



**EDUC 714: Measurement & Evaluation for Decision-Making
Course Syllabus – Summer 2017**

3 Units

Instructor: Nicole Marie-Gerardi MacCalla, Ph.D.

Class Time and Place:

Thursday's (Section 26528D) 6:35-9:45pm, WPH 107, 5/18/17-8/3/17

Or,

Tuesday's (Section 26527D) 6:35-9:45pm, WPH 103, 5/23/17-8/8/17

Office Hours: By appointment

Contact Info: maccalla@usc.edu; cell/text: 310-767-6637; office: 626-460-8930

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the USC Rossier School of Education is to improve learning in urban education locally, nationally, and globally. This course is related to Rossier's mission because it focuses on the applied research skills leaders need in order to find answers to inquiry-based questions to inform decision-making.

PURPOSE

This course focuses on collecting, analyzing, and using quantitative data to solve applied problems of practice in evaluating educational institutions, programs, and policies. Following a two-part research methods series, this course further prepares you to engage in a meaningful inquiry process, as consumer of empirical knowledge and/or researcher/evaluator. This course's main objective is to help you build skills you will need to thoughtfully produce and/or critically consume research and evaluation studies as informed leaders in organizations. This course will deepen your research literacy and sharpen the lenses by which you are able to discern varying qualities of knowledge and to better understand how valid and reliable knowledge is constructed. We will practice applied research techniques and critically assess study design, instrumentation, data collection procedures, findings, and interpretations from relevant research and evaluation studies. Additionally, we will explore current global issues (local, state, national, international) in testing and measurement and their implications for decision-making in high stakes settings.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Demonstrate understanding and application of applied research techniques;
- Demonstrate basic understanding of measurement theory and psychometrics;

- Demonstrate basic understanding of program theory and its articulation;
- Demonstrate basic understanding of uses of program theory and its application for evaluation planning and decision-making;
- Discuss and apply the criteria by which study designs are determined and/or assessed;
- Discuss and apply the criteria by which instruments are designed and/or assessed;
- Discuss and apply the criteria by which data collection procedures are planned and/or assessed;
- Discuss and apply ways in which reliability and validity are established;
- Critically assess interpretation of study findings in relation to research/evaluation questions, instrumentation, and data collection procedures;
- Demonstrate basic understanding of various issues in testing and measurement.

REQUIRED READING

Texts

Alkin, M.C. (2011). *Evaluation essentials: From a to z*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Fink, A. (2016). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. (If students already own the 5th Edition, contact instructor for roughly equivalent reading assignments.)

Articles, Chapters, and Reports (Available on ARES, online, and *through Instructor)

AEA. (2004) *Guiding principles for evaluators*. American Evaluation Association. Retrieved from: <http://www.eval.org/cm/ld/fid=51>

AERA. (2006). Standards for reporting on empirical social science research in AERA publications. *Educational Researcher*, 35(6), 33-40.

Bledsoe, Katrina L., & James A. Graham. (2005). The uses of multiple evaluation approaches in program evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(3), 302-319.

Brockopp, D. Y., & Hastings-Tolsma, M. T. (2003). Unit 3: Answering the research question: Quantitative designs - Chapter 6: Measurement. In *Fundamentals of Nursing Research*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlette Publishers, Inc. Retrieved from: http://samples.jbpub.com/9780763715670/brockopp_sample_06.pdf

Champion, R. (2002). Choose the right data for the job. *Journal of Staff Development*, 23(3), 78-79.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). Chapter 1: The selection of a research approach. In *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3-23). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). Chapter 8: Quantitative methods. In *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (155-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- *Davidson, P. L., Maccalla, N. M. G., Abdelmonem, A. A., Guerrero, L., Nakazono, T. T., Zhong, S., & Wallace, S. P. (In review). A participatory approach to evaluating a national training and institutional change initiative: The BUILD longitudinal evaluation. *BioMed Central: BMC Proceedings*.
- Estrada, M., Woodcock, A., & Schultz, P. W. (2014) Tailored Panel Management: A theory-based approach to building and maintaining participant commitment to a longitudinal study. *Evaluation Review*, 38(1), 1-26.
- Irwin, C. W., & Stafford, E. T. (2016). *Survey methods for educators: Collaborative survey development* (Part 1 of 3) (REL 2016-163). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL_2016163.pdf.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (2006). Seen keys to unlock the four levels of evaluation. *Performance Improvement*, 45(7), 5-8.
- Pazzaglia, A. M., Stafford, E. T., & Rodriguez, S. M. (2016). *Survey methods for educators: Selecting samples and administering surveys* (Part 2 of 3) (REL 2016-160). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL_2016160.pdf.
- Pazzaglia, A. M., Stafford, E. T., & Rodriguez, S. M. (2016). *Survey methods for educators: Analysis and reporting of survey data* (Part 3 of 3) (REL 2016-164). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL_2016164.pdf.
- Shakman, K., & Rodriguez, S. M. (2015). *Logic models for program design, implementation, and evaluation: Workshop toolkit* (REL 2015-057). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL_2015057.pdf.
- Schoenfeld, Alan H. (2006). What doesn't work: The challenge and failure of the What Works Clearinghouse to conduct meaningful reviews of studies of mathematics curricula. *Educational Researcher*, 35(2), 13-21. And Author Responses, p. 22-23. Retrieved from: https://gse.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/users/alan-h.-schoenfeld/Schoenfeld_2006%20What%20Doesn%27t%20Work.pdf
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (2004). *Logic model development guide*. Retrieved from: <https://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide>.

Westat, (2010). *The 2010 user-friendly handbook for project evaluation*. Washington DC: NSF.

*** Additional relevant readings to be determined during week's 5 & 10 for week's 10-12.

NIH Diversity Program Consortium Web Links

<https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/nih-fund-research-workforce-diversity-program>

<https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-RM-13-016.html>

<http://www.diversityprogramconsortium.org/>

<https://commonfund.nih.gov/diversity/index>

CLASS TIME

Class time for the course is 3 hours and 10 minutes, weekly. Contact time will be met by a combination of lecture, conversations with invited experts, discussions, group work, presentations, and in class activities. The course will integrate a flipped classroom design, based on research that clearly demonstrates that learning is enhanced when working actively as opposed to listening passively (as in a lecture). The class meets once a week during the Summer session, for 12 weeks. Students are expected to prepare for class by doing all the reading, and completing all required tasks before attending class.

COURSE REQUIREMENT OVERVIEW & GUIDELINES

A. Class Participation (10% of grade)

Class participation is essential to the collaborative learning process. Students are expected to come to class having completed the assigned readings for the week and be prepared to discuss the material and participate in class activities. In order to earn full credit for class participation, each student must complete course readings and attend each session, participate in class discussions/activities, and bring/submit necessary materials for class discussions/activities (e.g. questions for readings, week's 2-4 & week's 10-12, selected articles for Group Project II – week 2, 3 topical choices for Issues in Measurement & Testing assignment – week 7, etc.). See weekly course overview to identify necessary due dates for content and supplementary materials/activities. Due to the intensive nature of summer courses, absences of any kind may jeopardize a student's ability to pass the course. Students are to notify the instructor via email before the absence and initiate contact to explore possible (not guaranteed) arrangements for missed content and make-up work. If you are going to miss a class, please make arrangements with a colleague to share class notes.

B. Group Project I: Evaluation Proposal Preparations and Submission (45% of grade)

Students are to form working groups of minimum of 3 to maximum of 5 members to complete this first project. Each group will complete and/or submit Parts I-III (1 submission per group, per part):

Part I.

Interview with a Diversity Program Consortium (DPC) Stakeholder – Due Week 4 (12.5% of grade)

- a) As a class, we will be working on developing applied research skills, in the context of the Diversity Program Consortium (DPC), a NIH sponsored initiative to increase underrepresented groups in biomedical sciences. Readings and class sessions, week's 1-3, will provide students an orientation to the initiative in general, and more specifically, to the BUILD program component of the initiative. Student groups will have the opportunity to role play as evaluators commissioned to design an evaluation of an aspect of the BUILD program. During week 4, a DPC stakeholder (and evaluation expert) will come to our class to begin planning the BUILD program evaluations.
- b) Submit 10-20 interview questions your group plans to ask a DPC stakeholder, to help narrow the focus of your evaluation proposal. Consult course readings and class discussions for suggested areas to cover during the initial evaluator-stakeholder meeting. Make sure your group addresses: stakeholder group of interest, program activities, evaluation purpose, timeline, relevant outcomes, and credible evidence. **(10% of grade)**
- c) Using the interview protocol developed, engage in a purposeful conversation with a DPC stakeholder (in class) to help narrow the focus of your group's evaluation proposal. Consider taking extensive notes during the interview and/or digitally recording the conversation. **(2.5% of grade)** A debrief on the interview experience will take place week 5.

Part II.

Articulating a Program Theory (Logic Model) for the Identified DPC Stakeholder Group of Interest – Draft Logic Model Due Week 6, Final Logic Model Due Week 8 (10% of grade)

- a) Using the logic model figure template provided, develop a logic model articulating the program theory for the DPC stakeholder group of interest. Clearly identify: problem, assumptions, activities, outputs, outcomes (short-, medium-, long-term), and impact.

Part III.

DPC Evaluation Proposal & Presentation Due Week 8 (22.5% of grade)

- a) Using the Data Collection Framework table template provided, develop a plan for data collection and use for your DPC evaluation proposal. Clearly identify: activities, indicators, data sources, data collection instruments, when data is collected, by whom, and evaluation use. Organize by short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes (consult DPC logic model). **(10% of grade)**
- b) Design a comprehensive program evaluation proposal for the DPC. Include the revised DPC program logic model (figure), data collection framework (table), and accompanying narrative.
 - i. In the narrative, make sure to identify/address: stakeholder group of interest, evaluation questions, evaluation approach (if appropriate), study design, description of instrumentation (including relevant constructs, IVs, DVs, and control variables, if appropriate), validity and reliability, site selection and

sampling, timeline for data collection, data collection procedures, data analysis, and use of evaluation findings. **(10% of grade)**

- c) Present your evaluation proposal to a DPC stakeholder, during class, week 8. **(2.5 % of grade)**

C. Group Project II: Critical Review & Discussion of Research or Evaluation Findings, Instrumentation, and Data Collection Procedures (20% of grade)

Students are to form working groups of minimum of 3 to maximum of 5 members to complete this second project. Each group will complete and/or submit Parts I-III (1 submission per group, per part):

Part I.

Identification of Relevant Research or Evaluation Findings

- a) Each student must bring to class 2 relevant peer-reviewed articles or evaluation reports that include presentation and discussion of study findings. Appropriate articles or report must be between 20-50 pages in length, include discussion of findings (addressing descriptive, correlational, predictive, or group difference questions), and access to study instrumentation (i.e. instruments in the appendix, online, or available by request). Articles/reports can address a multitude of topics, inside or outside of education. Review selected articles/reports in class, as a group, week 2. (Class participation credit)
- b) As a group, identify and submit the top 3 articles/reports and instrumentation your group would like to critique and discuss, week 3. Instructor will confirm the final selected article/report for the second group project, week 5. **(2.5% of grade)**
- a. Final assigned articles/reports will be assigned as reading for week 10.
- i. Students must read 3 total, of the assigned articles/reports for week 10.

Part II.

Facilitation of Class Discussion & Oral Critique of Assigned Article – Due Week 10 (7.5% of grade)

- a) Each group will facilitate a 45-minute discussion of their article/report, in class, week 10. Structure the discussion around interpretation and critique of study findings and implications for decision-making. What should the reader pay attention to? What is the nature of analysis? Are the study design and/or study results valid and reliable (why, or why not)? What are the study limitations and/or biases and what do they mean for analysis and interpretation? Under what conditions and in what ways is this article/report useful, and for whom? What decisions have been tied to the study findings and are they appropriate? Additionally, make sure to respond to the submitted class questions about your article/report.

Part III.

Written Critique of Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedures in Relation to Study Findings and Decision-Making 4-6 pages Due Week 10 (10% of grade)

- a) Description of Instrumentation: Provide a summary of the instrument used in the research or evaluation study. Include: instrument name and citation, number of items, constructs/subscales, response formats, etc.,

- b) Note the original study population as well as instrumentation appropriateness for the population.
- c) Assess the aesthetics of the instrumentation as well as the general content and construction of items in relation to the overarching study research/evaluation questions.
- d) If the instrumentation is quantitative in nature, assess the psychometric properties including: levels of measurement, total score computations, reliability, and validity information, etc., as well as appropriateness for use in the study.
- e) If the instrumentation is qualitative in nature, assess instrument content and individual item quality, as well as appropriateness for use in the study.
- f) Assess the data collection procedures (mode of administration, timing, use of incentives, etc.) including appropriateness for use with study site and sample.
- g) Make an assessment of the quality of study findings and interpretation in relation to study instrumentation relative to research/evaluation questions.
- h) Address what decisions are appropriate given the study research questions, instrumentation, and findings.

D. Individual Project: Issues in Testing & Measurement Research Assignment (25% of grade)

Topic Selection – Due Week 7

- a) Identify an issue in testing or measurement (introduction to current issues will take place in class during week 5, e.g. value-added measurement of teacher effectiveness, use of standardized test scores for measuring student achievement for underrepresented minority populations, etc.) to learn more about. Topics can be education or non-education related.
 - i. Submit your top 3 topical choices, in preferential order, in week 7 for instructor approval.
 - i. Final topical assignments and order of presentations will be assigned, in class, week 8.

Class Article Assignment – Due Week 10 (2.5% of grade)

- a) Submit a single suggested article for the class to read, related to your current issue in testing and measurement.
 - i. Final assigned articles/reports will be assigned as reading for week 11 or 12.
 - i. Students must read 3 total, of the assigned articles/reports for each, week 11 and week 12.

Executive Summary Due Week 12 (17.5% of grade)

- b) Produce a two-page (single-spaced) executive summary/“white paper,” with citations, on the selected/assigned issue in testing & measurement. Note the economic/social/political context of the issue, history and importance of the issue, possible causal factors, and impact of the issue on the respective field. Conclude with what is currently being done to address the issue. The class is your audience.
- c) Produce an annotated bibliography of a minimum of five sources used to construct the executive summary. Do your best to include multiple perspectives on the issue (sources may be a combination of scholarly, governmental, economic, mainstream,

popular media, etc.). The annotated bibliography should summarize and evaluate/critique the sources.

Presentation Due Week 11 or 12 (5% of grade)

- d) Structure a short presentation or experience for the class to share important information about the issue in testing and measurement that you have chosen to cover. Acceptable presentation formats include: PowerPoint, Keynote, Google Slides, Podcast, Pecha-Kucha, Infographic, handout, exercise, etc. Do your best to facilitate discussion and be ready to answer questions around the important issue.

COURSE GRADING

Final grade will be assigned based on the following range based on total points possible (100).

A 100–95%	B+ 89–86%	C+ 79–76 %	D+ 69–66%	F 59–0%
A– 94–90%	B 85–83%	C 75–73%	D 65–63%	
	B– 82–80%	C– 72–70%	D–62–60%	

Grading Breakdown

Assignment	Points	Week Due
Attendance & Participation	10	Weekly
Submit 2 questions for an evaluation expert, related to the week's readings		(24hrs before class) 2
Bring 2 articles EACH for Group Project II		2
Submit 2 questions for an evaluation expert, related to the week's readings		(24hrs before class) 3
Submit 2 questions for an evaluation expert, related to the week's readings		(24hrs before class) 4
Draft logic model for a DPC stakeholder group		6
Submit top 3 choices for testing & measurement assignment		7
Submit 2 questions related to the week's readings		(24hrs before class) 10
Submit 2 questions related to the week's readings		(24hrs before class) 11
Submit 2 questions related to the week's readings		(24hrs before class) 12
Group Project I: Evaluation Proposal Preparations & Submission		
Evaluator Interview Protocol for a DPC Stakeholder	10	4
Evaluation Planning Interview with a DPC Stakeholder	2.5	4
Logic Model for a DPC Stakeholder Group	10	8
Data Collection Framework	10	8
Evaluation Proposal	10	8
Evaluation Proposal Presentation	2.5	8
Group Project II: Critical Review & Discussion of Research or Evaluation Findings, Instrumentation, and Data Collection Procedures		
Identification & Submission of 3 Appropriate Articles/Reports	2.5	3
Facilitation of Class Discussion & Oral Critique of Article	7.5	10
Written Critique of Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedures in Relation to Study Findings and Decision-Making	10	10
Individual Research Assignment: Issue in Testing & Measurement		
Submission of a Single Suggested Article for Class Reading Related to a Current Issue in Testing & Measurement	2.5	10
Executive Summary & Annotated Bibliography of an Instructor Approved Current Issue in Testing & Measurement	17.5	12
Current Issue in Testing & Measurement Presentation	5	11 or 12
Total Points Possible	100	

Late Assignments

1. Late assignments will be accepted **only** with the instructor’s advance permission **and** under limited circumstances.
2. Instructor will determine what constitutes sufficient advance permission and acceptable circumstances.
 - a. Sufficient advance notice may range from 36 hours to 2 hours to the due date and time of the assignment.
 - b. Acceptable circumstances do NOT include personal holidays, celebrations, and/or vacations OR scheduling conflicts/over commitments including work and child care.
3. Late papers submitted with advanced permission will not be docked points for lateness. If advance permission has not been granted, late papers will not receive full credit.
4. In the event that a student submits a paper after the paper deadline *without* advanced permission, the following penalties will apply:
 - a. A 10% reduction in the points earned per day late will be applied for each day after the due date.
 - b. After 5 days late, a yellow flag may be sent to the student’s academic advisor.

Class participation

Active participation will be assessed as described in the table below.

<i>Active Participation 9-10 points</i>	<i>Moderate Participation 7-8 points</i>	<i>Little to No Participation 1-6 points</i>
<p>Attends all class sessions on time and returns from breaks in a timely manner.</p> <p>Actively participates in class discussion and activities and shows verbal as well as nonverbal engagement (such as eye contact, body language, paying attention when others are talking). Stays on task during class discussion and exercises.</p> <p>Is attentive and respectful when others are talking. Demonstrates awareness of impact of self on others by monitoring self-participation to not overly monopolize class discussion to allow others opportunity to contribute.</p>	<p>Does not miss more than 1 class (excused absence only), is on time most of the time, and returns from breaks in a timely manner.</p> <p>Moderate participation in class discussion and activities and shows verbal as well as nonverbal engagement (such as eye contact, body language, paying attention when others are talking). Stays on task during class discussion and exercises.</p> <p>Mostly attentive and respectful when others are talking. Demonstrates some awareness of impact of self on others by monitoring self-participation to not overly monopolize class discussion to allow others opportunity to contribute.</p> <p>Demonstrates adequate evidence of having completed all the assigned readings by specific</p>	<p>Misses more than one class (with or without excused reason), is notably late on multiple occasions, and/or returns from breaks late in a manner that is disruptive to the class.</p> <p>Little to no participation in class discussion and activities, limited non-verbal engagement (such as eye contact, body language, paying attention when others are talking). Does not stay on task during class discussion and exercises, and shifts to non-class related topic after only minimal engagement.</p> <p>Appears withdrawn and uninterested majority of the time. Inattentive and disengaged</p>

<p>Demonstrates evidence of having completed all the assigned readings by specific reference and incorporation into class discussion and activities.</p> <p>Does not engage in distracted behavior such as using computer or phone for non-class related functions.</p>	<p>reference and incorporation into class discussion and activities.</p> <p>Does not engage in distracted behavior such as using computer or phone for non-class related functions.</p>	<p>when others are talking.</p> <p>Demonstrates little awareness of impact of self on others by overly dominating class discussion to the extent of inhibiting others from participating.</p> <p>Demonstrates little evidence of having completed all the assigned readings. Comments offered are tangential and indicate lack of familiarity with readings or are vague and general.</p> <p>Engages in distracted behavior in class by checking cell phone and focusing on a screen in a way that is evident to the instructor that the student is not engaged in what is happening in the class in the moment.</p>
---	---	--

Equivalent work in group projects

Students working in groups will set group norms for that group. For any group project work, if there are any concerns about non-cooperation or non-equivalence of work among the members, the student having the concern should email the instructor as soon as possible. The instructor will then conduct an informal assessment (without indicating who raised the concern). In groups where this is an issue, the instructor will ask for peer rating of group members on equivalence of participation at the end of the project. If there is majority agreement (or sufficient evidence) as to nonequivalence of contribution, then that person’s grade on that project may be lowered to maximum of a letter grade.

Grading criteria for papers

Grades will be assigned based upon the following criteria.

“A” Paper: The principal characteristic of the "A" paper is its rich content, "meaty," "dense," "packed." The information delivered is such that one feels significantly taught by the author, sentence after sentence, paragraph after paragraph. The "A" paper is also marked by stylistic finesse: the title and opening paragraph are engaging; the transitions are artful; the phrasing is tight, fresh, and highly specific; the sentence structure is varied; the tone enhances the purposes of the paper. It is completely free from grammatical or typographical errors. Finally, the "A" paper, because of its careful organization and development, imparts a feeling of wholeness and unusual clarity. Not surprisingly, then, it leaves the reader feeling bright, thoroughly satisfied, and eager to reread the piece. An "A" paper clearly takes

a stand and argues and defends that stand so as to completely persuade the reader, without leaving dangling questions and unexplored avenues of discussion. It is complete unto itself.

"B" Paper: It is significantly more than competent. Besides being almost free of mechanical errors, the "B" paper delivers substantial information that is, substantial in quantity, interest and value. Its specific points are logically ordered, well developed, and unified around a clear organizing principle that is apparent early in the paper. The opening paragraph draws the reader in; the closing paragraph is both conclusive and thematically related to the opening. The transitions between paragraphs are for the most part smooth, the sentence structures pleasingly varied. The diction of the "B" paper is typically more concise and precise than that found in the "C" paper. Occasionally, it even shows distinctiveness, i.e. finesse and memorability. On the whole, then, a "B" paper makes the reading experience a pleasurable one, for it offers substantial information with few distractions. It establishes a stand on an issue, and for the most part, clarifies and defends that stand, leaving few unanswered questions and unexplored angles. It is relatively successful in convincing the reader.

"C" Paper: It is generally competent and meets the minimum requirements of the assignment, but has mechanical errors, and is poorly organized and not written clearly. Information seems thin and commonplace. One reason for this is that the ideas are technically cast in the form of vague generalities. Stylistically, the "C" paper has little to draw the reader in; the final paragraphs are often bumpy; the sentences, besides being a bit choppy, tend to follow a predictable (hence monotonous) subject-verb-object order; and the diction is occasionally marred by unconscious repetitions, redundancy, and imprecision. The "C" paper, while it gets the job done, lacks both imagination and intellectual rigor, and hence does not invite a rereading. It attempts to establish a stand on an issue, but achieves only average success. It is not very successful in convincing the reader.

"D" Paper: Its treatment and development of the subject are as yet rudimentary. While organization is present, it is neither clear nor effective. Sentences are frequently awkward, ambiguous, and marred by serious mechanical errors. Evidence of careful proofreading, if any, is scanty. The whole piece, in fact, often gives the impression of having been conceived and written in haste. Or, the paper, while of standard writing, missed the assignment completely by achieving something other than requested such as presenting summary of an article rather than an analysis and opinion derived from article.

"F" Paper: Failed to follow paper guidelines. Does not address the required components or does so in a cursory and superficial manner without substantial effort. Lacks clear organization and the writing is of such poor quality that it is unacceptable. Mechanical errors are frequent. In short, the ideas, organization, and style fall far below what is acceptable graduate level writing.

Assignment Rubric

The following rubric provides a general guide as to how assignments in this course will be evaluated.

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>
Depth of thought	Shows evidence of depth of thought in preparation, organization, and clarity.	Evidence of depth of thought could be increased in some areas.	Not evident that serious thought went into preparation or organization.
Connection to course materials	Assignment shows engagement with course readings and	Some parts lack connection to course readings or other	Fails to relate to course materials and other relevant

	other relevant literature and integrates this in an appropriate manner.	sources, or they are not integrated in an appropriate way.	literature.
Completeness	All parts of the assignment are done completely and according to guidelines.	All parts of the assignments or presentation are done completely, however, lacks adherence to guidelines in some areas.	Assignment is not entirely complete, and/or shows marked lack of adherence to guidelines.
Format	Paper is free of grammatical, spelling, and format errors and is consistent with APA Guidelines.	Paper contains some errors in one or more of the areas related to format.	Paper contains significant format errors, which detract from the meaning.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one's own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another's work as one's own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. *Scampus*, the Student Guidebook, contains the Student Conduct Code in Section 11.00, while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A: <http://www.usc.edu/dept/publications/SCAMPUS/gov/>. Students will be referred to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards for further review, should there be any suspicion of academic dishonesty. The Review process can be found at: <http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/SJACS/>.

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATIONS

The University of Southern California is committed to full compliance with the Rehabilitation Act (Section 504) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). As part of the implementation of this law, the university will continue to provide reasonable accommodation for academically qualified students with disabilities so that they can participate fully in the university's educational programs and activities. Although USC is not required by law to change the "fundamental nature or essential curricular components of its programs in order to accommodate the needs of disabled students," the university will provide reasonable academic accommodation. It is the specific responsibility of the university administration and all faculty serving in a teaching capacity to ensure the university's compliance with this policy.

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The phone number for DSP is [\(213\) 740-0776](tel:2137400776). The email address is: ability@usc.edu. The

website for DSP has additional information regarding accommodations and requests (www.usc.edu/disability).

INCOMPLETES

An Incomplete (IN) is given when work is not completed because of documented illness or some other emergency occurring after 80% of the course has been completed. Arrangements for the IN and its removal should be initiated by the student and agreed to by the instructor prior to the final exam. The University policy on Incompletes (IN) is as follows (from the USC Catalogue):

Conditions for Removing a Grade of Incomplete: If an Incomplete is assigned as the student's grade, the instructor will fill out the Incomplete (IN) Completion form, which will specify to the student and to the department the work remaining to be done, the procedures for its completion, the grade in the course to date, and the weight to be assigned to work remaining to be done when computing the final grade. A student may remove the IN by completing only the work not finished as a result of illness or emergency. Previously graded work may not be repeated for credit. It is not possible to remove an IN by reregistering for the course, even within the designated time.

Time limit for removal of an incomplete: One calendar year is allowed to remove an IN. Individual academic units may have more stringent policies regarding these time limits. If the IN is not removed within the designated time limit, the course is considered "lapsed" and the grade is changed to an IX and it will be calculated into the grade point average as 0 points. Courses offered on a Credit/No Credit basis or taken on a Pass/No Pass basis for which a mark of Incomplete is assigned will be lapsed with a mark of NC or NP and will not be calculated into the grade point average.

EDUC 714: Measurement & Evaluation for Decision-Making – Summer 2017

**EDUC 714 – Measurement and Evaluation for Decision-Making
Course Schedule – 2017**

Week	Dates	Topics	Readings	Assignments	Class Activities
1	Thursday, May 18th	Overview of Course	REVIEW Creswell (2014) Readings from Inquiry I: Ch.1 & 8		Explanation of Group Project 1
		Framing Quantitative & Qualitative Research & Evaluation Questions	Fink: Ch. 5 (p. 117-126)		Form groups of 3-5 (Group Project I): set group norms & discuss next steps
	Tuesday, May 23rd	Quantitative Designs	Alkin: Sections. I, K, & L		Explanation of Group Project 2
		Quantitative Instruments	NIH Announcement: https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/nih-fund-research-workforce-diversity-program		Form groups of 3-5 (Group Project II): set group norms; begin discussing areas of interest for project
2	Thursday, May 25th	Introduction to Evaluation	Alkin: Sections. A-F & V	2 questions for an evaluation expert, related to the week's readings (24hrs before class)	Review of articles/reports for Group Project II
		Who, What, & Why of Evaluation	NIH BUILD RFA: https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-RM-13-016.html	Bring 2 articles EACH for Group Project II	Addressing questions about the DPC
	Tuesday, May 30th	Evaluation Use	Explore the DPC (Home, BUILD, NRMN, NIH, CEC, Newsletter): http://www.diversityprogramconsortium.org/	Complete EDUC 714 Student Survey	
		Introduction to the NIH Diversity Program Consortium	NIH DPC: https://commonfund.nih.gov/diversity/index		
3	Thursday, June 1st	Program Evaluation	Alkin: Sections. G, H, J, & M-Q	2 questions for an evaluation expert, related to the week's readings (24hrs before class)	
		Evaluation Frameworks	Kirkpatrick (2006)	<u>Submit top 3 articles/reports for Group Project II</u>	Prep for interview with an evaluation expert
	Tuesday, June 6th	Evaluation Planning	Champion (2002)		Prep for a DPC stakeholder interview for Group Project I

EDUC 714: Measurement & Evaluation for Decision-Making – Summer 2017

Week	Dates	Topics	Readings	Assignments	Class Activities
4	Thursday, June 8th	Practice of Evaluation	Alkin: Sections. T-U, & W	2 questions for an evaluation expert, related to the week's readings (24hrs before class)	Interview with an evaluation expert
		Survey Research	Fink: Ch. 1	<u>Submit 10-20 Questions for a DPC Evaluation Stakeholder for Group Project I</u>	<u>Interview with a DPC Evaluation Stakeholder for Group Project I</u>
	Tuesday, June 13th	Answering Evaluation Questions			
Reporting of Evaluation Findings					
5	Thursday, June 15th	Program Theory & Logic Modeling	Kellog Foundation Logic Model Development Guide (2004)		Review Template for Simple Logic Model
		Evaluation Approaches	Bledsoe & Graham (2005)		College Readiness Program class example
	Tuesday, June 20th	Introduction to Current Issues in Testing & Measurement			Debrief on interviews with the DPC evaluation stakeholder
			<i>Reference ONLY: Shakman & Rodriguez. (2016). Logic Models for Program Design, Implementation, and Evaluation: Workshop Toolkit</i>		Planning for Group Project II
				Overview of Current Issues in Testing & Measurement Assignment	
6	Thursday, June 22nd	Sampling	Fink: Ch. 4 & 6	Draft DPC Logic Model	Review Data Collection Framework Template
		Data Collection	Pazzaglia et al. (2016) (part 2 of 3)		College Readiness Program class example
	Tuesday, June 27th	Introduction to Data Analysis (Measures of Central Tendency, Variability, Descriptives, Correlation, Testing for Group Differences)	Pazzaglia et al. (2016) (part 3 of 3) (p. 1-13) Alkin: Sections. R & S		Planning for Group Project I

EDUC 714: Measurement & Evaluation for Decision-Making – Summer 2017

Week	Dates	Topics	Readings	Assignments	Class Activities
7	Thursday, June 29th			Work on Group Project I & II; Submit 3 Topical Choices for Testing & Measurement Assignment	
	Tuesday, July 4th				
8	Thursday, July 6th	Practice of Evaluation	Davidson, et al. (In review) files shared directly by Dr. Maccalla	<u>Group Project 1: DPC Evaluation Proposal, Revised Logic Model, Data Collection Framework, & Class Presentations</u>	Group Project 1: DPC Evaluation Proposal Presentations
		Judging Research & Evaluation Studies	Alkin: Section. X		
	Tuesday, July 11th		AERA (2006)		Issues in Testing & Measurement - Final topical assignments and order of presenters (Round 1: Week 11, Round 2: Week 12)
			AEA (2004)		
		<i>Reference ONLY: Westat (2010)</i>			
9	Thursday, July 13th	Scales of Measurement	Fink: Ch. 2, Ch. 3 (p. 67-78), & Ch. 5 (p. 126-132)		
		Item & Survey Construction	Irwin & Stafford (2016) (part 1 of 3)		
	Tuesday, July 18th	Reliability & Validity	Brockopp & Hastings-Tolsma (2003)		

EDUC 714: Measurement & Evaluation for Decision-Making – Summer 2017

Week	Dates	Topics	Readings	Assignments	Class Activities
10	Thursday, July 20th	Reporting & Presenting Study Results	Fink: Ch. 7	Submit 2 questions related to the week's readings (24hrs before class)	<u>Group Project II: Facilitation of Class Discussion & Oral Critique</u>
		Interpreting Study Findings for Decision Making	Read 3 total relevant articles identified for Group Project II, TBD, W5	<u>Group Project II: Written Critique of Instrumentation & Data Collection Procedures</u>	
	Tuesday, July 25th			Submit an electronic copy of the highest priority article related to: <u>Current Issue in Testing & Measurement</u>	
11	Thursday, July 27th	Curent Issues in Testing & Measurement (e.g. Who's Story Is it? (Alice Goffman); Election Polling, Establishing Inter-rater Agreement (e.g. large qual. data analysis teams) or Inter-rater Reliability (e.g. observation); Identifying Quality Indicators (e.g. Healthy Beaches); Value-Added Measures of Teacher Effectiveness; Comprehensive Teacher Evaluation Systems; Even or Odd Likert Scales;	Schoenfeld (2006) Read 3 total of the suggested articles for Round 1: Current Issues in Testing & Measurement, TBD Week 10	Submit 2 questions related to the week's readings (24hrs before class)	<u>Round 1: Testing & Measurement Presentations & Discussions</u>
	Tuesday, August 1st	Means with Likert Scale Items; Effect of Response Structure on Response; Use of the Retrospective Pre-Post-Test; Testing Bias; Use of Standardized Testing for Underrepresented Minorities (URMs); Stereotype Threat and Test Performance; Measuring Micro-Aggression; Bias of Non-Response; Assessing Drop-Out Rates; Measuring Constructs in Education/ Leadership/ Organizational Learning; etc.)	Estrada et al. (2014) Read 3 total of the suggested articles for Round 2: Current Issues in Testing & Measurement, TBD Week 10	Submit 2 questions related to the week's readings (24hrs before class)	
12	Thursday, August 3rd			<u>Executive Summary & Annotated Bibliography of a Current Issue in Testing & Measurement: Round's 1 & 2</u>	
	Tuesday, August 8th				

Guest Biographies for Evaluation Experts & DPC Evaluation Stakeholders

Jennifer Ho, Ph.D

Dr. Ho is a mixed-methodologist with 10 years of experience in monitoring, evaluation, and program evaluation. Following her work in education in California and China, she invested five years in monitoring and evaluating international educational development projects primarily in the South and Southeast Asia regions. Her evaluation work in developing countries has covered programming in the improvement of primary school learning environments, teacher professional development, student testing and assessment, technology and education, Interactive Audio Instruction, distance learning, early childhood learning, and primary-level reading, all targeted towards marginalized communities. Her recent work includes the evaluation of public health and maternal welfare policies and programs throughout Los Angeles and California State, as well as the evaluation of higher education efforts to promote diversity in biomedical research nationwide. Her current research looks closely at data-based decision making, strategic planning processes, and budgeting policies in Los Angeles schools.

Dr. Ho received her Ph.D in Education from UCLA with a focus on Social Research Methodology and Program Evaluation. Her doctoral research focused on the ways in which public school stakeholders use data to inform school-based decision-making. She also received her M.Ed. in International Education Policy from the Harvard Graduate School of Education in 2005 with an emphasis on educational equity in developing country contexts.

Dawn L. Purnell, Doctoral Candidate

Dawn Purnell is an extremely dedicated and passionate advocate for educational equity and has spent the past 15 years working to improve student achievement, collegiate access and personal efficacy. She currently provides consultation services and supports to nonprofit organizations on programmatic infrastructure, evaluation and assessment, and implementation processes. She aids in their fund development strategies, marketing and communication plans, as well as outreach and community engagement strategies

Prior to independent consultation, Dawn served as Deputy Neighborhood Officer of Education for the Los Angeles Urban League. Dawn directly managed the educational efforts for the organizations Neighborhoods @ Work Initiative. She supervised the fiscal support, development and assessment of programs that worked to increase academic proficiency and college eligibility rates while decreasing dropout and suspension rates. Dawn also managed the LA Urban League's signature Education Collaborative which regularly convened campus and community stakeholders to collectively identify and initiate solutions for improving academic achievement and college-going rates for students in South Los Angeles. Over the course of her time with the Los Angeles Urban League, Dawn aided in the academic enrichment and collegiate access support of more than 5000 students and parents.

Prior to her work with the Los Angeles Urban League, Dawn served as the Director of UCLA's Students Heightening Academic Performance through Education (SHAPE) program. As the Director, Dawn led a staff of more than 50 undergraduate students and volunteers in providing middle school and high school students with academic advising, college planning, and tutoring supports.

Dawn has also played a strong advocacy role in collegiate access and retention issues. Dawn has served as a member of the Alliance for Equal Opportunity in Education (AEOE), which has increased African American admissions at UCLA and other campuses UC System-wide by 40% since its establishment in 2006. Dawn also co-convenes the Black Community Clergy and Labor Alliance (BCCLA) Education Committee which has galvanized a cadre of school and community stakeholders to address African American achievement gap within LAUSD through an aggressive co-constructed education agenda.

Dawn earned her BA in African American Studies at UCLA and is currently a Doctoral Candidate in UCLA's Educational Leadership Program. Her dissertation research focuses on academic self-concept and identifying salient strategies for increasing college preparation and admission rates for African American youth.