

Advanced Evaluation of Educational Programs
ERM 742

Lynne R. Tingle, PhD
UNC Greensboro, 1000 Spring Garden Street, Office - 215 Curry, Greensboro, NC, 27402
Phone - (w) 334-3435, fax 336-256-0405, email – lrtingle@uncg.edu
Office Hours – By appointment

Textbook: No textbook required

Websites

<http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/>
<http://www.eval.org/>

Course Reference Material

Wiersma, W. (2000). Research Methods in Education. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Lipsey, M. W. (1999). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). Educational Research. Sixth Edition. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

American Journal of Evaluation. American Evaluation Association.

Campbell D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.

Krueger, R. (various years). Focus Groups. SAGE. (Many editions and versions)

Sanders, J. R. & Nafziger, D. N. (1976). A Basis for Determining the Adequacy of Evaluation Designs. Occasional Paper Series #6. Western Michigan Evaluation Center.

Scriven, M. (1975). Evaluation Bias and its Control. Occasional Paper Series #4. Western Michigan Evaluation Center.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000). The Ten Commandments, Constitutional Amendments, and Other Evaluation Checklists. Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Honolulu.

Taylor, J. P. (1974). An Administrator's Perspective of Evaluation. Occasional Paper Series #2. Western Michigan Evaluation Center.

Vogt, W. P. (1999). Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Purpose of the Course

The purpose of this course is to expound upon students' knowledge, understanding, and application of educational program evaluation models and research methods. Current debates, issues, and theories in the field of evaluation will be introduced.

Objectives

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- 1) demonstrate understanding of current quantitative techniques, how they are applied, and types of situations in which certain techniques could be used in program evaluation
- 2) demonstrate understanding of current qualitative techniques, how they are applied, and types of situations in which certain techniques could be used in program evaluation
- 3) apply any given program evaluation model once the basic purpose of a project has been defined
- 4) critically analyze current debates in the field of evaluation
- 5) list and describe program evaluation organizations, journals, and leaders in the field
- 6) compare and contrast present program evaluation models
- 7) critically analyze existing evaluations
- 8) apply meta-evaluation concepts to existing evaluations

Projects and Tests – Total Points = 211

Mid-term	30 points
Final	50 points
4 Model Application Assignments (10 points each)	40 points
Analysis Project	20 points
Reading Assignment 1	20 points
Reading Assignment 2	10 points
Reading Assignment 3, 4, and 5 (10 points each)	30 points
Reading Assignment 6	3 points
Reading Assignment 7	8 points

For various reasons, late assignments are not accepted under any circumstances. If you have reason to believe you may have difficulty meeting an assignment deadline, you should plan to turn in the assignment before the due date.

Grades

A = 211 – 190 (190-196 = A-, 197-203 = A, 204-211 = A+)

B = 189 – 169 (169 – 175 = B-, 176 – 182 = B, 183 – 189 = B+)

C = 168 – 148 (148 – 154 = C-, 155 – 161 = C, 162 – 168 = C+)

F = < 148

Tentative Course Topics

In extenuating circumstances, the schedule may change at the discretion of the instructor

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Chapters, Readings, and/or Class Materials</u>	<u>Assignments</u>
Week 1 Introduction Syllabus - Lecture Websites – Interactive Blackboard – Interactive		
Week 2 Introduction to Current Topics, Problems, and Themes in Program Evaluation	Mark, M. M. (2001). Evaluation's future: Furor, futile, or fertile. <u>American Journal of Evaluation</u> , 22, 457-479.	Reading Assignment 1 Due
Week 2 Research Basics	Powerpoint with Audio, Notes	
Week 2 Variables	Powerpoint with Audio, Notes	
Week 3 and 4 Models – Objectives Oriented Approaches		
Weeks 3 and 4 Models – Management Oriented Approaches		
Weeks 3 and 4 Models – Product Evaluation		
Weeks 3 and 4 Models – Participant Oriented Approaches		Model applications due on or before Week 6

Week 5 Retrospective Pre-test	Pratt, C. C., McGuigan, W. M., & Katzev, A. R. (2000). Measuring program outcomes: Using retrospective pretest methodology. <u>American Journal of Evaluation</u> , 21, 341-349.	Reading Assignment 2 Due
Week 5 Understanding Qualitative and Historical Research	Notes, Powerpoint with Audio	
Week 5 Survey and Descriptive Research	Notes, Powerpoint with Audio	
Week 6 Focus Groups, Interviews, and Observations	Notes, Powerpoint	
Week 7 Test 1		
Week 8 Meta-Analysis		Reading Assignment 3 Due
Week 9 Meta-Evaluation		Reading Assignment 4 Due
Week 10 Cost-Analysis		Reading Assignment 5 Due
Week 11 Checklists	Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation checklists: Practical tools for guiding and judging evaluations. <u>American Journal of Evaluation</u> , 22, 71-79.	Reading Assignment 6 Due
Week 11 Purpose of Research	Notes, Powerpoint with Audio	
Week 11 Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs	Notes, Powerpoint with Audio	
Week 12 Multi-site evaluations	Straw, R. B., & Herrell, J. M. (2002). A framework for understanding and improving multisite evaluations. <u>New Directions in Evaluation</u> , 94, (summer) 5 – 15.	Reading Assignment 7 Due
Week 12 Qualitative Analysis	Notes	
Week 13 Quantitative Analysis (Descriptive Stats and Regression)	Notes, Powerpoint with Audio	

Final Exam – Week 15

Final Analysis Project Due Week 17

Objectives-Based Model Application

Directions: Find the website on listed below. After reviewing the objectives, proposed activity/change, and benefits/challenges, write an evaluation plan using an objectives-based model.

The assignment should be no more than 4 pages (not including the title page), double-spaced, with a 12-point font. The assignment is worth 10 total points.

Design Issues: NAEP 2002 & Beyond

<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/bidding/pdf/DesignTable.pdf>

Description of the Plan – Adequately describe the evaluation plan (ie. who, what when, where, and how).

Inadequate description of the project	1
Project description omitted one or two important aspects	2
Project was adequately discussed	3

Fit of the Plan to the Model

Inadequate fit of the plan to the proposed model	1
Fit of the plan to the model included a few minor errors	2
The plan fit the model	3

Implementation of the evaluation plan

Inadequate description of the procedures for implementation	1
Description omitted one or two important aspects or left questions unanswered	2
Implementation was adequately described	3

Limitations of evaluation

Inadequate description of the limitations of the model for this project	0
Adequate description of the limitations	1

CIPP Model Application

Directions: Respond to the following item by writing no more than 4 pages, double-spaced, pages with a 12-point font. Each accurate representation of the four components of the CIPP model will be awarded 2.5 points for a total of 10 possible points.

Suppose you have been summoned by the Dean of the School of Education at UNC Greensboro, a small graduate level university in North Carolina. She explains to you that they want their graduate students to be proficient in research and statistics upon graduating. Subsequently, she is starting a support program to achieve this goal. The program includes the following components:

- a. a statistics laboratory
- b. a team of 6 statistics tutors
- c. computers and software
- d. 3 new faculty for the ERM department
- e. videos, tapes, and web-based tutoring assistance

You have been asked to design an evaluation of the success of the program. Data would need to be gathered during the first semester that the program is in operation (Fall semester) and a written report would be needed three weeks after final exams in the Spring semester. Your task is to develop the evaluation plan using the CIPP model.

Product Evaluation Application

Directions: Find the website listed below. In the search engines, type in a content area of interest to you (and grade level if you prefer) and review the resources provided. I suggest limiting the search to free materials that can be obtained via the website.

<http://thegateway.org>

Some of the resources may be a series of lesson plans and some may be projects. For the purpose of this project, any type of resource can be used. After you review your product, apply the concepts learned about Product Evaluation.

The assignment should be no more than 4 pages (not including the title page), double-spaced, with a 12-point font. The assignment is worth 10 total points. The number of points awarded will depend on the level at which you apply the concepts accurately, adequately, and understandably.

Countenance Model Application

Directions: Respond to the following item by writing no more than 4 pages, double-spaced, pages with a 12-point font.

Demonstrate your understanding of the Countenance model by applying it to one of the following programs:

- a. a reading-tutoring program for children who are at level 1 or 2 in reading.
- b. a parenting class for single teen mothers
- c. a math acceleration program for eighth graders
- d. a cardiac rehabilitation program

Include in your response at least three intended antecedents, at least 3 transactions and at least three intended outcomes (3 points). Identify how you would assess the corresponding “observed” antecedents, transactions, and outcomes (3 points). List the standards that might be used for each (3 point). Finally, identify the limitations of using this model with the program you selected (1 point).

Advanced Evaluation
Reading Assignment #1

Mark, M. M. (2001). Evaluation's future: Furor, futile, or fertile. American Journal of Evaluation, 22, 457-479.

Directions: Read each item/question carefully and respond based on your understanding of the article. Turn in your assignment with a title page. Responses must be double-spaced. Each item is worth 1 point.

1. Describe the purpose of the article.
2. Why does Scriven think it is important to think about future trends in evaluation?
3. After reading about the qualitative-quantitative debate, describe your understanding of the majority opinions about the issue.
4. Describe Worthen's view on the qualitative-quantitative debate.
5. Elaborate on the suggestions by the author on reaching permanent peace between qualitative and quantitative researchers.
6. Describe some underlying causes of the qualitative-quantitative debate. What are your thoughts on this issue?
7. What does "context" mean in program evaluation?
8. Describe the issues/discussions surrounding generalizability and program evaluation.
9. Elaborate on the 3 approaches that increase our understanding of causality by accounting for context more accurately.
10. Critically analyze the relationship between generalization and particularization.
11. Describe the role of meta-analysis in program evaluation.
12. Describe Stake's position across many issues presented in this paper.
13. Describe the most accepted working relationship between stakeholders and evaluators.' What are some of the arguments against this type of relationship?
14. What are some of the issues relating to advocacy of particular evaluation methods? How would the results of DARE differed if the evaluation methods used were empowerment oriented?

15. What are the different views on “values” and the role of “values” in evaluation? What is the present and future role of evaluation in some political arenas? How can evaluation maintain some level of credibility and objectivity when evaluating a politically charged program?
16. How does synthesis help the field of evaluation?
17. Describe the view represented in this article about the field of evaluation. Describe your view about evaluation before enrolling in this course.
18. What are some of the issues surrounding performance assessment evaluation?
19. How does the field of evaluation need to change in order to achieve more credibility?
20. Describe your thoughts as you read this article. Were you surprised at how much debate occurs in this field or were you aware of some of these issues. How has your perception of program evaluation changed?

Advanced Evaluation
Reading Assignment #2

Pratt, C. C., McGuigan, W. M., & Katzev, A. R. (2000). Measuring program outcomes: Using retrospective pretest methodology. American Journal of Evaluation, 21, 341-349.

Directions: Read each item/question carefully and respond based on your understanding of the article. Turn in your assignment with a title page. Responses must be double-spaced. Each item is worth 1 point.

1. What is GPRA? Why was it created? How is it different from conventional research methodology?
2. What are the two challenges of program evaluation as outlined by these authors?
3. Provide two reasons why performance measurement strategies have become so common in program evaluation.
4. What are the limitations of traditional pre-post test designs?
5. What is pretest overestimation? Why is this a problem in program evaluation?
6. Describe the methodology of implementing a retrospective pretest design.
7. Describe the study methods (i.e. comparisons made, analysis conducted, measures used).
8. What were the findings of the study? Compare and contrast each finding and the significance of the results.
9. What are the limitations of this methodology according to the authors? Describe any limitations you believe were omitted.
10. Critically analyze the study based on your evaluation, research design, and statistical knowledge. What did you learn from this study that you hadn't heard of or thought about before? How might you use this new knowledge in future projects?

Advanced Evaluation
Reading Assignment #3

Directions: The purpose of this project is to become familiar with various methods of conducting a meta-analysis. Each student will prepare a written report and presentation describing a meta-analysis study that has been published in a peer-reviewed journal.

Select a topic of interest (i.e. reading achievement) and conduct a literature search. Locate and obtain a meta-analysis research study in the area of interest. After reading the article, write a two-page report that addresses the following issues:

- a. Area of study
- b. Purpose of the study/hypotheses
- c. Methodology
- d. Results
- e. Conclusions
- f. Future research topics

The written report should include a title page and the article. The two-page report should be double-spaced with 12-point font. Reports that do not follow these guidelines will not be accepted for a grade. The written report is worth 5 points. 5 = Outstanding, 4 = Outstanding, with a few minor issues omitted or errors, 3 = Average report, writing does not flow well, grammatical errors, and a few minor issues omitted, 2 = Below average = writing does not flow well, grammatical errors, and major issues omitted, 1 = Poor quality report.

Prepare a presentation for the class and be ready to answer questions. You may use any tables or appendixes used in the article to enhance your presentation. The presentation should be maximum of 20 minutes in length and include the categories from the written report. The presentation is worth 5 points and follows the same logic as the written assignment, except is in relation to the presentation.

Provide a copy of the article you selected to each member of the class.

Advanced Evaluation Reading Assignment #4

Directions: The purpose of this project is to become familiar with the content involved in conducting a meta-evaluation. Each student will prepare a written report and presentation describing a meta-analysis study that has been published in a peer-reviewed journal.

Select a topic of interest (i.e. reading achievement) and conduct a literature search. Locate and obtain a meta-evaluation research study in the area of interest. After reading the article, write a two-page report that addresses the following issues:

- a. Area of study
- b. Purpose of the study/hypotheses
- c. Methodology
- d. Results
- e. Conclusions
- f. Future research topics

The written report should include a title page and the article. The two-page report should be double-spaced with 12-point font. Reports that do not follow these guidelines will not be accepted for a grade. The written report is worth 5 points. 5 = Outstanding, with a few minor issues omitted or errors, 4 = Outstanding, with a few minor issues omitted or errors, 3 = Average report, writing does not flow well, grammatical errors, and a few minor issues omitted, 2 = Below average = writing does not flow well, grammatical errors, and major issues omitted, 1 = Poor quality report.

Prepare a presentation for the class and be ready to answer questions. You may use any tables or appendixes used in the article to enhance your presentation. The presentation should be maximum of 20 minutes in length and include the categories from the written report. The presentation is worth 5 points and follows the same logic as the written assignment, except is in relation to the presentation.

Provide a copy of the article you selected to each member of the class.

Advanced Evaluation
Reading Assignment #5

Directions: The purpose of this project is to become familiar with cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analyses used in the field of program evaluation. Each student will prepare a written report and presentation describing a cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis published in a peer-reviewed journal.

Conduct a literature search to locate published articles that describe a cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness study on any content area. After reading the article, write a two-page report that addresses the following issues:

- a. Area of study
- b. Purpose of the study/hypotheses
- c. Methodology
- d. Results
- e. Conclusions
- f. Future research topics

The written report should include a title page and the article. The two-page report should be double-spaced with 12-point font. Reports that do not follow these guidelines will not be accepted for a grade. The written report is worth 5 points. 5 = Outstanding, with a few minor issues omitted or errors, 4 = Outstanding, with a few minor issues omitted or errors, 3 = Average report, writing does not flow well, grammatical errors, and a few minor issues omitted, 2 = Below average = writing does not flow well, grammatical errors, and major issues omitted, 1 = Poor quality report.

Prepare a presentation for the class and be ready to answer questions. You may use any tables or appendixes used in the article to enhance your presentation. The presentation should be maximum of 20 minutes in length and include the categories from the written report. The presentation is worth 5 points and follows the same logic as the written assignment, except is in relation to the presentation.

Provide a copy of the article you selected to each member of the class.

Advanced Evaluation
Reading Assignment #6

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation checklists: Practical tools for guiding and judging evaluations. American Journal of Evaluation, 22, 71-79.

Directions: Read each item/question carefully and respond based on your understanding of the article. Turn in your assignment with a title page. Responses must be double-spaced. Each item is worth 1 point.

1. Describe the history of checklists (i.e. who, what, why, when, etc).
2. What are the checklists available thus far for program evaluators? What focus do each of the checklists have?
3. What are the future needs in the checklist arena of program evaluation?

Advanced Evaluation
Reading Assignment #7

Straw, R. B., & Herrell, J. M. (2002). A framework for understanding and improving multisite evaluations. New Directions in Evaluation, 94, (summer) 5 – 15.

Directions: Read each item/question carefully and respond based on your understanding of the article. Turn in your assignment with a title page. Responses must be double-spaced. Each item is worth 1 point.

1. Describe a multisite evaluation using the authors' definitions of the various types.
2. What are some limitations of multisite evaluations?
3. What are some benefits to multisite evaluations?

Leff, H. S. & Mulkern, V. (2002). Lessons learned about science and participation from multisite evaluations. New Directions in Evaluation, 94, 89-101.

Write a critical analysis of the problems encountered in multisite evaluations and the solutions given by the authors. Describe your agreeability or disagreeability with some of the solutions presented. 5 points.

Analysis Activity

Advanced Evaluation of Educational Programs

For your analysis project, you will conduct a qualitative and quantitative review of data relating to a needs assessment. The project was commissioned by a school district with the purpose of determining the needs of the clients served by the Human Resources Department.

Three-hundred surveys were mailed to a randomly selected sample of County employees. Of those 300, 213 were returned. Some of the respondents elected to write additional comments at the end of the survey. The comments and the raw data are provided for you.

Your task is to analyze the data and generate a report based on the results. The report should include a brief introduction describing the project, a methods section, a results section, and a conclusion. Additionally, an executive summary and a title page must be included.

The data for this needs assessment will be generated through the administration of a survey, focus group, and interviews. The students in this class will develop all instruments and guides for data collection and act as participants in the needs assessment. Below is a detailed description of the grading components of the analysis project.

Title Page – Title of the Project, Your Name, Title, Organization, Address, Phone, Email

Introduction (2 points) – Adequately describe the purpose of the project, why the project was commenced, who requested the project, when the project was conducted (ie. who, what when, where, and how).

Inadequate description of the project	0
Project description omitted one or two important aspects	1
Project was adequately discussed	2

Methods (7 points) – Adequately describe the methods used in the project, how subjects were obtained, data collection and instrumentation, and analysis procedures.

Failed to provide an overview of the methods used	0
Provides an overview of the methods used	1
Inadequate description of the subjects and/or sampling procedures	0
Subjects/sampling description omitted one or two important aspects	1
Adequate description of the subjects and/or sampling procedures	2
Inadequate description of the data collection technique(s)	0
Data collection description omitted one or two important aspects	1
Data collection technique(s) was adequately discussed	2
Inadequate description of the analysis technique(s)	0
Analysis description omitted one or two important aspects	1

Analysis was adequately discussed 2

Results (7 points) – Accurately interpret the data in relation to the purpose of the project. This includes presenting the results in text and in table format.

Adequate description of the results	
Items omitted, many of the results were interpreted incorrectly	1
items omitted, of those included, some interpreted incorrectly	2
items omitted, majority included, few interpreted incorrectly	3
minor errors with reporting of results	4
no errors with reporting of results and interpretation	5
Tables not included	0
Tables were not presented in a commonly used format	1
Tables were presented in appropriate format	2

Conclusions (4 points) – Expound upon the results section and describe any limitations that may have affected the results. Describe ideas that may need future attention based on results of this project. Make recommendations that are based on the results, not your opinion.

Vague conclusions section, choppy, no relation to the rest of the article	1
Conclusion section had at least one issue appropriately addressed but was below average in totality	2
Conclusion section covered majority of issues with few minor errors	3
Conclusion section covered all issues and had no errors	4