

**University of Georgia
Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, & Policy**

ERSH 7250 PROGRAM EVALUATION

Spring Semester, 2007

The course syllabus is a general plan for the course; deviations announced to the class by the instructor may be necessary.

Faculty

Lorilee R. Sandmann, Ph.D.
Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, & Policy
850 College Station Road
413 River's Cross Building
Athens, GA 30602
<http://www.coe.uga.edu/leap/faculty/sandmann/index.html>

706.542.4014 Work Phone
706.340.3746 Cell
706.542.2214 Dept. Administrator's phone
sandmann@uga.edu

Office hours: Wednesday 1:30-4:00 PM or by appointment

Carolina Darbisi, MSTM, M.Ed.
Teaching Assistant
706.224.1212 Cell
cdarbisi@uga.edu

Class Dates

January 10-May 2, 2007
Wednesdays, 4:30-7:15
G 62 River's Crossing
Alternative to this basic schedule are determined by event on the University calendar, available online at
http://www.reg.uga.edu/or.nsf/html/Academic_Calendar_06-07.

Course Description

This class on program evaluation will equip those with an interest in adult and continuing education, training and development, non-profit community-based programming, K-12, and higher education with the ability to design evaluations that yield needed information and also add value to program stakeholders. Information discussed in this class will be useful in developing a strong theory base as well as the practice skills required by the profession. To aid in the development of practical skills, students will assist with the design and conduct an evaluation.

The goal of this course is to provide a theoretical and practical understanding of program evaluation in education, business, community and social change settings. Students are

expected to complete the course with a greater understanding of: the political, real world and practical face of evaluation; the theoretical, social and scientific face of evaluation; approaches to program evaluation; standards and ethical practices in evaluation; designing, implementing, reporting and managing an evaluation; and resources on the study and practice of evaluation.

Class sessions will be a combination of in-class and online formats.

Course Objectives

The goal of this course is to provide a theoretical and practical understanding of program evaluation in education, community and social change settings. Students are expected to complete the course with a greater understanding of:

- a) The political, real world and practical face of evaluation
- b) The theoretical, social and scientific face of evaluation
- c) Approaches to program evaluation
- d) Standards and ethical practices in evaluation
- e) Designing, implementing, reporting and managing an evaluation
- f) Resources on the study and practice of evaluation.

Class Structure

Each class will be divided into a variety of formats to increase participation, present new materials, review reading assignments and conduct evaluations. Possible activities may include small group exercises, individual exercises, presentation and interviews, questions and answers, etc. Everyone's participation is essential to vary the delivery of the class and keep an energetic pace.

Course Communication

We will communicate through the WebCT email function. Anything to do with the course should be dealt with through WebCT. If there are other issues that you need to discuss, or if WebCT is not functioning, I can best be reached through my UGA email – sandmann@uga.edu.

Attendance Policy

The course is based on the assumption that each student is a resource person as well as a learner and each has a responsibility to contribute to the group's learning. Students are expected to attend all scheduled classes, to be on time, to be prepared, and to participate actively in each class session. Unexcused absences can result in a loss of 10 points for each such absence. In the event that you must miss a class, you must notify the instructor prior to class and you must make arrangements with one of your classmates to obtain notes and handouts from the session.

Required Texts

Books are available from the university bookstore or from reputable booksellers:

- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. ISBN: 0803952651

Description adapted from publisher:

This edition offers readers a full-fledged evaluation text from identifying primary users of an evaluation to focusing the evaluation, making methods decisions, analyzing data, and presenting findings. Both practical and theoretical, Utilization-Focused Evaluation: The New Century Text, Third Edition tells how to conduct program evaluations and why to conduct them in the manner prescribed.

Each chapter contains a review of the relevant literature and actual case examples to illustrate major points. Finally, the book offers a definite point of view developed from observing much of what has passed for program evaluation that has not been very useful: Program evaluation ought to be useful and something different must be done if evaluation is to be useful.

Written with humor, a soft touch, and the sound advice of two decades of experience, this text provides an overall framework and concrete advice for conducting useful evaluations.

- Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. ISBN: 0761908943

Description adapted from publisher:

Since Peter H. Rossi, Mark W. Lipsey, and Howard E. Freeman first published Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, more than 90,000 readers have considered it the premier text on how to design, implement, and appraise social programs through evaluation. In this, the completely revised Seventh Edition, authors Rossi and Lipsey include the latest techniques and approaches to evaluation as well as guidelines to tailor evaluations to fit programs and social contexts. This bestselling text covers the full range of evaluation topics, including framing evaluation questions, uncovering program theory, studying implementation, designing impact assessments, assessing program costs and benefits, understanding the politics of evaluating.

- The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *Program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational program* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. ISBN: 0803957327

Description from *Journal of Educational Measurement*:

The Program Evaluation Standards is a 'must-have' book for anyone responsible for reviewing evaluation proposals, planning and conducting evaluations, managing evaluation projects, or judging the merit and worth of evaluations once completed.... The book is an invaluable 'how-to' resource for graduate students venturing out into the field, and it instills a sense of what it means to be a responsible evaluator. For clients or consumers, the book offers advice on what they should expect of an evaluation. Each

standard is explained in just a few pages using a format that makes the book easy to read and navigate through. It is crisply written with user-friendly language. . . . The extra examples provide a greater range of applicability, thereby strengthening the book. . . . The Standards will continue to be an important sourcebook for scholars, practitioners, and administrators working in educational program evaluation.

Additional materials will be handed out in class.

Assignments and Due Dates:

1. Required reading, noted in the course outline, is to be completed in advance of the class for which it is assigned. Class discussions will assume that the readings have been done.
2. Meaningful, substantive participation each week whether in class and/or online.
3. There will be three projects in the course; a major multi-phased project due throughout the course, a midterm paper, and the last is a reflective summary paper.

Project #1 Evaluating Disaster Preparedness of Georgia Hospitals 50 points—varying due dates

This is a five-part assignment. It is to provide experience in designing and implementing a program evaluation and in serving as an evaluation consultant.

You will become familiar with and involved in the evaluation of the University of Georgia's Center for Mass Destruction Defense (CMADD) hospital preparedness drills. Students will work in teams of 4 persons. Assignments are to:

1. Develop an evaluation plan, including
 - Identification of stakeholders, issues, and questions
 - Logic model as program theory
 - Performance measurement
 - Staffing, timeline and budget

Product will be a written evaluation plan developed by each team.
Due: February 28th

2. Participate in developing an IRB for submission.
Product will be a completed IRB application.
Due: Feb. 21st

3. Participate in data collection, analysis and interpretation.
Product will be a team summary of data.
March-April

4. Write an evaluation final report; present your findings to the class.
Product will be a written team evaluation report and class presentation.
Due: April 25^h

5. In the role as an evaluation consultant, draft a **business letter** (no longer than 3 pages) to the project's director that
- does a meta analysis of hospital and project's effectiveness
 - makes recommendations about the project's prospects for replication and expansion.

Due April 25thth

Products related to these projects will be evaluated on:

- Degree to which components are addressed
- Integration with course readings and discussions
- Judgment of lessons learned, potential application or implications
- Appropriate grammar and correct format—business letter or APA, where applicable.

Project #2 Evaluation Model or Approach

Description and Critique Paper (5 double-spaced pages); Electronic Presentation

Due on or before March 21st

20 points

The purpose of this assignment is to provide the opportunity for students to become knowledgeable about one particular approach to program evaluation and to share that approach with the class electronically. An example of an evaluation model may be Fetterman's Empowerment Evaluation or Kirkpatrick's The Four Levels for Evaluating Training Programs.

Write a descriptive and critical analysis of the approach in a paper of **no more than 5 pages**. In the paper summarize some of the features of the model such as:

- What are the key features of this evaluation approach?
- What is the major purpose of and who is the primary audience for this approach to evaluation?
- What are the likely questions to be pursued?
- What are the typical evaluation designs and methods?
- What is the role of the evaluator?
- What criteria are used to judge the program?
- How is data reported and utilized?
- What vision of education, teaching-learning process is being assumed?
- Where and under what condition is the model applied?
- What are the strengths and limitations of the approach?
- What is your overall critique of the model for your practice?

In addition to the paper, a summary of the model or approach should be prepared for the class and presented in some format online through our class WebCT site. You can do it as a short "briefing" paper, a PowerPoint presentation, a simulation, or an interview with author, etc. Whatever format is used, include bibliographic references.

Papers will be evaluated on:

- Critical description and assessment
- Integration with course readings and discussions
- Discussion of relevance to practice as adult educator/evaluator
- Appropriate grammar and correct APA format

Project #3 Reflective Summary Paper (5 double-spaced pages)

Due on or before May 2

20 points

Reflect on the

- theoretical, political and practical elements of program evaluation based on the experience with the Disaster Preparedness evaluation
- application of the standard of evaluations in this setting
- characteristics of successful outcome evaluation
- features of your experience in program evaluation, your view of evaluation and your potential future in program evaluation.

Use class readings as a basis of reflection.

Papers will be evaluated on:

- Critical description and assessment
- Integration with course readings and discussions
- Discussion of relevance to practice as adult educator/evaluator
- Appropriate grammar and correct APA format

Include bibliographic references

Alternative to Project # 1, with permission of instructor: (50 points)

1. Serve as a consultant to a United Way agency director and/or staff to identify performance metrics, process measures, mission validity, demonstrating ROI, and, if possible, outcome data for program decisions. Or, if you are part of an organization with a training program that is being evaluated, similarly serving as an evaluation consultant might be possible.
2. Prepare a summary paper including:
 - The agency/organization, its needs and capacity
 - Logic model of the agency/organization's program under review and possible outcome indicators and measures for the program
 - Features of your experience in agency/organization diagnosis and consultation

Due April 18th

Products related to these projects will be evaluated on:

- Degree to which components are addressed
- Integration with course readings and discussions
- Judgment of lessons learned, potential application or implications
- Appropriate grammar and correct format—business letter or APA, where applicable.

Writing and Submission Guidelines

1. Double space all material using at least 11pt font in a format compatible with Microsoft Word (e.g. .doc, .rtf) following the *APA Manual, 5th Edition*, for paper layout, style and citation guidelines. Points will be deducted if APA style is not followed in all writing assignments. *Note:* This edition of the *Publication Manual* of the APA is an important

part of your professional library. A link to a summary of the most frequently used elements of APA, 5th edition, is available via the *Resources* page on WebCT.

2. All course assignments are due on or before 4:30 of the due dates indicated. Late assignments will not be accepted. To submit your assignments upload your electronic document via the Assignment Drop Box on WebCT.
3. Quality written assignments meet the following criteria:
 - Identify issue/question being addressed or purpose of paper through a clear thesis statement
 - Define key terms and concepts
 - Give examples that enhance understanding of the concepts
 - Apply theory and principles from the assigned readings and elsewhere
 - Provide a strong summary and conclusion.

Summary of Grading

Grading is completed on a 100-point scale. Attendance, participation, and in-class assignments are worth 10% of the total grade. The remaining 90% of the course grade is distributed across the major assignments as follows:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| A- Class Participation | 10 points |
| B- Project 1 Evaluation Design and Implementation | |
| 1. Design (20 points) | |
| 2. IRB (5 points) | |
| 3. Data Collection (10 points) | |
| 4. Final Report and Presentation (10 points) | |
| 5. Letter to Project Director (5 points) | 50 points |
| C- Project 2 Evaluation Model | 20 points |
| D- Summary Reflective Paper | 20 points |

Final grades will be assigned on the following numeric scale:

| | | |
|----------|--------|----|
| 95 – 100 | points | A |
| 90 – 94 | points | A- |
| 87 – 89 | points | B+ |
| 83 – 86 | points | B |
| 80 – 82 | points | B- |
| 70 – 79 | points | C |

Any grade below a B- should be addressed with the instructor immediately.

Students with a sound grasp of the material and a demonstrated ability to analyze this material at a satisfactory to above average level for graduate students can expect to receive a grade of "B." Grades below "B" will be assigned for performance that is less than satisfactory. The grade of "A" will be reserved to designate excellence. This will require not only a sound grasp and analysis of the material at a graduate level, but also a clear capacity to synthesize and critique the materials. There is no preconceived designation of the number of class members to

receive each grade, nor any ceiling on the number of "A's" to be assigned if all students exhibit the high standards of performance expected for that grade.

Incompletes will not be given except in the documented case of a medical or personal emergency. Please see the graduate school bulletin regarding the assignment of incomplete grades. These are reserved for situations in which a student who has otherwise been making satisfactory progress is unable to complete final course requirements due to extenuating circumstances. In such cases, the instructor must be contacted to negotiate a reasonable extension of time. Barring such a situation, the grade will be assigned on the date required by the registrar's office as earned according to the distribution described above.

University Honor Code and Academic Honesty Policy:

All academic work must meet the standards contained in "A Culture of Honesty." Each student is responsible to inform themselves about those standards before performing any academic work. "A Culture of Honesty" is the University of Georgia's policy and procedures for handling cases of suspected dishonesty and can be found online at www.uga.edu/ovpi. UGA Student Honor Code states "I will be academically honest in all of my academic work and will not tolerate academic dishonesty of others."

Statement of Equity and Special Assistance

Every attempt will be made in this course to engage in equitable verbal and nonverbal behavior by the instructor and the students as related to age, sex, race, handicapping condition, and religion.

Students with disabilities who require reasonable accommodations in order to participate in course activities or meet course requirements should contact the instructor early in the semester to discuss any concerns.