing, and 2) all of the stakeholders (not just the learners) have needs/interests that must be taken into account when planning a program. All of the stakeholders you identified in the last module have

interests related to the program; they will benefit in some way from the program. Someone in the planning process has represented (well or poorly) all of the stakeholders' interests. Thus, their first point is that the needs of all stakeholders (including the learners have been represented in developing the program. However, stating that every program has been based on a needs-assessment says absolutely nothing about the quality of that assessment. In other words, the question isn't "Was a needs-assessment done?" [of course it was]. Rather, the important question is "how responsibly was a needs-assessment done?"

It is possible (and generally desirable) to collect good data about stakeholders' needs. These data can be collected by surveys, focus groups, public meetings, informal conversations, memorandums, and any other way that people interact in social and organizational contexts. Their vision for a responsible needs-assessment is captured by the metaphor of the planning table: all people who will be affected by a program ought to have a place at the planning tables for the development of the program. There are three practical questions you should address for each stakeholder group at the planning table: 1) are the people representing the stakeholder group legitimate representatives?; 2) do you have accurate information about their needs?; and 3) has this definition of their needs (whether through data or personal representation) been effectively represented?

Group Discussion Topics: (From February 5th through February 16th 2007

We will be discussing the topics listed below:

" I did/did not a good needs assessment for this program because...

" The strategies that could have been used (data collection, political involvement) to improve the understanding and negotiation of needs were...

" When negotiating the needs for a program, the most important things to know or do are...

Written Assignment: Part 3 (Draft due February 16th 2007)

6. What processes did you use to determine needs for the program (if applicable, what data did you collect) from the various stakeholders (learners, instructors, organizational leadership, affected public, planners)?

7. Whose needs should have had a substantive impact in planning the program and why? Whose needs were effectively represented at the "planning table"?

8. What were the needs for the stakeholders identified above?

Readings:

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 4

Caffarella, R. (2002). Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 5 & 7

Session #4

February 19 --- 23, 2007:

February 26 --- March 02, 2007:

- Negotiating the program and learning objectives

Themes:

E) Educational programs always have both educational/learning agendas (learning objectives) and political-economic agendas (program objectives), which derive from stakeholders' needs.

F) Program and learning objectives, whether stated or not, provide direction for the instructional program and benchmarks for evaluation.

The objectives of your educational program are really important, even though many adult educators believe they are only professional and regulatory busywork. Both Caffarella and Cervero and Wilson agree that there are different kinds of objectives (learning and program) and that these objectives provide direction for decisions about the instructional program and benchmarks for the evaluation. However, they offer different definitions for program objectives and have different understandings of the source of objectives.

Caffarella believes that objectives are critical because they "provide clear statements of the anticipated results to be achieved through an educational program. ...At the heart of formulating program objectives is defining program outcomes" (p. 100). Objectives are not busywork because they help the planners sort out what they are trying to accomplish in the first place. Without objectives, educational programs could be unfocused (at best) or result in unanticipated consequences. Because objectives articulate the planner's vision of a program's reason for being, they are necessarily closely related to the original idea(s) that generated the program. In fact, Caffarella maintains that objectives arise from ideas: "Once the program ideas have been sorted and prioritized, program planners can realistically move to finalizing program objectives for a given program" (p. 95).

Caffarella divides objectives into three layers: learning objectives, program objectives focused on learning, and program objectives based on program operations. Learning objectives are what participants should be able to know/feel/do as the result of the educational program. Program objectives based on learning take a larger perspective on the outcomes of the educational program. These objectives articulate what you want to be different in the lives of individuals, groups, or even entire communities as a result of an educational program (for example, a multi-day conference made up of multiple educational events). A program that results in community members feeling more empowered to halt planned development in their neighborhood would have "empowerment" as a program objective focused on learning. She makes the distinction with learning objectives, but this is just a matter of degree. Program objectives based on

program operations are concerned with outcomes that are not learner-related, such as making money on a program. Caffarella describes these objectives as what the program is about other than learner achievement: "People who plan programs often overlook those program objectives that are directed at improving the quality of the program."

Cervero and Wilson agree that defining program outcomes is a critical activity. In fact, they believe that educational programs benefit many stakeholders in many ways, including the learning of the participants. Thus, stakeholders have many interests related to the program, which you described in the response about needs in Question 5. Cervero and Wilson believe that these needs are the source of program and learning objectives for your program. Cervero and Wilson divide your stakeholders' needs (and therefore objectives) into those related to learning/educational issues and to political/economic issues. The difference with Caffarella's definition is that Cervero and Wilson: 1) combine her "learning objectives" and "program objectives based on learning" into "learning objectives", and 2) broaden her "program objectives based on program operations" to include all stakeholder interests not related to the learning outcomes. Logically, if stakeholders' interests define who will benefit from the program, then stakeholders' interests define the program's objectives.

It is critical to understand, then, that all programs have many objectives whether or not you actually record them in written form. This means that program and learning objectives exist whether or not they are ever written down by the planner. The practical implications of this are that you-as the planner-will probably have more control over a program's direction if you take the time to make explicit (even write down) the key learning and program objectives. Questions 6 and 7 ask you to do just that-write them down. In the case of learning objectives, you are to evaluate whether the statement of learning objectives actually used in the program (assuming you had them) conform to Caffarella's useful guidelines for writing them. She believes that learning objectives should always have three components: 1) Who (learner), 2) how (action verb), and 3) what (the content). Two additional elements for objectives that are measurable quantitatively are 4) conditions under which learning is to be demonstrated, and 5) criteria for acceptable performance. Caffarella doesn't give any specific guidelines for writing program objectives (which I agree with) except that they are "stated clearly enough to indicate to all rational minds exactly what is intended." However, I believe you: 1) Should be sure they are related to a stakeholder interest; 2) you can actually achieve it through the program; and 3) you are clear about how your stakeholder will know that it has been achieved.

Group Discussion Topics: From February 19th through March 2nd 2007

We will be discussing the topics listed below:

" The most important struggles I face in negotiation program and learning objectives are...

" The consequences of ignoring program and learning objectives are...

" When negotiating the program and learning objectives, the five most important things to know or do are...

Written Assignment: Part 4 (Draft due March 2, 2007)

8. Using the list of needs in Question 6, write the 3-5 program objectives that had the most influence in the development of the program? Discuss each objective using the following criteria: a) was it achievable through the program, b) was it supposed to be measurable; if so, was it?
9. List the 3-5 primary learning objectives for the program? Evaluate each objective using the following criteria: a) was it clearly related to an educational need, b) was it stated in terms of learner achievement, c) was it practical and doable in the time frame, and d) was it supposed to be measurable; if so, was it?

Readings:

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapter 5

Caffarella, R. (1994). Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 8 & 9 (pp. 166-172)

Session #5

March 05 --- 09, 2007:

March 12 --- 16, 2007 (NO CLASS --- NO ACTIVITY ----- SPRING BREAK)

March 19 --- 23, 2007:

- Negotiating the development of the instructional program

Themes:

G) Selecting and sequencing content and methods should be based on the learning objectives, the participants' knowledge and experience, and the demands of the social and organizational context.

H) Enabling participants to transfer their learning to social and organizational contexts after the program can be facilitated by your planning strategies.

Having already made numerous important decisions about needs and objectives, you are now ready to develop the instructional program. Indeed, many of your prior decisions will provide a framework for the set of decisions you are about to make. You now know how the multiple stakeholders, including the learners, expect to benefit from the program. You understand the politics of your social and organizational context and how that will affect the decisions you are about to make. If you are the person who will deliver the program (the instructor), you are also familiar with the content that might be included. If you are the planner, you have a process for working with a team to develop the content for the program. Caffarella outlines these various options, saying: "Most instructional plans are developed by those who will be delivering the instruction. ...There are time though, when designing instructional plans is a team effort...usually involving instructional designers, content specialists, and persons representing the overall team or educational unit" (p. 199).

Question 8 asks you to take the key learning objectives you have identified and map out the instructional plan, focusing on the selection of content and instructional methods. Caffarella defines content as "what will be learned" (p. 186). The major issue in selecting content is that you can rarely include all the material you want to teach. Therefore, I suggest that you evaluate each content element primarily in relation to the learning objectives by the following criteria:

- What participants must know: Content that is essential to the objectives.
- What participants should know: Content that supplements the essential material and should be included if time allows.

- What participants could know (nice to know): Content that is interesting and relevant but not essential for clear understanding.

In addition to this criterion, it is essential that you select content on the basis of the learners' knowledge and experience. Finally, it often happens that your selection of content is affected by the demands of your social and organizational context (such as program objectives, time, physical facility, cost, available resources, number of participants, instructor skills). In responding to question 9, you should classify each content element as must, should, or nice to know. Briefly comment on: 1) how each element matched (or not) participants' knowledge and/or experience, and 2) if and how each element selection was affected by the demands of the social and organizational context. Question 10 asks you to also evaluate the selection of your instructional methods according to these three criteria (learning objectives, participants' knowledge/experience, and demands of the social and organizational context).

Many of your programs will have to address how the participants' learning will transfer from the instructional program to a wider context. If this is so, it is essential that you consider how your planning process can anticipate this transfer and build it into the planning process itself (pre-program), the instructional program, or the post-program activities. Question 8 asks you to identify the barriers to transfer and strategies that did/would have overcome these barriers to increase the likelihood of transfer.

Group Discussion Topics :(From March 5th through March 23rd 2007

We will be discussing the topics listed below:

* The strategies I used to facilitate the transfer of learning were...

* The instructional techniques I found most useful for transfer of learning to occur were...

* The changes that were required by the organization, people involved (planners, students) for successful transfer of learning were...

Written Assignment: Part 5 (Draft due March 23, 2007)

12. Use the model of an instructional plan given by Caffarella on page 194 to describe your instructional plan.
13. Evaluate the selection of content based on the relationship of each element to achieving the learning objectives (is it a "must know", or "nice to know"), the

- participants knowledge and experience, and the demands of the social and organizational context.
14. Evaluate the selection of methods based on the learning objectives, the participants' knowledge and experience, and the demands of the social and organizational context.
 15. What were the three most significant barriers to the participants transferring the learning to their settings? What would be three effective strategies you used/could have used to increase the likelihood that the participants would transfer their learning to their settings?

Readings:

Caffarella, R. (1994). Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 9 & 10

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapter 6

Session #6

March 26 --- 30, 2007:

April 02 --- 06, 2007:

- Negotiating the financing and marketing of the program

Themes:

I) Although only some programs have written budgets, all programs are financed in some way.

J) The ways that your program is marketed influences who participates.

The instructional program that we discussed in the previous module is the most visible part of the planning process to the participants. Yet there are many other tasks, which are largely invisible to these same participants, that you must accomplish if a program is to happen. As Caffarella points out: "planning programs requires a whole range of activities that go beyond thinking about the educational components of the program. People who are responsible for program planning need to recognize that budget management and other behind-the-scenes tasks are integral components of the planning process" (p. 163). The two that we will take up in this module are financing the program and marketing the program. These two dimensions almost always are related to the program objectives for a program because they have to do with issues of money and audience, which as Caffarella notes, "may even serve as the driving force behind program development efforts" (p. 163). Indeed, having to deal with these two issues distinguishes program planning for adults from the processes of curriculum planning that occur in the K-12 educational system.

The planners for virtually every educational program for adults must grapple with issues related to financing. This is obviously true for programs that are expected to generate a profit for the organization, where there are usually business plans and program budgets that are written for each program. This formal accounting of costs and income occurs in the for-profit educational sector as well as in non-profit agencies, such as continuing education centers at colleges and universities. In other agencies, such as training departments in the corporate sector or community-based programs in the community, participants are not charged a fee to attend. Nevertheless, there are certainly costs associated with the program, that planners are aware of, sometimes painfully so. The income in these cases may be from external grants or from an organizational subsidy to support the planner and other staff associated with the program. In these cases, even though there may not be a written budget, planners will likely be held accountable to those who provided the financing for the program. Question 12 asks you to estimate the categories of costs and income, even if you did not write a budget, to make visible the actual financing of your program.

As with financing, planners must grapple with issues of marketing because this directly

relates to the audience for the program. What is often overlooked in this part of planning is that promotion is only one part of marketing. Whereas promotion is very important to those programs where participation is voluntary and you need to attract a certain number of participants for the program "to make," there is much more to marketing. Caffarella discusses audience analysis, which we partly addressed in the needs-assessment module, product, price, and place as the other key decisions you might make depending on the specific setting for your program. These issues are vitally connected to your program because they deal with not only how many people will attend, but also with access, including the type of people who will attend. I would suggest that since Caffarella's first book was published in 1994, the questions of place have broadened to virtual, as well as physical, space. Question 13 asks you to discuss what you did, if anything, about the five dimensions of marketing, and how important these planning activities were to securing the audience for your program.

Group Discussion Topics: (From March 26th through April 6th 2007

We will be discussing the topics listed below:

" The major issues in the financing and marketing of my program are...

" The most important things to know about the facilities used for my program are...

" When negotiating the financing and marketing of the program, the five most important things to know or do are...

Written Assignment: Part 6 (Draft due April 6, 2007)

15. Analyze the financing of your program by providing an estimate of the cost of the 10 budget items (Exhibit 14.1) and the revenue from the six income sources (Exhibit 14.2). Explain whether and why you did or did not prepare a written budget for the program.

16. Five dimensions of program marketing are audience analysis, product, price, place, and promotion. In your response, 1) put these five dimensions of marketing in their order of importance for affecting the number of people who participated in your program, and 2) explain what you did in each dimension and how this affected participation.

17. How did the factors in your social and organizational context affect the financing and marketing of your program?

Readings:

Caffarella, R. (1994). Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 14 & 15

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapter 7

Session #7

April 09 --- 13, 2007:

April 16 --- 20, 2007:

- Negotiating the evaluation of the program

Themes:

K) Every program is evaluated by all of the stakeholders; it's just a matter of what evidence they use.

L) Your goal is to provide accurate and comprehensive information for the questions that your stakeholders want answered

Caffarella and Cervero have similar definitions of evaluation, namely, "judging the value or worth of an educational program" (Caffarella, p. 119). Similar to the point I made about needs-assessment, "evaluating a program" is generally confused with "collecting data" about the program. As I point out in the reading for the week:

"Determining the worth of a program--the definition of evaluation used here-- is such a fundamental human urge that it is done continually at various levels of formality by learners, instructors, and program planners. Since all these individuals make judgments about the worth of all programs, the issue is not whether workshops should be evaluated but the degree to which evaluative information should be collected systematically" (Cervero, 1984, p. 55). Thus, your stakeholders will make judgments about the achievement of your program and learning objectives; the only issue is the kind of information they use to make these judgments. Will this information be word of mouth from people who attended the program? Will it be follow-up studies of participants' performance? Will it be profit and loss statements? Will this information be accurate and comprehensive? Or biased and incomplete? Caffarella summarizes the value of your focus on asking good evaluation questions and collecting data systematically: "In essence, good program evaluation provides useful feedback to program planners, participants, supervisors of participants, managers and administrators [institutional leadership], community groups, and other interested parties" (p. 120). You will notice that these groups are the same as what Cervero and Wilson discussed as the people who may have a stake in your program, which you identified in Question 1 for your first paper.

If evaluation is happening all the time, how difficult can it be? It turns out often to be relatively difficult because of both technical and political issues. For example, some of your objectives may not be easily measurable. In evaluating the effect of your program on participants' performance, it may be difficult to claim that the program itself, and not other factors, contributed to the change. You may find that the cost of gathering the information exceeds its worth. You may have stakeholders who do not want the program judged with data because of political reasons.

Because of these and other difficulties, it is essential that you have a clear idea of who needs the information and why kind of information will be useful to their judgments about the program.

Thus, Question 15 asks you to focus the evaluation on the program and learning objectives that you developed in response to Questions 6 and 7 earlier in the semester. This will tie your evaluation process to important stakeholder needs (Question 5), which you translated to objectives. This will provide a clear focus on what really matters to your stakeholders.

With these key program and learning objectives in mind, you can proceed to design systematic data collection. Caffarella and Cervero each identify a number of issues and strategies to guide you in responding to Question 16. They point out that:

Evaluation data can be collected at four time points:

- " prior to the program
- " during the program
- " immediately after the program
- " well after the program (this time point is necessary for evaluating application of learning, impact of learning, return on investment)

In a number of ways:

- " written survey (the most common strategy)
- " observation before and after the program
- " Interviews with learners and other stakeholders
- " Tests
- " Product evaluation of something tangible
- " Performance review of a skill
- " Written records of possible program outcomes

As with all other parts of program development, the evaluation will be affected by the relationships and other factors in your social and organizational context. Take the time to assess these factors (Question 17) because how your stakeholders judge the program matters. Remember the bottom line: Every program is evaluated by all of the stakeholders: it's just a matter of what evidence they use. Your goal in negotiating the evaluation of the program is to provide accurate and comprehensive information for the questions that your stakeholders want answered.

Group Discussion Topics: (From April 9th through April 20th 2007

We will be discussing the topics listed below:

- " The strongest and weakest parts of the evaluation process were...

" The best methods for collecting evaluation data for my program were/are...

" When negotiating the evaluation of the program, the most important things to know or do are...

Written Assignment: Part 7 (Draft due April 20, 2007)

18. Which stakeholders had an interest in the achievement of which the primary program objectives (Question 6) and learning objectives (Question 7) and what evidence did they need to evaluate the achievement of the objective?
19. Based on your response in Question 15 describe the information you would collect to evaluate the program objectives and learning objectives and how you would collect it.
20. What factors in your social and organizational context affected the evaluation of the program?

Readings:

Caffarella, R. (2002). Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapters 11 & 12

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapter 8

Cervero, R.M.(1984). Evaluating workshop implementation and outcomes. In T.J.Sork (Ed.), Designing and implementing effective workshops. (pp. 55-67). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, no. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Session #8

April 23 --- 27, 2007:

- What is good program planning revisited

Final Project: Educational Program For Adults (Due May 4th 2007)

Written assignment: Essay (7 to 10 pages) (Due May 8th 2007) You have been asked to give advice to a group of people who are taking on their first program planning assignment. You need to tell them, in your own words, how to plan educational programs for adults. Please write this in the second person as if you were speaking to this group of people. In giving this advice, feel free to illustrate your points using examples from your planning of the program for EADU 7030 (this may be things that went well or things that didn't go well). Although you may cite publications in your response, it is not necessary that you do so. This essay will be evaluated on the basis that its' points are clearly stated and explained and internally consistent with each other.

Final Discussion: (From April 23rd through April 27th 2007

Discuss and complete the sentences listed below. Each incomplete sentence will be listed separately in the discussion area:

As a final activity and based on our discussions this semester, complete of the following two sentences:

Pete and Joan were good planners because....

Pete and Joan were not good planners because...

Readings:

Cervero, R.M. & Wilson, A.L. (2005). Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing and workplace education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chapter 9

Caffarella, R. (2002). Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Chapters 1 & 3