



Psychology Department

Course name:	Program Evaluation
Course no.:	PSYC 5353
Course CRN:	14483
Semester/year	Spring 2016
Graduate credit hours:	3
Class location:	Hudspeth Hall 114
Class meeting time:	Tuesdays and Thursdays, 3:00-4:20 PM
Class instructor:	Dr. Julia Lechuga
Office location:	Psychology Bldg. Office 107
Phone:	915-747-7164
Email:	julialec@utep.edu
Office hours:	By appointment
Preferred contact method:	Email
Course description:	Students will be exposed to the field of program evaluation in a broad sense including major paradigms, theories, and approaches. Major emphasis will be placed in the acquisition of skills that will enable the student to conduct evaluations of programs attempting to impact real-world challenges in real-world conditions.
Required textbooks:	Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2012). Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide (4rd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
Supplemental reading:	See course schedule and appendix
Course format:	Lecture & discussion, case studies, guest speaker, group work, student presentations, written assignments, and exams The course is predominantly delivered in a seminar format, relying heavily on active student participation, practice of skills, and group work
Major learning objectives (must be numbered):	By the end of this course, the student will be able to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand the meaning of specific terminology used in the field of program evaluation 2. Identify major theories and philosophical stances influencing the field of program evaluation 3. Understand the fundamentals of planning and implementing evaluations including choices of research designs and data analysis techniques 4. Identify appropriate communication strategies to promote utilization of findings by the intended audience
Assessment strategies (must be numbered)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weekly written homework questions or activity on assigned readings 2. Weekly group led discussions of assigned supplemental readings 3. Individual proposal on evaluation of a program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor will assign the program to be evaluated • Evaluation and feedback on proposal (by instructor) 4. Meta-evaluation presentation (group)- evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation and feedback on oral case study presentation (by instructor and student peers using evaluation rubric) 5. Mid-term and a final exam

Grading scale & criteria	<p>Grading scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A (> 90%-exceptional graduate-level performance) ▪ B (80-89%-average graduate-level performance) ▪ C (70-79%-below average graduate-level performance) ▪ D (60-69%-unacceptable graduate-level performance) ▪ F (< 60%-very unacceptable graduate-level performance) <p>Grading components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Homework supplemental reading questions or activity: 10% ▪ Group led discussions: 10% ▪ Individual proposal preliminary components: 10% ▪ Individual proposal: 25% ▪ Meta evaluation presentation (group): 20% ▪ Exams: 25% ▪ Active class participation is required: points will be deducted for students who do not actively participate in class discussions and other activities.
Incomplete policy:	<p>An "I" (incomplete grade) can only be considered only if requested by the student in <u>advance of the conclusion of the course</u> and only for <u>legitimate, documented</u> emergencies. Failure to request and negotiate the terms of an "Incomplete" grade before the conclusion of the course will result in a denial except in the most extraordinary circumstances.</p>
Course/Instructor & Institutional Policies	
Attendance:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is UTEP policy that all students attend all scheduled classes. Attendance will be taken at each class. When a student registers for a course, it is assumed that she/he has made arrangements to avoid such conflicts. Students are responsible for any information or activities presented in class discussions, lectures, assignments, and/or readings. If you are unable to attend class, it is your responsibility to inform the instructor before the respective class session. Students may be administratively withdrawn for excessive unexcused absences (2 or more classes). Compliance to due dates, in class presentations, homework, exams and other activities, is mandatory. All emergency-related absences must be verified. ▪ Chronic tardiness not only reflects lack of commitment and professional behavior but also is disruptive to your classmates and the instructor. You are expected to be in class and seated by 3:00 PM.
Reading assignments:	<p>All assigned readings need to be completed prior to coming to the next scheduled class session. Example: the reading assignments for day 1 of week 1 need to be completed prior to coming to that class session of week 1.</p>
Writing standards	<p>Effective academic leaders and practitioners are also effective written as well as oral communicators. Written communication is a critical element of the communication process. Our Ph.D. graduate program both recognizes and expects good writing to be the norm for course work. Please feel free to seek out assistance from the free UTEP Writing Center.</p>
Policy for late assignments	<p>Due dates for homework, exams, presentations and other assignments are designed for fairness to all students. No exceptions to those dates will be made excepting in cases of university-designated closures. All assignments are due at the beginning of the class period on the due date. Five (5) points will be deducted for each day an assignment is late (including weekend days).</p>

Cellphone/electronic tablet/ use policies:	Please note that all cellular telephones, pagers, headphones, iPods, iPads, mp3 players, earpieces, and other forms of communication and entertainment technology equipment must be powered off and put away during the class period. If a situation should arise which necessitates a student to be contacted by a physician or family member, the instructor shall be notified and cell phone can be set to “vibrate.” Please be advised that students who use unauthorized technology during class time will be dismissed from that week’s class session.
Class participation:	Active student participation in this course is very important. Students must be prepared to come to class to discuss, answer questions, and participate in all class activities.
Special accommodations:	If you have a disability and need classroom accommodations, please contact The Center for Accommodations and Support Services (CASS) at 915.747.5148, cass@utep.edu , or visit their office located in UTEP Union East, Room 106. For additional information, visit http://sa.utep.edu/cass/ . CASS staff are the only individuals who can validate and if need be, authorize accommodations for students with disabilities.
Student conduct:	<p>Students are expected to be above reproach in all scholastic activities. Students who engage in scholastic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and dismissal from the university. “Scholastic dishonesty includes but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, collusion, the submission for credit of any work or materials that are attributable in whole or in part to another person, taking an examination for another student, any act designed to give unfair advantage to a student or the attempt to commit such acts.” <u>Regent’s Rules and Regulations</u>, Part One, Chapter VI, Section 3.2, Subdivision 3.22. Since scholastic dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. From the UTEP Dean of Student Affairs (http://studentaffairs.utep.edu/Default.aspx?tabid=4386) “It is an official policy of the university that all suspected cases or acts of alleged scholastic dishonesty must be referred to the Dean of Students for investigation and appropriate disposition. Any student who commits an act of scholastic dishonesty is subject to discipline. Scholastic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, collusion, the submission for credit of any work or materials that are attributable in whole or in part to another person, taking an examination for another person, any act designed to give unfair advantage to a student or the attempt to commit such acts”.</p> <p>Examples of “cheating” include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copying from the homework, in-class work or exam paper of another student, engaging in written, oral, or any other means of communication with another student during an exam, or giving aid to or seeking aid from another student during a test; • Possession and/or use during an exam or home test of materials which are not authorized by the person giving the test, such as class notes, books, or specifically designed “crib notes”; • Using, obtaining, or attempting to obtain by any means the whole or any part of non-administered test, test key, homework solution, or computer program; using a test that has been administered in prior classes or semesters but which will be used again either in whole or in part without permission of the instructor; or accessing a test bank without instructor permission; • Collaborating with or seeking aid from another student for an assignment without authority; • Substituting for another person, or permitting another person to substitute for one's self, to take a test;

- Falsifying research data, laboratory reports, and/or other records or academic work offered for credit.

“Plagiarism” means the appropriation, buying, receiving as a gift, or obtaining by any means another's work and the unacknowledged submission or incorporation of it in one's own academic work offered for credit, or using work in a paper or assignment for which the student had received credit in another course without direct permission of all involved instructors. NOTE: This includes cutting-and-pasting and photocopying from on-line and other material.

“Collusion” means the unauthorized collaboration with another person in preparing academic assignments offered for credit or collaboration with another person to commit a violation of any provision of the rules on scholastic dishonesty.

TENTATIVE COURSE SCHEDULE*

Dates	Topics	Assignments
Class 1 Jan 19	Syllabus & course overview Definition of Evaluation, Ethical Principles for Evaluators, Culturally Responsive Evaluation	<u>Assignment</u> ➤ Read supplemental readings 1, 2 & 3
WEEK 1 Jan 21 & 26	Introduction to Evaluation	<u>Assignment for Jan 21</u> ➤ Read textbook chapter 1 <u>Assignment for Jan 26</u> ➤ Read supplemental readings 4, 5, 6 & 7 ➤ Complete assigned exercises and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Instructor will lead the discussion
WEEK 2 Jan 28 & Feb 2	Framing Evaluation: Paradigms, Branches, and Theories	<u>Assignment for Jan 28</u> ➤ Read chapter 2 <u>Assignment for Feb 2</u> ➤ Read supplemental readings 8 & 9 ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 1 will lead the discussion
WEEK 3 Feb 4 & 9	The Postpositivist Paradigm	<u>Assignment for Feb 4</u> ➤ Read textbook chapter 3 <u>Assignment for Feb 9</u> ➤ Read supplemental readings 10 & 11 ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 1 will lead the discussion
WEEK 4 Feb 11 & 16	The Pragmatic Paradigm and The Use Branch	<u>Assignment for Feb 11</u> ➤ Read textbook chapter 4 <u>Assignment for Feb 16</u> ➤ Read supplemental readings 12, 13 & 14 ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 1 will lead the discussion

<p>WEEK 5 Feb 18 & 23</p>	<p>The Constructivist Paradigm and The Values Branch</p>	<p><u>Assignment for Feb 18</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read textbook chapter 5 <p><u>Assignment for Feb 23</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read supplemental readings 15, 16 & 17 ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 2 will lead the discussion
<p>WEEK 6 Feb 25 & Mar 1</p>	<p>The Transformative Paradigm and The Social Justice Branch</p>	<p><u>Assignment for Feb 25</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read textbook chapter 6 <p><u>Assignment for Mar 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read supplemental readings 18, 19 & 20 ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 2 will lead the discussion ➤ First proposal component due (March 1).
<p>WEEK 7 Mar 3 & 15</p>	<p>Working with Stakeholders: Establishing the Context of the Evaluand</p> <p>Guest Lecturer: Dr. Holly Mata</p>	<p><u>Assignment for Mar 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read textbook chapter 7 <p><u>Assignment for Mar 15</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read supplemental readings 21, 22 & 23 ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 2 will lead the discussion ➤ Mid-Term Exam Assigned March 15 (Take Home Essay)
<p>WEEK 8 Mar 17 & 22</p>	<p>Evaluation Purposes, Types and Questions</p> <p>Guest Lecturer: Dr. Guadalupe Corral</p>	<p><u>Assignment for Mar 17</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read textbook chapter 8 <p><u>Assignment for Mar 22</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read supplemental readings TBA ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 3 will lead the discussion ➤ Mid-Term Exam Due March 22
<p>WEEK 9 Mar 24 & 29</p>	<p>Evaluation Designs</p>	<p><u>Assignment for Mar 24</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read textbook chapter 9 <p><u>Assignment for Mar 29</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read supplemental readings TBA ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 3 will lead the discussion
<p>WEEK 10 Mar 31 & Apr 5</p>	<p>Data Collection Strategies and Indicators</p>	<p><u>Assignment for Mar 31</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read textbook chapter 10 <p><u>Assignment for Apr 5</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read supplemental readings TBA ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 3 will lead the discussion

		➤ Second proposal component due (April 5).
WEEK 11 Apr 7 & 12	Stakeholders, Participants, and Sampling	<u>Assignment for Apr 7</u> ➤ Read textbook chapter 11 <u>Assignment for Apr 12</u> ➤ Read supplemental readings TBA ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 4 will lead the discussion
WEEK 12 Apr 14 & 19	Data Analysis and Interpretation	<u>Assignment for Apr 14</u> ➤ Read textbook chapter 12 <u>Assignment for Apr 19</u> ➤ Read supplemental readings TBA ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Individual team member of group 4 will lead the discussion
WEEK 13 Apr 21 & 26	Presenting Data Effectively	<u>Assignment for Apr 21</u> ➤ TBA <u>Assignment for Apr 26</u> ➤ Read supplemental readings TBA ➤ Answer assigned discussion questions and turn in at beginning of class ➤ Instructor will lead discussion
WEEK 14 and 15 Apr 28 & May 3 & 5	Meta-Evaluation Presentations	
WEEK 17 May 9-13	No class-exam week Final Exam scheduled for Thursday, May 12 th 4:00 pm–6:45pm	

* Note: The course syllabus is a general tentative plan for the course. Any changes will be announced to the class in advance by the instructor.

Assignment Instructions

1. Assigned readings homework questions

The team member responsible for the class discussion will come up with 10 questions and/or critical thinking activity to be handed to the class. The questions/activity should be developed to encourage critical thinking about the topics being discussed. Class members will type their answers to these questions and/or activity and turn them in via blackboard by noon the day of the class. No handwritten questions & answers will be accepted. All homework must include your name, the class week and the due date. Each question will be worth two points for a total of 20 points.

2. Group discussions

Class discussion will occur the second class of each week and will focus on interactive discussions about the supplemental readings. Each student in a group will lead the discussion portion of the seminar each week by preparing questions on the reading assignments (primary focus will be on the supplemental readings). Performance will be graded using a rubric that fellow students and the instructor will fill (see attached rubric).

3. Critical meta-evaluation-group study presentation- oral presentations (group assignment)

You are required to present a meta-evaluation of a research report describing an evaluation. The research report will be assigned by the instructor. You are expected to do a thorough job compiling the substantive information and generating discussion in the class. You must plan on 30 minutes for presenting the case study in class using PowerPoint and 20-25 minutes of discussion. You will provide the instructor with a copy of the Power point presentation (handout mode-4 slides/page). The quality of the presentation will be assessed by peers and the instructors with a rubric (see attached rubric).

4. Individual Proposal: The intent of the individual proposal assignment is to present a plan for a program evaluation. The proposal will illustrate the steps and procedures to plan and implement an evaluation including appropriate statistical analyses and communication of results to the intended audience. Each section will be assigned points as follows:

The instructor will assign a program, intervention, or project. Then, each individual must develop a proposal to evaluate the program.

The paper should include the following sections, adapted from the format required by the Wisconsin Partnership Program format for Collaboration Implementation Grants

(http://www.med.wisc.edu/files/smph/docs/community_public_health/partnership/community_academic_partnership/2010-capf-rfp-application-instructions-april-23-2010-final.pdf):

1. Executive Summary (10 points): Provide a one-page abstract summarizing the following elements:

- A brief background on the significance of the topic
- The primary goal or aim of the project
- A brief description of the intervention or health improvement initiative
- The intended outcome of the project
- The Executive Summary may not exceed one (1) single-spaced page with one-inch margins. Use a minimum 11-point font and number the pages.

2. Narrative (40 points total): The narrative, excluding tables, figures, and references, may not exceed twelve (12) single-spaced pages with one-inch margins. Use a minimum 11-point font and number the pages. Use the section headings indicated in the instructions below throughout the narrative. Instructions for what to include in each section are provided below. The Narrative must include:

- **Project Purpose, Need and Statement of the Problem (10 points)**
 - Clearly state the need for and purpose of the program or project.
 - Describe the primary target population; include demographic information and data if appropriate.
 - Describe the significance of the problem or need that the program or project will address. Use state or community-level data to provide evidence of need. If available and appropriate, refer to local county or city health plan to demonstrate how the project strengthens local health goals.
 - Briefly describe the expected achievements or outcomes following successful implementation of the proposed project.
- **Theoretical basis (5 points)**
 - Address one or more theoretical models underlying the proposed evaluation approach.
- **Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes (10 points)**
 - Discuss the project's goals, intervention or prevention strategies, objectives and activities to

achieve goals.

- Provide a description of the expected results and outcomes and how they will be measured.
- Describe how stakeholders will be involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the project.

- **Work plan and timeframe (5 points)**

- Describe the project work plan and corresponding timeframe of activities. As part of the work plan, define:
 - Project goal(s)
 - Project objective(s)
 - Measurable outcomes (quantitative or qualitative impact measures that provide a basis for assessing achievement, change, or performance over time)

- **Evaluation (10 points)**

- Describe the evaluation plan and activities used to measure progress on project goals, objectives and outcomes.
- Describe how the evaluation plan will measure whether the goals were met and the outcomes achieved.
- Describe the plan for communicating project results to the public health community and to policy makers.

The evaluation plan must rely on rigorous, scientific methods to provide evidence regarding the effects of the intervention. The use of pre and post measures, control/comparison groups, and experimental or quasi-experimental methods is recommended. Likewise, the evaluation must include both outcomes and change mediators. It is recommended that a logic or conceptual model be developed to guide the proposal and included as an appendix.

Final proposals should be written according to the length limits described above, using a typeface 11 points or larger (smaller size can be used in tables and figures) and 1" margins all around. Reference style can be APA or AMA (choose one and stick to it). Papers must include page numbers.

Preliminary Proposal Components. Students will submit two preliminary components of their final paper prior to turning in their final proposal. The purpose of this assignment is three fold. First, it gives students an opportunity to receive feedback from the instructor and incorporate that feedback into their final proposals. Second, it allows students to earn some credit earlier on the semester. Finally, and most important, it helps students avoid procrastination and start thinking and working on their final paper early in the semester. Preliminary components must be turned in by specific dates (see course outline table for details).

- Component 1: Project Purpose, Need and Statement of the Problem **(10% of final grade)**
- Component 2: Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes **(25% of final grade)**

Electronic copies (uploaded to the appropriate dropbox on blackboard) of the final proposals and preliminary components should be turned in before or on the day they are due (refer to the syllabus for specific date).

Supplemental Websites

- The American Evaluation Association (www.eval.org)
- The “Basic Guides” by Sociologist Gene Shackman (<http://gsociology.icaap.org/methods>)
- The Harvard Family Research Project (www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange)
- Center for Culturally Responsive Evaluation and Assessment (<http://education.illinois.edu/crea>)
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (<http://www.jcsee.org>)
- The International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (<http://ioce.net>)
- The Foundation Center (www.fdncenter.org)

Supplemental Required Readings:

1. What is program evaluation? Pdf document.
2. American Evaluation Association (2015). American Evaluation Statement on Cultural Competence. Available at <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=92>
3. American Evaluation Association (2015). Guiding principles for evaluations. Available at <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51>
4. Samuels, M., & Ryan, K. (2011). Grounding evaluations in culture. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 32, 183-198.
5. Trochim, W. M. K. (1998). An evaluation of Michael Scriven’s “Minimalist Theory: The Least Theory that Practice Requires”. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19, 243-249.
6. House, E. R. (1990). Research news and comment: Trends in evaluation. *Educational Researcher* 19, 24-28.
7. Mareschal, P. M., McKee, W. L., Jackson, S. E., & Hanson, K. L. (2007). Technology-based approaches to preventing youth violence. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 5, 168-187.
8. Donaldson, S., & Lipsey, M. W. (2006). Roles for theory in contemporary evaluation practice: Developing practical knowledge. In I. Shaw & J. Greene (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Evaluation*. CA: Thousand Oaks.
9. Skolits, G. J., Morrow, J. A., & Burr, E. M. (2009). Reconceptualizing evaluator roles. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30, 275-295.
10. Brady, B., & O’Reagan, C. (2009). Meeting the challenge of doing an RCT evaluation of youth mentoring in Ireland. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 3, 265-280.
11. Duse, G., Kerschner, D. (2008). Removing a nail from the booth camp coffin: An outcome evaluation of Minnesota’s Challenge Incarceration Program. *Crime Delinquency*, 54, 614-643.
12. Morgan, D. L. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 48-76.
13. Patton, M. Q. (2002). A vision of evaluation that strengthens democracy. *Evaluation*, 8, 125-139.
14. Walden, E. M., & Baxter, D. (2004). The comprehensive approach: An evaluation model to assess HIV/AIDS-related behavior change in developing countries. *Evaluation*, 7, 439-452.
15. Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 126-136.
16. Wertz, F. J. (2005). Phenomenological research methods for counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 167-177.
17. Abama, T. A. (2005). Responsive evaluation: Its meaning and special contribution to health promotion. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 28, 279-289.
18. Henry, E., & Pene, H. (2001). Kaupapa Maori: Locating indigenous ontology, epistemology and methodology in the academy. *Organization*, 8, 234-242.
19. Chilisa, B. (2005). Educational research within postcolonial Africa: A critique of HIV/AIDS research in Botswana. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18, 659-684.
20. Mercado-Martinez, F. J., Tejada-Taybas, L. M., & Springett, J. (1998). Methodological issues in emergent evaluations of health programs: Lessons from Iberoamerica. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18, 1277-1288.
21. Caldwell, J. Y. (2005). Culturally competent research with American Indians and Alaska Natives. *The Journal of the National Center*, 12, 1-21.

22. Trochim, W. (1989). An introduction to concept mapping for planning and evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 12, 1-16.
23. Trochim, w., et al. (2004). Setting objectives for community and systems change: An application of concept mapping for planning a statewide health improvement initiative. *Health Promotion Practice*, 5, 8-19.

Suggested Readings:

Shaw, I., Greene, J., & Mark, M. (2006). *The Sage Handbook of Evaluation*. CA: Thousand Oaks.

Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental Evaluation*. NY: The Guilford Press.

Fetterman, D. M., Kaftarian, S. J., & Wandersman, A. (2015). *Empowerment Evaluation*. CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization Focused Evaluation*. CA: Thousand Oaks.