

Educational Evaluation RMTD 406

Dr. Leanne Kallemeyn
lkallemeyn@luc.edu
(best means to contact)
Ph: 312-915-6909

Lewis Tower #1122
820 N. Michigan Ave.
Office hours by appt.

Course Overview

Course Description

This course provides students with an overview of program evaluation, particularly as it relates to the field of education. Throughout the course, students will be able to *practice* program evaluation. An assumption of this course is that “the pursuit of professional practice in evaluation requires developing a life of the mind for practice” (Schwandt, 2015, p. 143). Evaluation practices include considering the ethical issues surrounding the role of the evaluator, understanding the social and political dynamics of an evaluation context, determining which evaluation approach to use in a given context, identifying the various roles of the evaluator, developing an evaluation plan, generating and collecting data, valuing and making value judgments, and facilitating use of the evaluation.

The goals of the course are that students will be able to:

- Identify, read, and meta-evaluate program evaluation reports (Conceptual Framework 1; IDEA Objective 2),
- Understand the ethical, political, and social aspects of program evaluation practice (Conceptual Framework 3; IDEA Objective 3).
- Understand culturally responsive evaluation practices (Conceptual Framework 2, IDEA Objective 3)
- Carry out an aspect of evaluation practice, including working with stakeholders, identifying the evaluation purpose(s) and question(s), and designing the evaluation and data collection tools (Conceptual Framework 4; IDEA Objective 2 and 3)

As indicated, the goals of this course align with the Loyola University Chicago School of Education Conceptual Framework. Please see <http://luc.edu/education/syllabus-addendum/> for a complete description of the Conceptual Framework. School of Education students submit selected assignments aligned to the conceptual framework via LiveText, as indicated in the assignment description <http://luc.edu/education/admission/tuition/course-management-fee/>

The goals also align with the following objectives on the IDEA Course Evaluations.

4. Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
12. Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good

At the end of the course, you will have an opportunity to complete an Online IDEA course evaluation (go to <http://luc.edu/idea/> and click on *Student IDEA Log In*).

Required Texts

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. ISBN: 0804786550

Additional readings will be posted on Sakai.

Grading

<u>Scale</u>		<u>Assignments</u>	<u>Points</u>
95-100	A	Evaluation Report Paper	10
90-94	A-	Case Scenario Discussion	15
86-89	B+	Final Evaluation Practice Project	50
83-85	B	Critical Reflection on Final Project	10
80-82	B-	Class participation	15
Below 80	C		

Dispositions and Class participation is based on the rubric, which is included at the end of the syllabus. Points for class participation will be allocated for professionalism, inquiry, and social justice. These dispositions also align with the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for professional evaluators. Refer to the rubric in Livetext or at the end of the syllabus.

Late assignments: I strongly discourage turning in assignments after the due date. Given how assignments build on one another in the course, turning in assignments late will hinder progress in the course. I will accept late assignments and do not reduce points for late assignments, but I will provide less feedback and will not as rapidly return your graded assignment to you. If you know in advance that you will be gone when an assignment is due, please plan ahead and submit it early. If you have an unexpected personal circumstance, please talk to me about your concerns with completing course obligations.

RMTD 406 Course Schedule with Readings & Assignments

Week 1: Introduction to Course and Evaluation (Jan. 18)

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. Prologue, p. 1-14.

Week 2: Variability in Evaluation Practice (Jan. 25)

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. Ch. 1, p. 15-30.

Abma, T. & Widdershoven, G. (2008). Evaluation and/as social relation. *Evaluation*, 14(2), 209—225.
Selection of Evaluation Report DUE

Week 3: Evaluation Theory and Practice (Feb. 1)

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. Ch. 2, p. 31-44.

[Carden & Alkin \(2012\). Evaluation roots: an international perspective. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, 8\(17\), 102-118.](#)

Evaluation Report Paper DUE

Week 4: Evaluation Theory and Practice (con't) (Feb. 8)

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., Worthen, B. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Education. Ch. 10: Clarifying the Evaluation Request and Responsibilities. pp. 173—198.

[Rogers, P., & Weiss, C. H. \(2007\). Theory-based evaluation: Reflection ten years on: Theory-based evaluation: Past, present, and future. In Mathison, S., *New Directions for Program Evaluation: Enduring Issues in Evaluation* \(pp. 63—81\). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.](#)

[Morris, M. \(2010\). The good, the bad, and the evaluator: 25 years of AJE ethics. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 1098214010388267.](#)

Morris, M. (2008). *Evaluation Ethics for Best Practice: Cases and Commentaries*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press. ISBN: 1593855699 Ch. 2 The Entry/Contracting Stage.

Week 5: Values and Valuing (Feb. 15)

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. Ch. 3, p. 45-66.

Greene, J. C. (2006). Evaluation, democracy, and social change. *The Sage Handbook of Evaluation*, pp. 118-140. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Week 6: Values and Valuing (con't) (Feb. 22)*

Mertens, D.M., & Wilson, A.T. (2012). *Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press. Ch. 7 (p. 223—260).

Gates, E. (2016). Making Sense of Emerging Conversation in Evaluation about Systems Thinking and Complexity Science. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 59, 62-73.

Scenario to be determined.

Program Description and Evaluation Plan DUE

Week 7: Reasoning, Evidence and Arguments (Mar. 1)

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. Ch. 4, p. 67-86.

Schriener, M. (2014). Demythologizing causation and evidence. In Donaldson, S. I., Christie, C. A., & Mark, M. M. (Eds.), *Credible and actionable evidence: The foundation for rigorous and influential evaluations*, pp. 115-132. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Meeting with Stakeholders DUE

Spring Break (Mar. 8)

Week 8: Reasoning, Evidence and Arguments (Con't) (Mar. 15)*

Davidson, E.J. (2013). *Actionable evaluation basics*. Real Evaluation.
Additional Reading Selected as Relevant for Final Project
Scenario to be determined

Evaluation Plan DUE

Week 9: Politics and Policymaking (Mar. 22)

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. Ch. 5, p. 87-104.
Chelimsky, E.. (2006). The purposes of evaluation in democratic society. *The Sage Handbook of Evaluation*, pp. 33-55. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Week 10: Politics and Policymaking (Con't) (Mar. 29)*

Rugg, D.L. (2016). Evaluation and politics: tips and barriers to use. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 8(3), 436—445. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2016.1213030>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PlcKxkJF7qE> (4 minutes)
Scenario to be determined

Week 11: Use (Apr. 5)

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. Ch. 6, p. 105-122.
Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-Focused Evaluation: The New Century Text* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapters 4 and part of 5, pp. 97-157.

Week 12: Use (con't) (Apr. 12)*

Russ-Eft, D. & Preskill, H. (2009). Evaluation in organizations (2nd Ed). New York, NY: Basic Books. Ch. 14
Communicating and reporting evaluation activities and findings (pp. 399—440).
[Fierro, R.S., Schwartz, A., and Smart, D.H. \(2016\). Evaluation and Facilitation. *New Directions for Evaluation*. 2016 \(149\) DOI:10.1002/ev.20137](#)

Scenario to be determined

Data Generation DUE

Week 13: Professionalism and Professionalization (Apr. 19)

Schwandt, T. (2015). *Evaluation Foundations Revisited: Cultivating a Life of the Mind for Practice*. Stanford University Press. Ch. 7 and Epilogue, p. 123-143.
[Yarborough, D.B., Shulha, L.M., Hopson, R.K., & Caruthers, F.A. \(2011\). *The Program Evaluation Standards: A Guide for Evaluators and Evaluation Users*. 3rd Edition. Sage Publications.](#)
American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles, statement on cultural competence in evaluation <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=92>, and draft competencies

Week 14: Professionalism and Professionalization (con't) (Apr. 26)

Project Presentations

Week 15: Wrap-Up (May 3)

FINAL EVALUATION PROJECTS DUE
CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON EVALUATION PROJECTS DUE
ONLINE IDEA COURSE EVALUATION <http://luc.edu/idea/>

Assignment Descriptions and Class Participation

Please submit all assignments electronically via Sakai. I will repost your assignments with grades and comments in Sakai. If you have difficulties uploading the file, then please email it to me at lkallemeyn@luc.edu.

Evaluation Report Paper (10 points) DUE Feb. 1

Locate an evaluation report in your own area of interest. You may want to refer to the list of evaluation organizations in Sakai, which often post reports on their websites. Be sure that I approve the report prior to your completion of the assignment. PLEASE UPLOAD THE REPORT IN SAKAI BY THURS. JAN. 25.

Write a 2—3 page paper regarding the evaluation report. Your paper should focus on characterizing the evaluation report in relation to course readings and discussions during the first two weeks of the course.

Your paper will be graded on the following:

- Extent to which the paper summarizes the report in relation to course readings and discussions (5 points);
- Extent to which the paper integrates what you are learning from course readings to analyze the evaluation report (3 points);
- Extent to which the paper is well-organized and coherently written (2 points).

Case Scenario Discussion (15 points)

With small group, you will choose a week that you and colleagues will be responsible for leading the discussion of the case scenario (Refer to the weeks with an *). You will have 30-40 minutes to lead the class in a presentation that includes a brief introduction of the scenario (5-10 minutes), and then a related interactive activity, such as a whole group discussion, small group activity, etc. Be creative. You are more than welcome to contact me with questions regarding readings and the course presentation and activity.

Your Case Scenario Discussion will be graded, as follows:

Presenters as teachers

- Has an activating presentation (1 pt)
- Includes an activity for colleagues (1 pt)
- Builds a presentation and activity in such a way that colleagues gradually learn to learn in a self-directed manner (1 pt)
- Communicates clearly (1 pt)
- Exhibits respect for all colleagues (1 pt)

Experts on content knowledge

- Accurately represents the case scenario (2 pt)

- Accurately represents the issues in relation to the AEA guiding principals, Joint Committee standards, or statement on culturally responsive evaluation practice (2 pt)
- Integrates multiple elements of the AEA guiding principles, Joint Committee standards, or statement on culturally responsive evaluation practice to analyze the case critically (4 pt)
- Uses relevant information from course readings in teaching (2 pt)

Final Course Project (50 points; *choose one*) DUE May 5

Evaluation Practice: Group Project

As a class, you will plan an evaluation, and carryout carry it out. A list of possible programs is available in Sakai. Dr. Kallemeyn will choose a program based on students’ substantive interests and expertise.

Related Assignments

The following assignments will be required for the Final Course Project. Full descriptions of each assignment are listed after the table.

Due Date	Evaluation Practice
2/22	Program Description Draft
3/1	Meeting with Stakeholders
3/8	Evaluation Plan Draft
4/12	Data Generation
4/26	Project Presentations
5/3	Final Evaluation Report*

*Points assigned toward final grade.

Program Description Draft

For the program you are evaluating, write a description of the program. This description may include the program goals, program activities, program theory, key stakeholders, program context, and so on. As you write the description, consider which key stakeholders will be the audience for the evaluation. Write the program description with this audience in mind. You are welcome to include tables and figures as appropriate, in addition to text. Next, given the description of the program and the key stakeholders, develop 1-5 evaluation questions that will guide your evaluation. I will provide formative feedback on this assignment.

Meeting with Stakeholders

Meet with at least one stakeholder from the program to learn about the program and the information needs of stakeholders. Also, access as much background information as possible, such as from websites, brochures, presentations, etc.

For this assignment, submit what you prepared for the meeting (e.g., notes with background information, questions to discuss, agenda items), and notes from the meeting that demonstrate what you learned from the interaction and what additional questions you may have. Also, revisit the program description and evaluation questions. What revisions are necessary?

Drawing from the AEA guiding principles and/or the statement on cultural competence, critically reflect on your meeting in 1-2 pages. What went well? What might you do differently? What are appropriate next steps?

Evaluation Plan Draft

Utilizing the template provided in Sakai (see Evaluation Plan Table_ Blank.doc), complete the evaluation plan table for your evaluation. This assignment builds upon any feedback provided previously. It includes your evaluation question(s), indicators, sampling, evaluation methods, data sources, data collection, and analysis. Be sure to use concise, direct language and consistent easy to follow formatting, including effective use of merging rows and columns to assure understanding. Be sure to also attach all data collection tools that you intend to use, and a management plan that details the remaining activities for the semester and who is responsible for them. You may want to reference the file "Evaluation Plan Table Sample" as an example. I will provide formative feedback on this assignment.

Data Generation

You must complete all data generation assigned as your responsibility, and make it available to the rest of your team. Be sure to also share preliminary analysis, as relevant.

Drawing from the AEA guiding principles and/or the statement on cultural competence, critically reflect on your meeting in 1-2 pages. What went well? What might you do differently? What are appropriate next steps?

Project Presentation

Prepare a 20 minute presentation about your project. Be sure that your presentation provides a report on your findings, including how you arrived at your findings. In the process, be sure to integrate a learning experience that you had in relation to the core areas discussed in the course: values and valuing; reasoning, evidence and arguments; politics and policy making; or use. Please prepare a powerpoint presentation and/or handout to support your presentation, as relevant to the stakeholder audience.

Final Evaluation Report

With your group, you will integrate an evaluation report on your component of the program into a single oral and/or written report to stakeholder(s) of the course evaluation project, revising based on any input from stakeholders on the preliminary report. The exact format of this report will be developed over the course of the semester in collaboration with the stakeholders. At a minimum, it will include the following:

- Theoretical approach to evaluation (3 pt)

- Evaluation purposes (3 pt)
- Evaluation question(s) (2 pt)
- Overview of the evaluation plan
 - Design (3 pt)
 - Data collection methods and procedures, including copies of all data collection tools developed and/or utilized (3 pt)
 - Data sources (3 pt)
 - Sampling (3 pt)
 - Analysis procedures, including any databases or tools to facilitate analysis (3 pt)
 - Indicators; Interpretation procedures and criteria (3 pt)
- Findings (3 pt)
- Communication and reporting plan (3 pt)
- Proposed recommendations and/or next steps for the evaluation (3 pt)

Individually, provide a bulleted list of the key contributions you made to the evaluation project, in relation to the management plan for the following areas.

- Working with Stakeholders
- Evaluation Purposes, Types and Questions
- Evaluation Designs
- Data Collection Strategies and Indicators
- Participants and Sampling
- Data Analysis and Interpretation
- Communication and Utilization of Findings

Be sure to include at least three times when you had direct interactions with a program stakeholder (e.g., observing an activity, interviewing a participant, visiting the school, stopping by to collect data). These contributions will be worth 15 out of 50 points for your final grade. Points for each area will be distributed as follows:

- Took leadership role on developing products for the group and/or contributed more than 3 hours to products for project (3 points)
- Attended meetings regularly with classmates outside of class and contributed products for evaluation project that took less than 3 hours (2 points)
- Provided meaningful contributions during meetings in class, and provided minimal contributions outside of class (1 points)
- Provided minimal contributions during class, and no contributions outside of class (0 points)

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STUDENTS SUBMIT THIS REFLECTION ON LIVETEXT
<http://luc.edu/education/admission/tuition/course-management-fee/>.

Critical Reflection on Final Project (10 points) DUE May 5

Provide a 3–4 page critical reflection on your experiences working on the team using the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles (systematic inquiry, competence, integrity/honesty, respect for people, responsibilities for general and public welfare), Statement on Cultural Competence, OR the Joint Committee Standards for Educational Evaluation (utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy, evaluation accountability). Considering the following questions might facilitate your reflection. How did you (and/or the team) conducted yourself during the evaluation? Are there principles that your project exemplifies good evaluation practice? Are there principles that may raise issues of concern with the evaluation? If so, what did or could you do to help better address these principles in practice? Are there principles in conflict through the project (i.e., practices that support one principle result in practices that also oppose another principle)? What is the rationale for which principles to compromise in the evaluation practice? SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STUDENTS SUBMIT THIS REFLECTION ON LIVETEXT <http://luc.edu/education/admission/tuition/course-management-fee/>.

This reflection will be graded as follows for each of the principles/standards:

- Targeted—The paper demonstrates the student is able to integrate the principle into their professional decision-making of evaluation practice, facilitating critical, honest self-reflection with particular awareness of practices that promote social justice. (2 point)
- Acceptable—The paper demonstrates the student is able to integrate the principle into their professional decision-making of evaluation practice. (1 point)
- Unacceptable—The paper presents a limited ability to integrate the principle into their professional decision-making. (0 points)

Dispositions and Class Participation

An asterisk(*) indicates that the disposition aligns with the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for professional evaluators.

	Target (0 pt)	Acceptable (0 pt)	Unacceptable (0 pt)
Systematic Inquiry IL-LUC-DISP.1*	Candidate communicates effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.	Candidate is working on communicating effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.	Candidate is unable to communicate effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.
Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare IL-LUC-DISP.1*	Candidate’s written work is appropriate and effective for the course.	Candidate’s written work is sometimes appropriate and effective for the course.	Candidate’s written work is inappropriate and ineffective for the course.
Competence IL-LUC-DISP.1*	Candidate provides appropriate assistance to tutoring or consulting clients.	Candidate sometimes provides appropriate assistance to tutoring or consulting clients.	Candidate does not provide appropriate assistance to tutoring or consulting clients.

	Target (0 pt)	Acceptable (0 pt)	Unacceptable (0 pt)
Timeliness IL-LUC-DISP.1	Candidate is able to meet all deadlines.	Candidate is sometimes able to meet all deadlines.	Candidate is unable to meet all deadlines.
Accountability IL-LUC-DISP.1	Candidate attends all classes and fulfills all professional obligations.	Candidate sometimes attends classes and fulfills professional obligations.	Candidate's attendance to class is inconsistent and is unable to fulfill all professional obligations.
Collegiality IL-LUC-DISP.1	Candidate is able to work with peers.	Candidate sometimes respects the viewpoints of others.	Candidate has difficulty respecting the viewpoints of others.
Integrity/Honesty IL-LUC-DISP.2*	Candidate respects the viewpoints of others.	Candidate sometimes respects the viewpoints of others.	Candidate has difficulty respecting the viewpoints of others.
Interpersonal Integrity/Honesty IL-LUC-DISP.2*	Candidate recognizes potential conflicts and handles them appropriately.	Candidate sometimes recognizes potential conflicts and handles them appropriately.	Candidate has difficulty recognizing potential conflicts and handling them appropriately.
Academic Integrity/Honesty IL-LUC-DISP.2*	Candidates appropriately represent procedures, data, and findings – attempting to prevent misuse of their results.	Candidates represent procedures, data, and findings in a manner that is likely to allow the misuse of their results.	Candidates misrepresent procedures, data, and findings. There is minimal attempt to prevent misuse of their results.
Maximizing Benefits & Reducing Harm IL-LUC-DISP.3*	Candidate understands the cost-benefit ratio of particular research designs for addressing important research questions.	Candidate sometimes understands the cost-benefit ratio of particular research designs for addressing important research questions.	Candidate does not understand the cost-benefit ratio of particular research designs for addressing important research questions.
Social Equity IL-LUC-DISP.3*	Candidate demonstrates appropriate empathy for others.	Candidate sometimes demonstrates appropriate empathy for others.	Candidate has difficulty demonstrating appropriate empathy for others.

	Target (0 pt)	Acceptable (0 pt)	Unacceptable (0 pt)
Respectful Communication IL-LUC-DISP.3*	Candidate communicates research in a manner that respects stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.	Candidate attempts to communicate research in a manner that respects stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.	Candidate makes no clear efforts to communicate research in a manner that respects stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
Respect for People IL-LUC-DISP.3*	Candidate respects differences when planning, conducting, analyzing, and reporting research results.	Candidate attempts to respect differences when planning, conducting, analyzing, and reporting research results.	Candidate does not respect differences when planning, conducting, analyzing, and reporting research results.

**Loyola University Chicago School of Education
Syllabus Addendum**

IDEA Course Evaluation Link for Students

Each course you take in the School of Education is evaluated through the IDEA Campus Labs system. We ask that when you receive an email alerting you that the evaluation is available that you promptly complete it. To learn more about IDEA or to access the website directly to complete your course evaluation go to: <http://luc.edu/idea/> and click on **STUDENT IDEA LOGIN** on the left hand side of the page.

Dispositions

All students are assessed on one or more dispositional areas of growth across our programs: **Professionalism, Inquiry, and Social Justice**. The instructor in your course will identify the dispositions assessed in this course and you can find the rubrics related to these dispositions in LiveText. *For those students in non-degree programs, the rubric for dispositions may be available through Sakai, TaskStream or another platform.* Disposition data is reviewed by program faculty on a regular basis. This allows faculty to work with students to develop throughout their program and address any issues as they arise.

LiveText

All students, *except those who are non-degree*, must have access to LiveText to complete the benchmark assessments aligned to the Conceptual Framework Standards and all other accreditation, school-wide and/or program-wide related assessments. You can access more information on LiveText here: [LiveText](#).

Syllabus Addendum Link

- www.luc.edu/education/syllabus-addendum/

This link directs students to statements on essential policies regarding *academic honesty*, *accessibility*, *ethics line reporting* and *electronic communication policies and guidelines*. We ask that you read each policy carefully. This link will also bring you to the full text of our conceptual framework that guides the work of the School of Education – ***Social Action through Education***.