



Department of Public Health Sciences

Course name:	Public Health Evaluation and Research
Course no.:	PUBH 5352
Course CRN:	19573
Semester/year	Fall 2020
Graduate credit hours:	3
Class location:	Online
Class meeting time:	Blackboard Collaborate Biweekly Thursdays, 5:00-7:20 PM
Class instructor:	Dr. Julia Lechuga
Office location:	Blackboard Collaborate
Phone:	915-747-7221
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, research designs, and approaches. Major emphasis will be placed on critical thinking about philosophical assumptions of program evaluation theory, approaches and research designs to conduct evaluations of programs under real-world conditions.	
Required textbooks:	Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2012). Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
Supplemental Readings	See course schedule and calendar
Course format:	Online and virtual Face-to-Face (F2F) activities including mini-lectures, class forum discussions, written assignments, application of course content in applied exercises, and exams. Some course activities will be delivered via virtual F2F activities and active student participation, practice of skills, and team-work will be key course aspects.
Major learning objectives:	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 evaluation2. Understand the major theories and philosophical stances influencing the field of program evaluation3. Understand the fundamentals of planning and implementing evaluations including choices of research designs4. Select appropriate communication strategies to promote utilization of findings by the intended audience
Assessment strategies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Bi-weekly written assignments and discussion forums▪ Bi-Weekly virtual F2F team led discussions of assigned readings (evaluation by professor using evaluation rubric) & applied exercises▪ 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)▪ Meta-evaluation of a program evaluation report or study (team presentation)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation and feedback on oral case study presentation (evaluation by classmates and instructor using evaluation rubric) ▪ 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"> ▪ Written Assignments: 15% ▪ Discussion Forums: 10% ▪ Participation in virtual F2F team led discussions: 10% ▪ Participation in virtual F2F applied exercises: 10% ▪ Individual program evaluation proposal: 20% ▪ Meta evaluation oral presentation (group assignment): 15% ▪ Exams: 20% <p>Participation in virtual F2F activities is mandatory: Missed F2F virtual sessions will result in a zero grade for that activity.</p>
-------------------------------------	---

Incomplete policy:	<p>An “I” (incomplete grade) will be considered only if <u>requested by the student in 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:	<p>Because this is an online course, attendance is determined by class participation online including participation in assignments through blackboard and F2F virtual discussions and exercises. Students must complete the activities of each course module (readings, mini-lectures, videos, forum discussions, and written assignments) before the scheduled virtual F2F activities in order to be prepared to engage in team discussions and meaningfully contribute to virtual team based activities.</p>
--------------------	--

Writing standards	<p>Effective masters level professionals are also effective written as well as oral communicators. Written communication is a critical element of the communication process. Students are strongly encouraged to seek out assistance from the free UTEP Writing Center https://www.utep.edu/uwc/ as points will be deducted for grammatical errors or run-on sentences in written assignments.</p>
--------------------------	--

Policy for late assignments	<p>Due dates all assignments are designed for fairness to all students. No exceptions to those dates will be made excepting in cases of university-designated closures.</p>
------------------------------------	---

Technology Requirements:	<p>Course content is delivered via the Internet through the Blackboard learning management system (LMS). Ensure your UTEP e-mail account is working and that you have access to the Web. You may use any of the primary Web browsers—Explorer, Google Chrome, Firefox, Safari, etc. When having technical difficulties, try switching to another browser.</p>
---------------------------------	---

	<p>You will need to have or have access to a computer/laptop, a webcam, and a microphone. You will need to download or update the following software: Microsoft Office, Adobe, Flashplayer, and Windows Media Player. Check that your computer hardware and software are up-to-date and able to access all parts of the course. If you encounter technical difficulties of any kind, contact the Help Desk https://www.utep.edu/technologysupport/.</p>
Netiquette	<p>The following professional demeanor is expected of all students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remember that members of the class and the professor will be reading any postings. Please carefully consider your audience before writing postings. • Respect and courtesy must be provided to classmates and to professor at all times. No harassment or inappropriate postings will be tolerated. • When reacting to someone else’s message, address the ideas, not the person. Post only what anyone would comfortably state in a Face-to-Face situation. • Blackboard is not a public internet venue; all postings to it should be considered private and confidential. Whatever is posted on these online spaces is intended for classmates and professor only. Do not copy documents and paste them to a publicly accessible website, blog, or other space. If students wish to do so, they have the ethical obligation to first request the permission of the writer(s).
Class participation:	<p>Active student participation during virtual F2F activities is mandatory. Students must be prepared to discuss, answer questions, and participate in all activities designed to apply course content.</p>
Special accommodations:	<p>The University is committed to providing reasonable accommodations and auxiliary services to students, staff, faculty, job applicants, applicants for admissions, and other beneficiaries of University programs, services and activities with documented disabilities in order to provide them with equal opportunities to participate in programs, services, and activities in compliance with sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 and the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act (ADAAA) of 2008. Students requesting an accommodation based on a disability must register with the UTEP Center for Accommodations and Support Services https://www.utep.edu/student-affairs/cass/</p>
Student conduct:	<p>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: “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”. All suspected violations of academic integrity at The University of Texas at El Paso must be reported to the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution (OSCCR) https://www.utep.edu/student-affairs/osccr/ for possible disciplinary action.</p>

Examples of “cheating” include:

- 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 homework assignment, 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 Due/Class Activities Dates
<p>Module 1 Aug 27 & Sept 3</p>	<p>Introduction to Evaluation Definition of Evaluation, Ethical Principles for Evaluators, Culturally Responsive Evaluation</p>	<p><u>Assignments for Thursday Aug 27 at 11:59 PM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read Chapter 1 ➤ Read Supplemental Readings 1, 2, 3, 4 ➤ Read mini-lecture ➤ Post to forum discussion ➤ Turn in Written assignment <p><u>Live Virtual F2F Activities for Thursday Sept 3:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Meet the instructor (blackboard connect @ 5:00) ➤ Team Assignments and program assigned (blackboard connect @ 5:30) ➤ Applied group exercise and class discussion (blackboard connect @ 6:00 – 7:00)
<p>Module 2 Sept 10 & 17</p>	<p>Framing Evaluation: Paradigms, Branches, and Theories The Postpositivist Paradigm</p>	<p><u>Assignments for Thursday Sept 10 at 11:59 PM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read Chapters 2 and 3 ➤ Read Supplemental Readings 5

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read mini-lecture ➤ Post to forum discussion ➤ Turn in written assignment <p><u>Live Virtual F2F Activities for Thursday Sept 17:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Team led discussion T1 (blackboard connect @ 5:00) ➤ Applied group exercise (blackboard connect @ 6:00 – 7:00)
Module 3 Sept 28 & Oct 1	The Pragmatic, Constructivist, and Transformative Paradigms	<p><u>Assignments for Monday Sept 28 at 11:59 PM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read Chapters 4, 5, 6 ➤ Read Supplemental Readings 6, 7, 8 ➤ Read mini-lecture ➤ Post to forum discussion ➤ Turn in written assignment <p><u>Live Virtual F2F Activities for Thursday Oct 1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Team Led Discussion T2 (blackboard connect @ 5:00) ➤ Applied group exercise (blackboard connect @ 6:00 – 7:00)
Module 4 Oct 12 & 15	Working with Stakeholders: Establishing the Context of the Evaluand	<p><u>Assignments for Monday Oct 12 at 11:59 PM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read Chapter 7 ➤ Read supplemental readings 9, 10, 11 ➤ Read mini-lecture ➤ Post to forum discussion ➤ Turn in written assignment <p><u>Live Virtual F2F Activities for Thursday Oct 15:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Team Led Discussion T3 (blackboard connect @ 5:00) ➤ Applied group exercise (blackboard connect @ 6:00 – 7:00)
Module 5 Oct 26 & 29	Evaluation Purposes, Types, and Questions & Evaluation Designs	<p><u>Assignments for Monday Oct 26 at 11:59 PM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read Chapters 8, 9 ➤ Read supplemental readings 12, 13 ➤ Read mini-lecture ➤ Post to forum discussion ➤ Turn in written assignment <p><u>Live Virtual F2F Activities for Thursday Oct 29:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Team Led Discussion T1 (blackboard connect @ 5:00) ➤ Applied group exercise (blackboard connect @ 6:00 – 7:00)
Oct 30	Mid-Term Readings Modules 1-5	Mid-term available Oct 30 in Blackboard Mid-term due Sunday Nov 6 at 11:59 PM
Module 6 Nov 9 & 12	Data Collection Strategies and Indicators & Stakeholders, Participants, and Sampling	<p><u>Assignments for Monday Nov 9 at 11:59 PM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read Chapters 10, 11 ➤ Read supplemental readings 14, 15 ➤ Read mini-lecture ➤ Post to forum discussion ➤ Turn in written assignment <p><u>Live Virtual F2F Activities for Thursday Nov 12:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Team Led Discussion T2 (blackboard connect @ 5:00) ➤ Applied group exercise (blackboard connect @ 6:00 – 7:00)

Module 7 Nov 23 & Dec 3	Data Analysis and Interpretation & Presenting Data Effectively	<u>Assignments for Monday Nov 23 at 11:59 midnight:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read Chapter 8 ➤ Read supplemental readings 16, 17 ➤ Read mini-lecture Ch 8 ➤ Individual Quiz # 9 (Ch 8) ➤ Post to forum discussion Ch 8 ➤ Turn in written assignment <u>Live Virtual F2F Activities for Thursday Dec 3:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Team Led Discussion T3 (blackboard connect @ 5:00) ➤ Meta-evaluation oral presentation (blackboard connect @ 5:00 – 7:20)
Finals week	Final Exam Chapters 7-14	Final exam made available on blackboard Monday Dec 7 Final exam due Friday Dec 14 at 11:59 PM

* 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.

Information and Instructions for Course Activities and Assignments:

1. Mini-Lectures

Mini-lectures will consist of course content posted on blackboard in the form of power points with audio recordings or written content posted. Other content in the form of videos may be included. Students should view, listen, and read this content as it will contain complementary information not found in the assigned readings. Exposure to this content is needed to perform well in class assignments, discussions, applied exercises, and exams.

2. Written Assignments

Students will be asked to turn in written assignments throughout the semester. Dr. Lechuga has planned these assignments to enhance critical thinking about course content. These assignments will be an opportunity for students to receive feedback on his/her mastery of the material and the application of course content to the program evaluation proposal write-up. When assigned, a link for each written assignment will appear inside each class module folder and include instructions for formatting and length. Written assignments will be due every other Thursday by 11:59 PM (see class calendar for specific dates). Points will be deducted for grammatical errors or run-on sentences.

3. Forum Discussions

Questions, scenarios, or vignettes covering course content (e.g., readings, mini-lectures, videos) will be posted in class discussion forums. Posts answering or commenting should be posted every other Thursday by 11:59 PM (see class calendar for specific dates). Students should post individual answers, comments and also reply to two other classmates. To receive full credit for posts, students should refer to course content, discussions, and other course material in their replies. Replies that are too short or too general such as “I agree” or “great suggestion” will be considered non-responsive and will not be graded. The purpose of discussion forums is to enrich the learning experience through informed discussions about course content.

4. Virtual F2F Team Led Discussions

Each team will be assigned a reading and will lead a virtual class discussion bi-weekly via blackboard collaborate. A link to the virtual room will be posted inside each class module folder. Teams will be responsible for generating discussion and participation of fellow classmates. Dr. Lechuga will provide suggestions to teams about content to focus on. Performance will be graded using a rubric that Dr. Lechuga will fill (see attached rubric).

5. Virtual F2F Applied Exercises

Bi-weekly Dr. Lechuga will plan and implement applied exercises that will take place virtually via blackboard collaborate. These applied exercise sessions will take place the same day after team led discussions and will be designed to apply course content to assist students in planning their write-ups of their program evaluation proposal. Active participation and contribution to discussion will be graded.

6. Critical meta-evaluation-case study team presentation- oral presentation

Teams will present a meta-evaluation of a research report describing an evaluation. Teams can select their example of a journal article or report describing a program evaluation. Dr. Lechuga will need to approve the selected example of a program evaluation report or study. Teams are expected to do a thorough job compiling the substantive information and generating discussion in the class. You must plan on 25-30 minutes for the virtual presentation using PowerPoint and 15-20 minutes of discussion. You will provide the instructor with a copy of the Power point presentation (handout mode-4 slides/page) before it is due. The quality of the presentation will be assessed by peers and the instructors with a rubric (see attached rubric).

7. Individual Program Evaluation Proposal Write-Up

The intent of the individual program evaluation proposal assignment is to facilitate students' acquisition of expertise in planning and designing a program evaluation. *Dr. Lechuga will assign a program.* Then, students will write individually a program evaluation plan to evaluate the program. Dr. Lechuga will provide a program evaluation write-up template which will consist of sections where information about a particular aspect of the program evaluation plan should be included. The evaluation plan must consist of/and elaborate upon the theories, strategies and methods discussed in class. Students **are encouraged to** submit preliminary components of their final program evaluation write-up to the professor prior to turning in their final proposal to obtain feedback. See additional sheet with further instructions.

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. 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.

5. 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. [T1]

6. 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. [T2]
7. Abma, T. A. (2005). Responsive evaluation: Its meaning and special contribution to health promotion. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 28, 279-289.
8. 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.

9. Caldwell, J. Y. (2005). Culturally competent research with American Indians and Alaska Natives. *The Journal of the National Center*, 12, 1-21.
10. Trochim, W. (1989). An introduction to concept mapping for planning and evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 12, 1-16.
11. 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. [T3]

12. Grigg-Saito, D., et al. (2008). Building on the strengths of a Cambodian refugee community through community-based outreach. *Health Promotion Practice*, 9, 415-425. [T1]
13. Hall, M. E., et al. (2007). Military sexual trauma services for women veterans in the veterans health administration: The patient-care practice environment and perceived support. *Psychological Services*, 4, 229-238.

14. Mukoma, W., et al. (2009). Development and test-retest reliability of a research instrument designed to evaluate school-based HIV/AIDS interventions in South Africa and Tanzania. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 37, 7-15.
15. Catsambas, T. T., & Webb, L. D. (2003). Using appreciative inquiry to guide an evaluation of the international women's media foundation African program. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 100, 41-51. [T2]

16. Wilson, A. T. (2005). The effectiveness of international development assistance from American Organizations to Deaf communities in Jamaica. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 150, 292-304.
17. Horn, K., McCracken, L., Dino, G., & Brayboy, M. (2008). Applying CBPR principles to the development of a smoking cessation program for American Indian teens: "Telling our Story". *Health Education & Behavior*, 35, 46-69. [T3]

Additional 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.