

## Educational Evaluation RMTD 406

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

Lewis Tower #1122  
820 N. Michigan Ave.  
Office hours Thurs 3-4pm or 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:

1. Understand the foundations of program evaluation practice (Conceptual Framework 1)
2. Identify, read, and meta-evaluate program evaluation reports (Conceptual Framework 1),
3. Understand culturally responsive evaluation practices (Conceptual Framework 2)
4. Understand the ethical, political, and social aspects of program evaluation practice (Conceptual Framework 3).
5. 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)

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 essential objectives on the IDEA Course Evaluations:

3. Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions) (Goals 1, 2, and 4)
4. Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course (Goals 3 and 5)

Other important objectives include:

10. Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making (Goal 4)
11. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view (Goal 2)
12. Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good (Goal 5)

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

Alkin, M. C., & Vo, A. T. (2017). *Evaluation essentials: From A to Z*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Guilford Publications. ISBN: 1462532438

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	10
86-89	B+	Final Evaluation Project	60
83-85	B	Critical Reflection on Final Project	10
80-82	B-	Class participation	10
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 & Assignment Due Dates**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Required Readings</b>	<b>Assignments Due</b>
Jan. 18	Week 1: Introduction to Course and Evaluation	Schwandt, Prologue, p. 1—14 Alkin & Vo, Section A	
Jan. 25	Week 2: Variability in Evaluation Practice	Schwandt Ch. 1, p. 15-30. Alkin & Vo Section C, p. 34-40 Abma, T. & Widdershoven, G. (2008). Evaluation and/as social relation. <i>Evaluation</i> , 14(2), 209—225. <a href="#">Yarborough, D.B., Shulha, L.M., Hopson, R.K., &amp; Caruthers, F.A. (2011). <i>The Program Evaluation Standards: A Guide for Evaluators and Evaluation Users</i>. 3rd Edition. Sage Publications.</a>	<i>Selection of Evaluation Report</i>
Feb. 1	Week 3: Evaluation Theory and Practice	Alkin & Vo Section D, p. 41—49 Alkin & Vo Section G—I, p. 66-98 Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., Worthen, B. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). <i>Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines</i> . Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Education. Selection of Ch. 10: Clarifying the Evaluation Request and Responsibilities. pp. 260-271.	<i>Evaluation Report Paper</i> <i>Case Scenario</i> <i>Discussion Group #1 only</i>
Feb. 8	Week 4: Evaluation Theory and Practice (con't)	Schwandt Ch. 2, p. 31-44. <a href="#">Carden &amp; Alkin (2012). Evaluation roots: an international perspective. <i>Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation</i>, 8(17), 102-118.</a> Case Scenario	<i>Program for Final Project</i>
Feb. 15	Week 5: Values and Valuing	Schwandt, Ch. 3, p. 45-66 Mertens, D.M., & Wilson, A.T. (2012). <i>Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide</i> . New York, NY: The Guilford Press. Ch. 7 (p. 223—260). <a href="#">AEA Statement on Cultural Competence</a>	
Feb. 22	Week 6: Values and Valuing	Alkin & Vo Section E p. 50—57 Alkin & Vo Sections J p. 101—110 Alkin & Vo Sections N p. 155—162 Alkin & Vo Sections T p. 241—248 Case Scenario	<i>Program Description and Evaluation Questions</i> <i>Case Scenario</i> <i>Discussion Group #2 only</i>
Mar. 1	Week 7: Reasoning, Evidence and Arguments*	Schwandt Ch. 4, p. 67-86. Schriener, M. (2014). Demythologizing causation and evidence. In Donaldson, S. I., Christie, C. A., & Mark, M. M. (Eds.), <i>Credible and actionable evidence: The foundation for</i>	<i>Case Scenario</i> <i>Discussion Group #3 only</i>

		<i>rigorous and influential evaluations</i> , pp. 115-132. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. Case Scenario	
Mar. 8	Spring Break		
Mar. 15	Week 8: Reasoning, Evidence and Arguments (Con't)	Alkin & Vo Sections M p. 141—154 Alkin & Vo Section O p. 163—176 Alkin & Vo Sections P p. 177—198 Additional Readings May Be Selected as Relevant for Final Project <a href="#">AEA Guiding Principles</a>  Optional Readings, as helpful: Alkin & Vo Section K p. 112—128 Alkin & Vo Sections L p. 129—140 Alkin & Vo Section R p. 212—228 Alkin & Vo Sections S p. 229—240	<i>Meeting with Stakeholders</i>
Mar. 22	Week 9: Politics and Policymaking	Schwandt Ch. 5, p. 87-104 <a href="#">Rugg, D.L. (2016). Evaluation and politics: tips and barriers to use. <i>Journal of Development Effectiveness</i>, 8(3), 436—445.</a> <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PlcKxkJF7qE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PlcKxkJF7qE</a> (4 minutes) Case Scenario	<i>Draft Evaluation Plan Case Scenario Discussion Group #4 only</i>
Mar. 29	Week 10: Easter Break		
Apr. 5	Week 11: Use	Schwandt, Ch. 6, p. 105-122. Case Scenario	<i>Secondary Analysis and/or Data Generation, if applicable Case Scenario Discussion Group #5 only</i>
Apr. 12	Week 12: Use (con't)	Alkin & Vo Section U p. 249—263 Alkin & Vo Sections V p. 264—272 Russ-Eft, D. & Preskill, H. (2009). <i>Evaluation in organizations</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> Ed). New York, NY: Basic Books. Ch. 14 Communicating and reporting evaluation activities and findings (pp. 399—440).	
Apr. 19	Week 13: Professionalism & Professionalization	Alkin & Vo Section W p. 273—282 Schwandt, Ch. 7 and Epilogue, p. 123-143	<i>Project Presentations</i>
Apr. 26	Week 14: (con't)		<i>Project Presentations</i>
May 3	Week 15: Wrap-Up	<i>ONLINE IDEA COURSE EVALUATION</i> <a href="http://luc.edu/idea/">http://luc.edu/idea/</a>	<i>Final Evaluation Projects Critical Reflections</i>

## 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](mailto: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 (10 points)**

With small group, you will choose a week that you and colleagues will be responsible for leading the discussion of the case scenario. 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 to facilitate discussion of AEA guiding principles, AEA statement of cultural competence, and/or Joint Committee Standards on Educational Evaluation in relation to the case. 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 (0.5 pt)
- Includes an activity for colleagues (0.5 pt)
- Builds a presentation and activity in such a way that colleagues gradually learn to learn in a self-directed manner (0.5 pt)
- Communicates clearly (0.5 pt)
- Exhibits respect for all colleagues (0.5 pt)

Experts on content knowledge

- Accurately represents the case scenario (1.5 pt)

- Accurately represents the issues in relation to the AEA guiding principles, 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 (3 pt)
- Uses relevant information from course readings in teaching (1 pt)

**Final Evaluation Project (60 points; *choose one*) DUE May 3**

Individually or in a group, you will engage in multiple (but likely not all) steps of planning and/or carrying out an evaluation. I encourage you to choose a program that supports your interests and career trajectory. For example, you may be familiar with a program through your workplace or a research team. You may also reach out to a program in your area of interest. Many organizations would greatly appreciate your services, and these volunteer opportunities can lead to beneficial career connections for the future. I also have connections with programs on campus that would greatly appreciate assistance (see list of possible programs on Sakai). You may also have a colleagues in the course that have connections to projects that are of interest to you, and beyond the scope of what they can work on individually during the semester.

Based on an adapted checklist from the Alkin and Vo text, you need to engage creatively and substantively in selected tasks in an evaluation. Your final project for the course will either be 1) Evaluation Plan developed in collaboration with stakeholders involving tasks 1–7, or 2) Evaluation Report that you generate with and/or provide to stakeholders involving tasks 6–11 and using what others have developed previously for tasks 1–5. If you are in a Masters program, you **MUST** complete option 1 if you are doing the project individually. If you are in an EdD or PhD program and choose to do option 1 individually, I expect that the project has a large enough scope that it requires 3 months of planning. I strongly recommend piloting data collection as part of this process.

1. Identifying and working with Stakeholders
2. Gaining understanding of the organizational/social/political context and Identifying Purpose of Evaluation
3. Describing and understanding the program
4. Developing initial evaluation questions
5. Considering possible instrumentation
6. Determining evaluable questions
7. Finalizing the Evaluation Plan, including the Evaluation Design and Sampling
8. Managing the Evaluation, including Collecting Data
9. Analyzing Data
10. Interpreting Data and Answering Evaluation Questions
11. Reporting Evaluation Results and Helping Stakeholders to Use the Results

Please note that accommodations to these requirements can be made based on the particular circumstances of your project. Please connect with Dr. Kallemeyn to discuss further.

## **Related Assignments**

### **Program for Final Project**

Propose how you would like to fulfill the final project requirements. If you will be involved in a group project, then you only need to provide one submission for the group. To do so, complete the information form, which will ask for the following information:

- Will you complete the evaluation individually or in a group? If in a group, who will be the group members?
- What program will you evaluate? Provide a 300 word description.
- Who are the key stakeholders in the program?
- What contact have you already had with stakeholders? What contact might you have during the course of the semester?
- Using the reading from Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen, why is this program ready for evaluation at this time?
- Will you produce an evaluation plan or an evaluation report for this class?
  - If you choose an evaluation plan, why do you think this will be beneficial for the organization? Will they have capacity to implement the plan?
  - If you choose the final evaluation report, what resources do you have available to help you address tasks 1 through 5 (e.g., existing evaluation reports, program logic models)?

If you have multiple options for projects, please connect with me to help decide the most appropriate project at this time.

### **Program Description and Evaluation Questions 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, program theory or logic model, 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 initial evaluation questions that will guide your evaluation.

### **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, 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.

### **Secondary Data Analysis and/or Data Generation**

If working on a team, complete all secondary data analysis and/or data generation assigned as your responsibility, and make it available to the rest of your team. If working individually, analyze and/or generate at least two data sources.

### **Project Presentation**

Prepare a 10 minute presentation about your project. Assume the audience for your presentation are your primary stakeholders. Present your evaluation plan to them and/or your evaluation and preliminary findings. In a final slide, 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**

#### Option #1: Evaluation Plan developed in collaboration with stakeholders involving tasks 1—7

For this final assignment, you will accompany your completed evaluation plan table with a written proposal with an explanation of your completed plan table. The narrative should include all previous work on your program description, evaluation questions, design, planned format for reporting findings, management plan, and so on, keeping in mind your stated purposes and feedback from previous assignments. Also include electronic versions of the tools for collecting the data. The database in which you will enter your collected data should be prepared, explained, presented, and included as well.

- Description of the program you are evaluating and its context (4pt)
- Theory of change or logic model (3pt)
- Key stakeholders (4pt)
- Evaluation purposes (4pt)

- Evaluation question(s) (4pt)
- Design (4pt)
- Data collection methods and procedures (4pt)
- Data sources (3pt)
- Sampling (3pt)
- Analysis procedures (3pt)
- Indicators; Interpretation procedures and criteria (4pt)
- Communication and reporting plan (4pt)
- Management plan (3pt)
- Electronic version of tools (3pt)
- Electronic version of database (3pt)
- Written for intended audience with concise, direct language throughout narrative and consistent easy to follow formatting, using proper APA headings that elaborates on the table (3pt)

Option #2: Evaluation Report that you generate with and/or provide to stakeholders involving tasks 6—11 and using what others have developed previously for tasks 1—5

You will integrate an evaluation report on 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:

- Description of the program, such as logic model or theory of change (3pt) and its context (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 (10 pt)
- Proposed recommendations and/or next steps for the evaluation (3 pt)
- Communication and reporting plan (3 pt)

If you are completing a project in a group, *individually*, provide a bulleted list of the key contributions you made to the project, in relation to the management plan for the list of tasks adapted from the Alkin and Vo text. 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 60 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 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:

- Exceeds Standards--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. (2.5 pt)
- Meets Standards--The paper demonstrates the student is able to integrate the principle into their professional decision-making of evaluation practice. (2 pt)
- Partially Meets Standards--The paper presents a partial ability to integrate the principle into their professional decision-making. (1 pt)
- Does Not Meet Standards--The paper does not demonstrate an ability to integrate the principle into their professional decision-making (0 pt)

### Dispositions and Class Participation

	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
<b>Professionalism (professional domain)</b>  <b>AEA Competence</b>	Candidate engages in and models ethical practice and on-going learning to promote personal growth.	Candidate engages in ethical practice and on-going learning to promote personal growth.	Candidate engages in some ethical practice and/or on-going learning to promote personal growth.	Candidate rarely engage in ethical practice and on-going learning to promote personal growth.
<b>Professionalism (management domain)</b>  <b>AEA Competence</b>	Candidate consistently manages time and responsibilities to meet deadlines and expectations, making adjustments as appropriate.	Candidate usually manages time and responsibilities to meet deadlines and expectations, making adjustments as appropriate.	More than 2/3 of the time throughout the course candidate manages time and/or responsibilities to meet deadlines and expectation. Candidate may struggle to make adjustments as appropriate.	Candidate rarely manage time and responsibilities to meet deadlines and expectations. Candidate is not able to make adjustments as appropriate.
<b>Professionalism (management domain)</b>  <b>AEA Integrity/Honesty</b>	Candidate always communicates effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.	Candidate usually communicates effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.	Candidate occasionally communicates effectively and/or appropriately with faculty and peers.	Candidate rarely communicate effectively and appropriately with faculty and peers.
<b>Social Justice (context domain)</b>  <b>AEA Responsibilities</b>	Candidate thoroughly understands, respects, and appropriately responds to the context(s) (i.e., environment, structure, culture, history, values,	Candidate usually understands, respects, and appropriately responds to the context(s) (i.e., environment, structure, culture, history,	Candidate occasionally understands, respects, and/or appropriately responds to the context(s) (i.e., environment, structure, culture, history, values,	Candidate rarely understand, respect, and appropriately respond to the context(s) (i.e., environment, structure, culture, history, values,

	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
<b>for General and Public Welfare</b>	politics, economics, power, privilege) within which the candidate is working.	values, politics, economics, power, privilege) within which the candidate is working.	politics, economics, power, privilege) within which the candidate is working.	politics, economics, power, privilege) within which the candidate is working.
<b>Social Justice (interpersonal domain)</b> <b>AEA Integrity/Honesty</b>	Candidate always shows empathy by listening and respecting the experiences and viewpoints of others, particularly those whose cultural experiences are different than their own. Candidate recognizes potential conflicts and handles them appropriately.	Candidate usually shows empathy by listening and respecting the experiences and viewpoints of others, particularly those whose cultural experiences are different than their own. Candidate recognizes potential conflicts and handles them appropriately.	Candidate sometimes shows empathy by listening and/or respecting the experiences and viewpoints of others, particularly those whose cultural experiences are different than their own. Candidate sometimes recognizes potential conflicts and/or handles them appropriately.	Candidate does not show empathy by listening and respecting the experiences and viewpoints of others, particularly those whose cultural experiences are different than their own. Candidate does not recognize potential conflicts or handle them appropriately.
<b>Inquiry (methodology domain)</b> <b>AEA Systematic Inquiry</b>	Candidate thoroughly understands and is independently able to carry out an inquiry process, including asking questions, designing studies, sampling, collecting and analyzing data, interpreting results, and reporting findings.	Candidate usually understands and needs a little assistance to carry out an inquiry process, including asking questions, designing studies, sampling, collecting and analyzing data, interpreting results, and reporting findings.	Candidate somewhat understands and needs extensive assistance to carry out an inquiry process, including asking questions, designing studies, sampling, collecting and analyzing data, interpreting results, and reporting findings.	Candidate does not understand and is not able to carry out an inquiry process, including asking questions, designing studies, sampling, collecting and analyzing data, interpreting results, and reporting findings.

**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/](http://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***.