

A Member of the Texas State University System

**EDLD 7361 Program Evaluation
2016**

*EDLD 7361 is a required course for the doctorate of Education degree in
Educational Leadership*

College of Education Department of EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Instructor:

George W. Moore, Associate Professor

Office Location: Box 2119, Huntsville, Texas 77341 (located in TEC 319A)

Office Phone: 936-828-0599 (leave voicemail &/or email)

Email: geomoores@shsu.edu

Office Hours: before class, by appointment, using Zoom

Day and time the class meets: Thursday, 7:20-9:50

Location of class: SHSU-The Woodlands Center, Room 203

Course Description:

EDLD 7361 This course is designed for the study of educational problem solving and accountability and their relationship to needs assessment techniques, evaluation, methodologies, and decision-making processes. Credit 3. *Course is a required course for doctorate in Educational Leadership.*

IDEA Objectives:

In this course, our focus will be on these major objectives (as assessed by the IDEA course evaluation system):

Essential: Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods) (21)

Important: Developing skill in written and oral expression. (28)

Important: Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems (29)

Textbooks/Articles/ Resources

Required and Provided in Course Resources

- American Evaluation Association. (2016). *Online handbooks & texts*. Retrieved from <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=79>
- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. (e-book in library)
- Frechtling, J. (2010). *The 2010 user-friendly handbook for project evaluations*. Washington DC: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.purdue.edu/research/docs/pdf/2010NSFuser-friendlyhandbookforprojectevaluation.pdf>
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2010). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (any edition ok, may have to borrow one)
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2014). *The program evaluation standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.jcsee.org/program-evaluation-standards/program-evaluation-standards-statements>
- Leech, N., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2007). An array of qualitative data analysis tools: A call for data analysis triangulation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 22, 557–584. doi:10.1037/1045-3830.22.4.557
- Leech, N., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2008). Qualitative data analysis: A compendium of techniques and framework for selection for school psychology research and beyond. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23, 587–604. doi:10.1037/1045-3830.23.4.587
- McNamara, C. (2014). *Basic guide to program evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://managementhelp.org/evaluation/program-evaluation-guide.htm>
- Morris, M. (2011). The good, the bad, and the evaluator: 25 years of AJE ethics. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 32, 134-151. doi:10.1177/1098214010388267
- Morris, M., & Clark, B. (2013). You want me to do what? Evaluators and the pressure to misrepresent findings. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 34(1), 57-70. doi:10.1177/1098214012457237

- Owen, J. M. (2007). *Program evaluation: Forms and approaches* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford. (e-book)
- Watkins, R., West Meiers, M., & Visser, Y. (2012). *A guide to assessing needs: Tools for collecting information, making decisions, and achieving development results*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from www.needsassessment.org
- Western Michigan University Evaluation Center. (2010). *The evaluation center*. Retrieved from <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/>
- W. K. Kellogg Foundation. (2010). *Evaluation handbook*. Retrieved from <https://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2010/w-k-kellogg-foundation-evaluation-handbook>

Course Format:

I believe that learning is facilitated by an instructor that offers the following:

- safety
- risk
- relevance, and
- challenge.

I have found that students appreciate choice and variety. Students are invited to set personal learning goals and to share additional materials that will support learning for themselves and others. Class meetings will be planned to include discussions and activities that will enrich theoretical understandings; therefore, participants will be asked to complete daily assignments so that they may actively participate during class meetings.

I will use a combined approach of classroom time, field projects, and Web-based instruction to achieve the objectives of the course. The allotment of instructional time will exceed the minimum requirements for the 3-credit hour course.

Course Content: (course objectives)

The curricula for this course (1) include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) ongoing student engagement in research related to professional practice.

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. Discuss the **purposes** of program evaluation.
2. Appraise the relative merits of external and internal **evaluators**.
3. Develop a program evaluation **proposal**.
4. Analyze **ethical** and political issues associated with program evaluation.
5. Given a specific situation, match appropriate **designs and methods of data collection** with specific evaluation questions of a program evaluation.
6. **Complete** and write a program evaluation.
7. Design a Questionnaire using research-based design principles.
8. Provide evaluation services to a school district, university, community college, or other educational institution. (community engagement outcome)

Additional objectives:

9. Synthesize findings of the published literature and **prepare a review of literature** using focused topic sentences and coherent paragraphs.
10. **Revise and reshape writing** to improve ideas, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics.

Prerequisite learning: writing process, grammar, and style; knowledge of Newton Gresham Library website, statistics, qualitative methods

Course Requirements: (Course Expectations & SHSU Policies)

Late Work

Assignments are due as stated. Late work at the graduate level will be considered unacceptable. The student may petition the instructor in writing for consideration in the event of one extenuating circumstance.

Attendance

Academic Policy Statement 800401 *The policy for this class is as follows:*

1. Attendance is taken for all class meetings. Notify me in advance if you will be absent or tardy.
2. More than one class absence may result in a reduced participation grade.

Time Requirement

This course will provide at least 40 hours of instruction utilizing in-class meetings, individual conferencing, and independent study.

Expectations for Students

The purpose of a doctoral program is to produce a graduate who has developed breadth of vision, a capacity for interpretation, and the ability to carry out critical investigations. From the association with scholars, the doctoral student is expected to gain many new concepts, a zeal for adding to the sum of human knowledge, and the development of the ability to conduct original research and to think clearly and independently. Extensive reading, writing, and research is an integral part of graduate study.

Doctoral students are expected to submit work that demonstrates mastery of content and independent thinking. Students are expected to read beyond the work assigned, finding relevant resources to supplant learning. As with all graduate students studying Educational Leadership, doctoral students are expected to demonstrate regular attendance, active participation in class, timely completion of assignments, and respectful interactions with others. Students are expected to be prepared for class and interact in discussions in a way that clarifies learning and adds new understanding.

Debate is encouraged within the bounds of respectful dialogue. Student dispositions will be factored in the final grade for the course.

Student Conduct

All students shall follow the tenets of common decency and acceptable behavior conducive to a positive learning environment.

Electronic Devices: All cell phones, computers, and other electronic devices should be turned off during class. Refrain from checking email during class time.

Matrix (Table 1)

Course Objectives	Course Activities	Performance Assessments
1. Discuss the purposes of program evaluation.	Lesson 1 and 2	Critique of Evaluations
2. Appraise the relative merits of external and internal evaluators .	Lesson 2 and 3	Class Discussion
3. Develop a program evaluation proposal (evaluation plan)	Lessons 1-4	Evaluation Plan Assignment
4. Analyze ethical and political issues associated with program evaluation.	Lesson 5	Reflection and Permission Letter Assignment
5. Given a specific situation, match appropriate designs and methods of data collection with specific evaluation questions of a program evaluation.	Lesson 5-7	Evaluation Plan Assignment
6. Complete and write a program evaluation.	Evaluation Report	Program Evaluation Report
7. Design a Questionnaire using research-based design principles.	Lesson 6, 7	: Questionnaire
8. Provide evaluation services to a school district, university, community college, or other educational institution. (community engagement outcome)	Program Eval Planning conference and prog evaluation project	Reflection

Course Evaluation:

Performance Assessments (linked to course objectives)

The final grade will be based on the student's demonstrated performance, attitudes, and abilities related to the goals and objectives of the class (detailed in syllabus) as measured by these assessments:

- Assignments will be submitted in Blackboard assignment link by the due dates specified in Table 2.
- Please see syllabus for policy on late work.
- Feedback will be given on all assignments.
- Students are expected to incorporate feedback into future assignments.

Assignment	Point Values
Evaluation Plan Tool 3 Matrix	5
Permission letter	5
Purpose statement for the evaluation	5
Program Description(s) paragraph (including context)	5
Evaluation Questions	5
Evaluation design (method) section	10
Brief Lit Review (1-2 pages)	15
Findings section	5
Recommendations section	5
Final Evaluation Report	10
Executive summary	10
Executive Summary to class	5
Final Reflection & Action Steps	5
Dispositions (Graduate student dispositions, attendance, participation, apply corrections, preparation, group work)	5

NOTES: Each of these individual items must be submitted as one assignment by color indication. For example, each item in **light blue** is ONE assignment to be submitted as ONE document; each item in **red** is to be submitted as one document etc.

A = Exceeds Standards and demonstrates learning beyond the course and stated expectations. “A” work is earned by learners who extend learning beyond the minimum presented in class and demonstrate developed reasoning, written, and verbal communication skills. A student cannot earn an A if any assignments are turned in late or are missing, even if the student earns 90% of the total points.

B = Meets Standards and demonstrates mastery of objectives assessed. “B” work is earned by learners who demonstrate responsibility by meeting all deadlines, attending class, completing homework assignments, and earning passing grades on assessments.

C= Inconsistent performance that may be impacted by incomplete assignments, absences, or tardiness. “C” work is earned for submissions with several mechanical errors or issues related to quality and quantity standards.

F= Failure to meet Standards as demonstrated by incomplete assignments, absences, tardiness, and failure to produce doctoral level work.

Regarding grading, work that ‘meets expectation’ for doctoral-level work will receive a B. Students earning A’s will demonstrate work that exceeds expectations in quantity, quality, and levels of thought.

Course Specific Information:

Table 2

At-A-Glance Content (Subject to Change)

	Date	Topics (tentative)	Assignments Due
1	8-23	Course Overview What is a program? Why do we evaluate programs? What tools do I need to evaluate programs? How is evaluation different than research? How are evaluation and research similar? What is an action plan? What are some ways to create an action plan? What actions plans have you experienced? What program to evaluate? Program Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee) What are some models of program evaluation?	Assignments due 8-3 Read Letendre, Lipka (LL) text Ch 1 Basics, 2: First Step, 3 Make a Plan Browse tools in LL text Bring 2-3 ideas for an evaluation you might undertake. Read 9 steps to PE in BlackBoard Read Guiding Principles under BlackBoard Course Document
2	8-30	Review evaluation info from Class 1 What are the components of a Program Evaluation? 9 Steps Construction of Evaluations Questions for your Project Evaluation Design Refine EQ and Purpose of Evaluation and Writing the Program Description	Assignments Due 9-6 Submit your evaluation topic/topics in BB Read LL Tool 10 Collecting Data By Asking pp 215-230 Read/Scan Watkins et al. in BlackBoard under Readings Watkins, R., West Meiers, M. and Visser, Y. (2012). <i>A guide to assessing needs: Tools for collecting information, making decisions, and achieving development results</i> . Washington, DC: World Bank.

	Date	Topics (tentative)	Assignments Due
3	9-6	<p>Please review American Evaluation Association (AEA) http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=52</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement on Cultural Competence in Eval • Guiding Principles for Evaluators <p>Small Groups Discuss Articles in American Journal of Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Good, the Bad, and the Evaluator: 25 Years of AJE Ethics by Morris, doi:10.1177/1098214010388267 • You Want Me to Do What? Evaluators and the Pressure to Misrepresent Findings, by Morris/Clark, doi:10.1177/1098214012457237 • Needs Assessments • Describe steps in needs assessment • Why? When? • Needsassessment.org and data collection methods <p>Writing the description, context, purpose, permission letter, and evaluation questions.</p>	<p>Assignments due 9-13</p> <p>Read LL Chapter 7 Taking Stock</p> <p>Create Matrix similar to one found on p. 183 LL <u>Submit the following to BB before the next class</u> <u>Five Parts in ONE document</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program Description 2. Context of the Program 3. Evaluation purpose 4. Permission Letter 5. Evaluation questions
4	9-13	<p>Writing the Background Section of the Report Writing the Literature Review for the Report Literature Review Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Searches and Method of Search • Note Taking, Summary Paragraphs • Theme organization, Synthesis • Editing • Evaluation Literature Review: conceptualizing the components 	<p>Assignments due 9-20:</p> <p>Note: Read Tool 7 & 8 Read Chapter 8 &9 LL</p> <p>Start Literature Review, bring it to next class. DO NOT SUBMIT to Blackboard.</p>

	Date	Topics (tentative)	Assignments Due
5	9-20	Discuss Effect of Evaluation Ch 8 Discuss Solution Seeking Evals Ch 9 Peer review and rewrite of Literature Review.	Assignments: Sep. 27 Read Chapter 5 LL Data Analysis, Tools 12-14 Review articles by Leech and Onwuegbuzie for qualitative analysis. 6. Submit Brief Lit Review (1-2 pages)
6	9-27		10-4 Assignments Due
7	10-4		10-11 Assignments Due
8	10-11		Assignment due 10-18
9	10-18		Assignment due 10-25
10	10-25	Writing Reports: How To with Examples Contents of the PE report Examples of PE Reports Bring Draft of Findings Section for Peer Review before submitting to BB	Assignments Due 11-1 Bring outlines, drafts, ideas for Dissertation Lit Review to class for review

	Date	Topics (tentative)	Assignments Due
		<p>Writing Executive Summary. Prepare for Consultations Next Week Editing and Revising your Program Evaluation: Common Errors Planning for the Last Class/ Round Table Presentations of Exec Summary (powerpoint not required, prepare for small group presentation)</p>	
11	11-1	<p>Work Session: Data Analysis, Findings, Recommendations & Peer Editing! Class does not meet as a group. Plan a work session and do peer editing of your draft. I will be in the class to assist you with your projects.</p>	Assignments Due 11-7
12	11-8	<p>Unit 10 Eval Report and Presentation 12. Present Executive summary (10 minutes) Round tables 13. Submit Final Eval report by 10-31 Schedule a time to share your report with a stakeholder between 10-29 and 11-11.</p>	
13	11-15		
	11-22	<p>Thanksgiving NO CLASS</p>	Assignments Due 11-30 Presentation of Lit Review Progress

	Date	Topics (tentative)	Assignments Due
14	11-29	Last Day of Class	

Program Evaluation Project Guidelines

The format of a program evaluation report differs from a research report in its format, conciseness, and language used. Remember that this is because program evaluations are typically read by stakeholders who may not understand technical research jargon, APA, and research methods. Likely, the evaluation report will be disseminated to many potential stakeholder groups, all of whom must be able to understand its contents. Research and evaluation reports are similar in the presentation of purpose, data collection and analysis, and findings.

Please adhere to the following guidelines in preparing your evaluation report.

Cover: Create an attractive cover. The cover page should NOT look like an APA-style title page.

Table of contents: Using the automatic “Table of contents” feature in Word, create a table of contents. (see Reference ribbon in Word)

Data Sources: To meet expectations at a B level, you should utilize at least two data collection strategies (ideally one quantitative, one qualitative).

Data Display: Some data tables and figures should be used, when appropriate.

Ethics: The program evaluation project will adhere to the program evaluation standards specified by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation; student will be asked to discuss evidence of adherence.

Data collection or analysis will not begin without instructor approvals. Instruments designed in the class must be approved by the instructor prior to using for data collection.

Format: Evaluation report components should include a Table of Contents and contain at least the following component:

- I. Executive Summary
 - a. Purpose

- b. Evaluation Plan
 - c. Results
 - d. Recommendations
- II. Background Information
 - a. Purpose of the Evaluation
 - b. Program Description (why/how the program started or is anticipated, purpose, expected outcomes)
 - c. Context (history of the setting, characteristics of the institution/setting, people involved and impacted)
 - d. Brief Literature Review or description of best practices related to program or program goals (1-3 pp). (Longer reviews, as warranted, can be included as an appendix).
- III. Evaluation Design (Method)
 - a. Evaluation Questions
 - b. Data Collection Methods (sampling, instruments, procedures)
 - c. Data Analysis Techniques
 - d. Limitations
- IV. Findings (suggestion: organize by eval question). Describe findings. Use tables and figures in report.
- V. Conclusions and Recommendations (suggested course of action based on findings)
- VI. References
- VII. Appendices (Place sample instruments and any other pertinent documents related to evaluation)

Reflections:

1. How did your work/program evaluation benefit the receiving district or organization?
2. What might you do differently in this evaluation? (changes)
3. What were some of your major ah-has as a result of this project? (significant learnings)

Program Evaluation Project Rubric

Component	Exceeds Expectations A-level Work (Quantity & Quality)	Meets Expectations B-Level Work	Inconsistent Performance C or F level work
Executive Summary	Summary is concisely written and clearly addresses all components of the evaluation for a variety of audiences.	Summary minimally addresses components of the evaluation and is written for a minimum of potential audiences.	Summary does not adequately address all evaluation components and is poorly written.
Background Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of program and evaluation are clearly described. • Provides a rich description of background and context. • A concise discussion of relevant literature and/or best practices is given with relevant citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of program and evaluation are adequately described. • Minimally describes background and context. • Literature/best practices are somewhat relevant to evaluation but are inadequately discussed or referenced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of program and evaluation are poorly described. • Background and context are not described or adequately developed. • Relevant literature/best practices are not discussed or do not contain any citations.
Evaluation Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation questions are clearly written and aligned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation questions are somewhat aligned to purpose and are basic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation questions are vague and limited in alignment.

Component	Exceeds Expectations A-level Work (Quantity & Quality)	Meets Expectations B-Level Work	Inconsistent Performance C or F level work
	<p>with the purpose of the evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data are collected from a minimum of 2 data sources and are described in a transparent way • Data are analyzed using appropriate methods, which are described & referenced. • Citations are provided that support your choice of methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data are collected from 2 data sources and described in general way. • Data are analyzed using adequate methods, which are minimally described. • Citations are minimal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data lack validity or reliability. • Data are not sufficiently analyzed. • Citations are incorrect or absent.
Presentation of Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings are clearly presented & organized. • Graphically appealing visual representations are utilized (chart, graphs, figures). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings are adequately presented. • A few graphics are used to display findings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings are brief and leave unanswered questions. • Graphics are absent OR are confusing and misleading.

Component	Exceeds Expectations A-level Work (Quantity & Quality)	Meets Expectations B-Level Work	Inconsistent Performance C or F level work
Conclusion & Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are clearly supported by findings. • Recommendations are meaningful to potential stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are adequately supported by findings. • Recommendations are included but are lacking in detail or meaning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are not supported by findings. • Recommendations are “surface-level,” lacking in merit or supporting evidence.
Format & Graphic Appeal	<p>Text is clear, well-organized, concise, and free of errors.</p> <p>Modified APA may include figures, bulleted lists, charts.</p> <p>Graphically appealing format.</p> <p>Table of Contents is used.</p>	<p>Text is generally well-organized and contains some errors.</p> <p>Minimal graphic appeal.</p> <p>Table of Contents is used.</p>	<p>Text is poorly organized, vague, and full of errors.</p> <p>Poor graphic appeal.</p> <p>Table of Contents is incorrect or incomplete</p>

Component	Exceeds Expectations A-level Work (Quantity & Quality)	Meets Expectations B-Level Work	Inconsistent Performance C or F level work
Back Matter (References & Appendices)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear APA style reference list. • Well-organized appendices including important information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Errors appear in APA reference list. • Appendices do not contain important study components. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerous reference list errors. • Poorly structured appendices.



Student Guidelines

University Policies

- SHSU Academic Policy Manual-Students
 - [Procedures in Cases of Academic Dishonesty #810213](#)
 - [Students with Disabilities #811006](#)
 - [Student Absences on Religious Holy Days #861001](#)
 - [Academic Grievance Procedures for Students #900823](#)
- SHSU Academic Policy Manual-Curriculum and Instruction
 - [Use of Telephones and Text Messagers in Academic Classrooms and Facilities #100728](#)
 - Technology during instruction: INSTRUCTOR'S POLICY ON TECHNOLOGY USE DURING INSTRUCTION
 - Technology during exams: INSTRUCTOR'S POLICY ON TECHNOLOGY USE DURING EXAMS
 - Technology in emergencies: INSTRUCTOR'S POLICY ON TECHNOLOGY USE IN EMERGENCIES
- Visitors in the Classroom- Only registered students may attend class. Exceptions can be made on a case-by-case basis by the professor. In all cases, visitors must not present a disruption to the class by their attendance.

Attendance

ATTENDANCE EXPECTATIONS



College of Education Information

Accreditation

The programs within the SHSU College of Education have the distinction of receiving accreditation and national recognition from multiple accrediting bodies. All educator certification programs, including teaching and professional certifications, have received ongoing accreditation from the Texas Education Agency ([TEA](#)). Additionally, the educator preparation program has been accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation ([CAEP](#)-formerly NCATE) since 1954. Many of the educator preparation concentration areas have also chosen to pursue national recognition from their respective Specialized Professional Associations ([SPA](#)), signifying the program is among the best in the nation. The programs within the Department of Counselor Education have also received accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs ([CACREP](#)).

Course and Program Evaluation

Near the end of the semester, students are asked to take part in the University's adopted course evaluation system, IDEA. The assessments are completed online and instructions are emailed to each student. Students' assessments of courses are taken are systematically reviewed by the Dean, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and individual faculty members. Only after the semester has completed are faculty members allowed to view aggregated results of non-personally-identifiable student responses.

The College of Education conducts ongoing research regarding the effectiveness of the programs. Students receive one survey in the final semester prior to graduation regarding the operations of the unit during their time here. A second survey occurs within one year following completion of a program, and is sent to students and their employers. This survey requests information related to students' quality of preparation while at SHSU. Students' responses to these surveys are critical to maintaining SHSU's programs' excellence.