Sam Houston STATE UNIVERSITY

A Member of the Texas State University System

EDLD 7361 Program Evaluation
Spring-2018
EDLD 7361 is a required course for the Doctorate of Education degree in Educational Leadership
College of Education
Department of Educational Leadership

Instructor:
Rebecca M. Bustamante, PhD, Professor
Office Location: Box 2119, Huntsville, Texas 77341 (located in TEC 319A)
Office Phone: 936-294-4946 (leave voicemail &/or email)
Email: rmb007@shsu.edu

Office Hours: By appointment or via Zoom (online)

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

Location of class: SHSU-The Woodlands Center, 3380 College Park, Conroe, 77380

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.*

You will work with an educational organization to provide evaluation services. These services will encompass about 40-60 hours of work in the form of the evaluation planning meeting, evaluation report, and evaluation presentation. The estimated value of your services would typically range from $1,500 to $5,000, depending on the scope of work.

You will apply the knowledge and skills for program evaluation to make a difference in the community and to improve the quality of education for students. This experience, it

is hoped, will help you see yourself as a positive force in this world and deepen your understanding of your role as a productive citizen.

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)
>
> Essential: Developing skill in written and oral expression.
>
> Important: Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems

Textbooks:

There will be no specific textbook for this course. We will use a variety of online resources available on our course Bb site.

Recommended Additional Articles/ Resources:

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)

Letendre, B. G., & Lipka, R. P. (2000). *An elementary school educator's guide to program evaluation: Getting answers to your questions.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Frechtling, J. (2010). *The 2010 user-friendly handbook for project evaluations*. Washington DC: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from http://coe.wayne.edu/engagement/theuserfriendlyprojectevaluationguide.pdf

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2010). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (any edition ok, used in your Research Methods class)

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 http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2006/02/WK-Kellogg-Foundation-Evaluation-Handbook.aspx

Course Content: (course learning 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 program or assessment 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 university, community college, or other educational institution. (ACE-community engagement outcome)
9. Apply program design to higher education contexts.

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, online instruction, 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.

Academic Honesty
Academic work submitted by you (such as papers, assignments, reports, tests) shall be your work alone and referenced in part or in whole to its correct source. Submission of commercially prepared (or group prepared) materials as your own work is unacceptable. Moreover, you shall encourage honesty in others by refraining from providing materials or information with knowledge that these materials or information will be used improperly. Violation of these academic standards may result in program removal or failure. Academic Policy Statement 810213. See also http://www.shsu.edu/syllabus/

Papers and reports will be submitted electronically and may be evaluated for originality of content and accuracy of quotes and paraphrasing using software such as *Turnitin.* Plagiarized work will receive a failing grade and possible program dismissal.

Sam Houston State University has an account with an automated plagiarism detection service that allows instructors to submit student assignments to be checked for plagiarism. We reserve the right to (a) request that assignments be submitted as electronic files and (b) electronically submit assignments. Assignments are compared automatically with a database of journal articles, web articles, and previously submitted papers. The instructor receives a report showing exactly how a student's paper was plagiarized. For information about plagiarism in SHSU's website, go to http://www.shsu.edu/students/guide/dean/codeofconduct.html (see section 5.31 and 5.32 of the Code of Student Conduct and Discipline) and http://www.shsu.edu/~vaf_www/aps/documents/810213.pdf (see section 5.31 and 5.32 of the Academic Policy Statement 810213)

PLAGIARISM: WHAT IT IS

Plagiarism is defined as "literary theft" and consists of the unattributed quotation of the exact words of a published text, or the unattributed borrowing of original ideas by paraphrase from a published text.

Dropping the Class/Withdrawing from the University:

If you need to adjust your schedule by dropping this course, please follow university procedures to drop the class. If you fail to drop the class, a failing grade shall be assigned at the end of the course. To resign (officially withdraw) from the university, a student must either report to the Registrar's Office to complete a Resignation Request or submit a letter stating his or her intent to resign.

Students with Disabilities Policy: http://www.shsu.edu/syllabus/

Student Absences on Religious Holy Days: http://www.shsu.edu/syllabus/

University Policies:

Graduate students are governed by the SHSU's policies related to student conduct. Any student with questions about grievances, ethical behavior, etc. should review the SHSU Graduate Catalog and the Texas State University System Rules and Regulations.

NCATE Accreditation

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the largest accreditation body in the United States, is officially recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and highly acclaimed as an accrediting body for institutions that prepare educators for professional roles in schools. NCATE's mission is to provide accountability and improvement in educator preparation through a standards-based assessment. NCATE accreditation adds value to your education as a program of high quality in the educational community.

"NCATE standards are based on the belief that all children can and should learn, (NCATE, 2008)." The effectiveness of the College or Unit is measured based on the standards, which

are institutional guidelines that ensure knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions educators need to facilitate P-12 learning.

The NCATE website is source for additional information accessed as follows:

http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/NCATE%20Standards%202008.pdf
http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4

Conceptual Framework Statement, Descriptors (5 indicators) and Logo:

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: Through programs dedicated to collaboration in instruction, field experience, and research, the candidates in Sam Houston State University's Educator Preparation Programs acquire the knowledge, dispositions, and skills necessary to create a positive learning environment. Employing a variety of technologies, these candidates learn to plan, implement, assess, and modify instruction to meet the needs of communities' diverse learners.

SHSU Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies

1. Demonstrates an attitude of reflection and thoughtfulness about professional growth and instruction. (CF 1)
2. Demonstrates a commitment to using technology to create an authentic learning environment that promotes problem-solving and decision making for diverse learners. (CF 2)
3. Practices ethical behavior and intellectual honesty. (CF 3)
4. Demonstrates thoughtfulness in communication and an awareness and appreciation of varying voices. (CF 3)
5. Demonstrates knowledge of second language acquisition and a commitment to adapting instruction or programs to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners. (CF 3; CF 5)
6. Demonstrates ability to be understanding, respectful and inclusive of diverse populations. (CF 3; CF 5)
7. Uses assessment as a tool to evaluate learning and improve instruction for all learners. (CF 4)
8. Demonstrates a commitment to literacy, inquiry, and reflection. (CF 1; CF 4)
9. Leads diverse learners to higher level thinking in cognitive, affective and/or psychomotor domains. (CF 5)
10. Demonstrates a commitment to adapting instruction or programs to meet the needs of diverse learners. (CF 5)

The Dispositions and Diversity Proficiencies (DDP) are administered and evaluated during the initial and advanced program in prescribed courses. (*Please provide additional information for the candidate if the DDP is administered during your course.*)

College of Education Information:
Please be advised that the College of Education conducts ongoing research regarding the effectiveness of the programs. You will receive one survey in the final semester prior to graduation regarding the operations of the unit during your time here. A second survey will occur within one year following graduation from or completion of a program, and will be sent to you and to your employer. This survey will focus on the preparation received at SHSU. Please remember that your response to these surveys is critical to SHSU program excellence.

Matrix (Table 1)

Course Objectives	Course Activities	Performance Assessments	Standards Alignment Conceptual Framework (CF) NCATE Knowledge and Skills Proficiencies by indicator (N)
1. Discuss the **purposes** of program evaluation.	Lesson 1 and 2	Critique of Evaluations	CF1 Knowledge Base CF3 Communication N-1e, 1f
2. Appraise the relative merits of external and internal **evaluators**.	Lesson 2 and 3	Class Discussion	CF1 Knowledge Base CF3 Communication N-1e, 1f
3. Develop a program evaluation **proposal** (evaluation plan)	Lessons 1-4	Evaluation Plan Assignment	CF1 Knowledge Base CF3 Communication N-1e, 1f
4. Analyze **ethical** and political issues associated with program evaluation.	Lesson 5	Reflection and Permission Letter Assignment	CF1 Knowledge Base CF3 Communication N-1e, 1f

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	CF1 Knowledge Base CF3 Communication N-1e, 1f
6. **Complete** and write a program evaluation.	Assessment 4: Program Evaluation Report	Program Evaluation Report	CF3 Communication CF 2 Technology N-1e, 1f
7. Design a Questionnaire using research-based design principles.	Lesson 6, 7	: Questionnaire	CF1 Knowledge Base CF 2 Technology N-1e, 1f, 1g
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	CF3 Communication CF 2 Technology N-1e, 1f

NCATE Unit Standards
http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/NCATE%20Standards%202008.pdf
http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4
COE Conceptual Framework: http://www.shsu.edu/~edu_edprep/

Requirements for graduate students in all College of Education programs include (1) varied filed experiences with diverse P-12 students, and (2) providing evidence of professional dispositions and diversity proficiencies.

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 the course calendar.
- Please see syllabus for policy on late work.
- Feedback will be given on all assignments.
- Students are expected to incorporate feedback into future assignments.

Grade Points

Higher Education Context Application Discussions-Expert Leadership	50
PROGRAM EVALUATION COMPONENTS	
1. Eval Plan Tool 3 Matrix & 8 Questions Worksheet	10
2. Permission letter	10
3. Purpose statement for the evaluation	10
4. Program Description(s) paragraph	10
5. Questionnaire or other tools or instruments	25
6. Context paragraph(s)	10
7. Brief Lit Review (1-2 pages)	10
8. Eval design (method) section	10
9. Findings section	10
10. Recommendations section	10
11. Executive Summary	20
12. Executive summary to class	10
13. Final Eval report	35
14. Final Reflection & Action Steps (after presentation to stakeholders)	10
Dispositions (Graduate student dispositions, attendance, participation, apply corrections, preparation, group work)	10
TOTAL	**250**

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. <u>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.</u>

B = <u>Meets Standards</u> 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= <u>Inconsistent performance</u> 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= <u>Failure to meet Standards</u> 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.

Expectations:
See Expectations for Students section

Additional Information:
Please visit <u>http://www.shsu.edu/syllabus/</u> for Sam Houston State University syllabus information regarding:
Academic Dishonesty, Student Absences on Religious Holy Days Policy, Students with Disabilities Policy, Visitors in the Classroom

Course Bibliography: see Course Textbook/Resource List

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 <u>NOT</u> 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-ha's 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	• 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.	• 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.	• Purpose of program and evaluation are poorly described. • Background and context are not described or adequately developed. • Relevant literature/best practices are not discussed of do not contain any citations.
Evaluation Design	• Evaluation questions are clearly written	• Evaluation questions are somewhat aligned	• Evaluation questions are vague and

	and aligned with the purpose of the evaluation. • 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.	to purpose and are basic. • 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.	limited in alignment. • Data lack validity or reliability. • Data are not sufficiently analyzed. • Citations are incorrect or absent.
Presentation of Findings	• Findings are clearly presented & organized. • Graphically appealing visual representations are utilized (chart, graphs, figures).	• Findings are adequately presented. • A few graphics are used to display findings.	• Findings are brief and leave unanswered questions. • Graphics are absent OR are confusing and misleading.

Conclusion & Recommendations	• Conclusions are clearly supported by findings. • Recommendations are meaningful to potential stakeholders.	• Conclusions are adequately supported by findings. • Recommendations are included but are lacking in detail or meaning.	• Conclusions are not supported by findings. • Recommendations are "surface-level," lacking in merit or supporting evidence.
Format & Graphic Appeal	Text is clear, well-organized, concise, and free of errors. Modified APA may include figures, bulleted lists, charts. Graphically appealing format. Table of Contents is used.	Text is generally well-organized and contains some errors. Minimal graphic appeal. Table of Contents is used.	Text is poorly organized, vague, and full of errors. Poor graphic appeal. Table of Contents is incorrect or incomplete
Back Matter (References & Appendices)	• Clear APA style reference list. • Well-organized appendices including important information.	• Errors appear in APA reference list. • Appendices do not contain important study components.	• Numerous reference list errors. • Poorly structured appendices.