

PPD 542

Policy and Program Evaluation

Spring 2018

William D. Leach, Ph.D
leachw@price.usc.edu

24/7 Technical Support
(877) 646-1885
<http://usc.echelp.org/>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Course Description](#)

[Course Objectives](#)

[Textbooks & Materials](#)

[Grading](#)

[Policies](#)

[Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems](#)

[Live Session Schedule](#)

[About the Instructor](#)

15 Weekly Activities

[1](#) | [2](#) | [3](#) | [4](#) | [5](#) | [6](#) | [7](#) | [8](#) | [9](#) | [10](#) | [11](#) | [12](#) | [13](#) | [14](#) | [15](#)

Course Description

PPD 542 Policy and Program Evaluation (4 units)

“Methods and models for policy and program evaluation; methods of collecting and analyzing evaluation data; processes for linking evaluation to policy formulation and program management.”

~ USC Catalogue

Program evaluation is the systematic investigation of social programs (including policies, plans, and regulations) to determine whether a particular program is achieving its objectives. By law, regulation, and custom, organizations must routinely evaluate how well their programs are working. For example, legislatures and interest groups frequently call upon evaluators to predict the consequences of proposed policies or to evaluate the outcomes of existing policies. Such knowledge promotes better decisions regarding whether programs should be continued, improved, expanded, or curtailed.

The most agile organizations can be described as "learning organizations"—continually adapting to new circumstances and information. Formal evaluation plays a pivotal role in helping organizations learn.

Knowledge of evaluation methods enables public administrators to:

- a. use evaluation findings to improve ongoing programs;
- b. select and work with evaluation consultants to design an evaluation project;
- c. write grant proposals to submit to funding organizations that require performance monitoring;
- d. critique evaluation studies cited by various organizations in a policy debate.

This course introduces students to the art and science of policy evaluation. Students will learn methods of collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and communicating information used in evaluation studies.

An explicit goal of the course is to provide students with the skills required for successful completion of the “capstone” course, *PPD 546 – Professional Practice of Public Administration*. In both courses, students work in teams to develop an evaluation proposal related to an actual public policy or program implemented by a public or nonprofit agency. In this course, PPD 542, you will create an evaluation proposal for a mock client. In the capstone course, PPD 546, you will develop a similar proposal for a real client during the first few weeks, and then you will carry out your evaluation project during the same semester.

Course Objectives

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

Knowledge Objectives:

1. Appreciate the importance of thinking through the entire design of a study before diving in.
2. Appreciate specific design principles that are common to a number of different types of research, such as the critical role of theories and hypotheses.
3. Understand the main approaches for detecting cause-and-effect relationships in scientific research, including those based on experimental and non-experimental designs.
4. Learn how to proceed from a concept to a variable designed to measure the concept in a valid and reliable fashion.
5. Understand the advantages and limitations of various types of data collection methods, including surveys, interviews, participant observation, content analysis, and secondary data.
6. Understand the differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection.
7. Be able to carry out and interpret simple descriptive and inferential analyses of evaluation data, and be able to read and understand studies using more complex techniques, including linear regression models.
8. Appreciate some of the ethical and political considerations in evaluation research, and understand how to position a study to influence policy decisions.

Practice Objectives:

1. *Analytic problem solving.* This course contributes to the competency of being able to “analyze, synthesize, think critically, and solve problems,” which is one of the universal competencies for all programs accredited by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.
2. *Teamwork and project management.* Students will need to collaborate to complete the evaluation proposal in an efficient and fair manner.
3. *Professional writing.* Students will apply and polish skills required for effective practice, including how to write an evaluation proposal.
4. *Communication.* Student teams will develop a media-rich oral presentation of the proposal in the form of a “pitch” to a mock client for the evaluation.
5. *Producing evaluation research.* Learn how to write an effective evaluation proposal and how to conduct evaluation research.
6. *Consuming evaluation research.* Learn how to comprehend and critique evaluation studies published by think tanks, government agencies, or academic journals.

Textbooks & Materials

Texts to purchase:

Fink, Arlene (2015) *Evaluation Fundamentals: Insights into Program Effectiveness, Quality, and Value*. 3rd Edition. Sage.

Bardach, Eugene, and Eric M. Patashnik (2016) *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*, 5th Edition. CQ Press.

Texts to download:

NSF [National Science Foundation] (2010) *The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation*.
<http://www.informalscience.org/sites/default/files/TheUserFriendlyGuide.pdf>

GAO [US Government Accountability Office] (2012) *Designing Evaluations*. GAO-12-208G
<http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/588146.pdf>

Articles:

Besides the textbooks, most required readings are supplied in the Google Drive [Readings Folder](#) in the General section of the Moodle course. The files are named according to the first author of the publication. To find a specific reading by a particular author, sort the files by name. Other readings are available on the internet, and are hyperlinked from the weekly schedule of readings provided in Moodle and at the end of this syllabus.

Software:

Microsoft Excel, available free here: <https://itservices.usc.edu/officestudents/>

Grading

This course uses a percent based grading schema, as shown below.

Course Components	Quantity	Weight (each)	Total Fraction of Course Grade
Discussions (drop 2 lowest of 12)	10	3%	30%
Quizzes	10	2%	20%
Data analysis labs	3	3 ⅓%	10%
Evaluation Proposal			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blogs 	5	2%	10%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial Draft (group) 	1	1%	1%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full Draft Proposal (group) 	1	1%	1%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Proposal (group) 	1	20%	20%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Pitch Video (group) 	1	4%	4%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CATME teammate assessment 	1	4%	4%
TOTAL			100%

Individual Work (70%)

Discussions (30%): In response to discussion prompts that reference assigned readings or instructional materials, students will post their response by Day 5 of the week, and will reply to two other students by Day 7. Twelve discussions are assigned in Weeks 1-3, 5-7 and 11-15. The highest ten grades will count toward the course grade; i.e. the lowest two scores will be dropped.

Quizzes (20%): Quizzes are designed to test your mastery of basic concepts introduced in the readings and lectures. Ten quizzes (one per week) are assigned in Weeks 1-10.

Data Analysis Labs (10%): During weeks 8, 9, and 10, which focus on data analysis, students will complete a data analysis “laboratory” assignment. Live sessions during these weeks will focus on the lab, and will be recorded for students unable to attend.

Blogs (10%): Blogs are a form of individual contribution to the group evaluation proposal. Blog assignments typically entail (a) archival research to locate reference material to support the evaluation proposal, and (b) individual reflections regarding how the group should proceed in crafting certain sections of the evaluation proposal (e.g., research questions, research design, data collection methods, data analysis methods). Five blogs (one per week) are assigned in Weeks 4, 6, 8, 10, 12.

Group Work (30%)

The main group project is to develop an evaluation proposal related to an actual public policy or program implemented by a public or nonprofit agency. This project requires students to apply all of the concepts learned throughout the course to the dynamic and ambiguous environment of practical program evaluation.

NOTE: Students will not actually carry out an evaluation study. Rather, the assignment entails crafting a 15-to-20 page evaluation *proposal* that details the practical and theoretical questions to be answered by the study, and the research methods that would be used to answer the stated research questions.

In Week 3, the course director will assign students to teams of approximately four students based on students’ policy interests and other considerations that students will share through a brief survey administered during Week 1. Once group assignments are announced, students are expected to work with the team through the completion of the course. There will be no reassignment of students to other teams following the initial assignment. Should issues arise regarding team dynamics, the section instructor will work with the team to address these issues.

In Week 4, teams will meet with the section instructor to propose a policy or program to focus on for the duration of the semester. Additional team meetings with the section instructor will be scheduled in Weeks 6, 10, and 14.

A **partial draft (1%)** is due Week 11, and a **full draft (1%)** is due Week 13 so that teams can receive detailed feedback from the section instructor.

Project Pitch Video (4%): In Week 14, teams will prepare a 10-minute summary of the evaluation proposal in the form of a pitch to a mock client. The presentation must be recorded using VoiceThread and PowerPoint, or another video medium with prior instructor approval. This presentation should translate the technical material to make it understandable and compelling to a non-expert political leader or public administrator.

Final Draft Evaluation Proposal (20%): In Week 15, teams will produce a professional-quality report, approximately 15–20 pages (single-spaced, including graphics), that details the proposed project.

CATME Teammate Assessment (4%): In Week 15, students will assess both their own and their teammates’ contributions to the evaluation proposal assignment. All students are required to provide thoughtful assessments via an online survey administered by www.catme.org. Grades for this assignment will be informed by your teammates’ evaluations of your contributions to group work. *(Note: The CATME assignment is only one measure of teamwork. Students who do not contribute substantially to a group assignment will be penalized, including potentially a score of zero on the assignment.)*

Numeric Ranges for Final Course Grades

Grade	Range	Grade	Range
A	≥ 93%	C+	≥ 77%, < 80%
A-	≥ 90% < 93%	C	≥ 73%, < 77%
B+	≥ 87% < 90%	C-	≥ 70%, < 73%
B	≥ 83%, < 87%	D	≥ 60%, < 70%
B-	≥ 80%, < 83%	F	< 60%

Grading Rubric for Discussions and Blogs (20 points max)				
Criteria	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Relevance, Application, Originality (6 points)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from the readings, and provides unique perspective (6)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from the readings, usually has clear focus (5)	Addresses the question but with little substance, inconsistencies, or partial incoherence (3)	Fails to address the question posed, or incoherent (0)
Insight, Observation, Analysis (6 points)	Offers significant analysis and insight with clear understanding of the question (6)	Offers some analysis or insight with clear understanding of the question (5)	Addresses concepts already highlighted; rudimentary understanding of the question (3)	No clear concept addressed, lacks clarity of ideas, or shows minimal understanding of the question (0)
Details & Evidence (4 points)	Details and evidence are effective, illuminating, and pertinent to the question (4)	Details and evidence are elaborated and pertinent to the question (3)	Details and evidence are scant or repetitious (2)	Details are absent or tangential to the question (0)
Writing Style & Mechanics (4 points)	Writing style is clear, concise, inviting, and free of mechanical errors (4)	Some stylistic problems or mechanical errors (3)	Multiple errors or patterns of errors (2)	Errors are frequent and severe (0)

Policies

Weekly Structure

Each day of the week is numbered (please see below). Day 1 is Wednesday, the first day of the beginning of each weekly session. Due dates for all assignments are stated in day numbers. Assignments are due no later than 11:55 p.m. in the Pacific Time zone on the day that is stated within the assignment page and the weekly activity table.

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7
Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday

Late Assignments

The asynchronous online framework allows considerable flexibility for completing the required work. All of the reading and many of the assignments are available at the beginning of this course for students who wish to work ahead of schedule. No assignments are accepted after their due dates without prior permission. At their discretion, faculty may grant extensions for extenuating circumstances, as defined in the USC student handbook.

Guidelines for all written work

- If you are addressing a topic that is highly contested, one way to strengthen your response is to clearly and fairly articulate both sides of the controversy. Analytical arguments that come down on one side or the other are welcome, especially if they critique the opposing perspective through theoretical or empirical arguments that reference the assigned readings, videos, lectures, or other sources.
- In addition to demonstrating your knowledge of the assigned readings, feel free to cite sources beyond the required materials. This helps you integrate your new knowledge from PPD 542 with ideas you have gleaned from your other courses or experiences.
- Please cite page numbers wherever feasible. If your citation is especially insightful, novel, or confusing, your instructors may wish to look it up.

For the Evaluation Proposal (due Week 15) and Project Pitch (due Week 14), refer to the “Evaluation Proposal – Assignment Instructions & Rubric” found in the Google Drive Assignments Folder in the General section of the Moodle course.

Instructor Announcements

The Instructor Announcements forum in the General section of the course contains an archive of all announcements regarding section-specific information or other important news as the course progresses. Whenever the instructor posts an announcement, each student on the roster receives the announcement via email.

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

Academic Conduct

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Part B, Section 11, “Behavior Violating University Standards”

<https://policy.usc.edu/scampus-part-b/>

Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on scientific misconduct, <http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct>

Support Systems

Student Counseling Services (SCS) - (213) 740-7711 – 24/7 on call

Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention. <https://engemannshc.usc.edu/counseling/>

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1-800-273-8255

Provides free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. <http://www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org>

Relationship & Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP) - (213) 740-4900 - 24/7 on call

Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm. <https://engemannshc.usc.edu/rsvp/>

Sexual Assault Resource Center

For more information about how to get help or help a survivor, rights, reporting options, and additional resources, visit the website: <http://sarc.usc.edu/>

Office of Equity and Diversity (OED)/Title IX compliance – (213) 740-5086

Works with faculty, staff, visitors, applicants, and students around issues of protected class. <https://equity.usc.edu/>

Bias Assessment Response and Support

Incidents of bias, hate crimes and microaggressions need to be reported allowing for appropriate investigation and response. <https://studentaffairs.usc.edu/bias-assessment-response-support/>

Student Support & Advocacy – (213) 821-4710

Assists students and families in resolving complex issues adversely affecting their success as a student EX: personal, financial, and academic. <https://studentaffairs.usc.edu/ssa/>

Diversity at USC

Tabs for Events, Programs and Training, Task Force (including representatives for each school), Chronology, Participate, Resources for Students. <https://diversity.usc.edu/>

Live Session Schedule

This course has eleven plenary Live Sessions, plus four small-group consultations with the section instructor to discuss the evaluation proposal assignment in weeks 4, 6, 10, and 14 (time and day to be determined).

Plenary live sessions are hosted in Zoom® on Day 01 of designated weeks from 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific Time, and will be recorded for students unable to attend. Recordings will be posted to the “Live Session Archive” in Moodle shortly after the session.

Plenary Live Sessions:

- Week 02: January 17, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 03: January 24, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 04: January 31, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 05: February 07, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 06: February 14, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 07: February 21, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 08: February 28, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 09: March 07, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 10: March 14, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 11: March 21, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific
- Week 12: March 28, Wednesday, 6:30-7:30 p.m. Pacific

Each live session may entail:

- Lectures on course material

- Guidance on statistical lab assignments
- Interactive Q&A with students and faculty

To attend live sessions:

- Open the meeting room at the URL listed below under “Zoom meeting details.”
- The Zoom app will launch automatically (or if it's not yet installed, it will guide you through installation).
- In the Zoom app, connect your audio by computer or by phone (use phone for best audio quality).
- Use headphones with a built-in microphone to eliminate echo and feedback noise.

Zoom meeting details:

- Name: PPD542 Live Sessions
- URL: <https://zoom.us/j/124877975>

About the Instructor

Bill Leach, Ph.D. is recognized internationally as an authority on collaborative approaches to policymaking and implementation. His studies of collaborative environmental management appear in the top journals in public administration, public policy, and political science. Dr. Leach has directed over \$1 million of research sponsored by the National Science Foundation, U.S. EPA, and private philanthropies, and has provided scientific and policy advice to federal and state agencies such as the U.S. Government Accountability Office, National Research Council, and the California Children & Families Commission. Prior to joining USC, he served as Research Director for the Center for Collaborative Policy at California State University, Sacramento, and Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Policy and Administration.



Weekly Activities

Week 01: Introduction to Policy and Program Evaluation		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define program evaluation and describe its roles in public administration. Identify the types of program evaluation (to be examined further throughout the course). 	~	~
Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1: “Program Evaluation: A Prelude” pp. 3-23 <i>only</i>. NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction, plus Ch. 1–2, pp. 1–14 GAO (2012) <i>Designing Evaluations</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1, pp. 1-9. Emerson, J. (2009). “But Does it Work? How best to assess program performance.” <i>Stanford Social Innovation Review</i> Winter: 29-30. 	~	~
Week 01 Discussion 01: Introductions	<i>Initial:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies:</i> Day 7	20
Week 01 Assignment 01: Interest Area Survey	Day 5	~
Week 01 Quiz 01	Day 7	10
Week 02: Program Theory, Logic Models, and Hypotheses		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the theory and logic underlying a given program. Develop a logic model for a program based on its underlying theory. Articulate the links between program theory and researchable questions, and hypotheses. Identify independent and dependent variables in causal hypotheses. 	~	~
Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1: “Program Evaluation: A Prelude” pp. 24-38 <i>only</i>. 	~	~

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ch. 3 “The Evaluation Process—Getting Started” pp. 15–30 <i>only</i>. ● GAO (2012) <i>Designing Evaluations</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Chapter 2: Defining the Evaluation’s Scope” pp. 10-17. <p><u>Evaluation Example:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chen, G. and R.N. Warburton (2006) “Do speed cameras produce net benefits? Evidence from British Columbia, Canada.” <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> 25: 661–678. <p><u>Recommended (optional):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Casey Foundation (2009) <i>Getting started: A self-directed guide to outcome map development</i>. By Gienapp, A., Reisman, J., & Stachowiak, S. ● Kellogg Foundation (2004) <i>Logic Model Development Guide: Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation, and Action</i>. ● Gervais, C., F. de Montigny, C. Lacharité, and D. Dubeau (2015) “The Father Friendly Initiative within Families: Using a logic model to develop program theory for a father support program.” <i>Evaluation and Program Planning</i> 52:133-141. ● Yin, Robert K. (1998) “The Abridged Version of Case Study Research,” Ch. 8 in Bickman, Leonard & Debra J. Rog Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods. Sage Publications. 		
Week 02 Live Session	Day 1	~
Week 02 Checkpoint: New Student Groups	~	~
Week 02 Discussion 01: Theory, Logic Models, Hypothesis	<i>Initial:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies:</i> Day 7	20
Week 02 Quiz 01	Day 7	10
Week 03: Evaluation Designs - True-, Quasi-, and Non-Experimental		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Understand the main approaches for detecting cause-and-effect relationships in scientific research, including those based on experimental and non-experimental designs. ● Define internal validity and external validity, and discuss how research design affects both. ● Discuss the practical and ethical constraints of different types of research 	~	~

designs.		
<p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 3: “Designing Program Evaluations” pp. 67-100. <p><u>Evaluation Examples (choose one):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HHS [U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services] (2010) “Head Start Impact Study, Final Report: Executive Summary.” 35 pages. Chiang, H. S., Clark, M. A. and McConnell, S. (2017) "Supplying Disadvantaged Schools with Effective Teachers: Experimental Evidence on Secondary Math Teachers from Teach For America." <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> 36(1):97-125 (skip or skim pp.110-120). Steele, Jennifer L., Richard J. Murnane, John B. Willett (2010) "Do Financial Incentives Help Low-Performing Schools Attract and Keep Academically Talented Teachers? Evidence from California" <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> 29(3): 451-478. <p><u>Recommended (optional):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GAO (2012) <i>Designing Evaluations</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Chapter 3: The Process of Selecting an Evaluation Design.” pp. 18-30. “Chapter 4: Designs for Assessing Program Implementation and Effectiveness.” pp. 31-49. Hausmann, Ricardo (2016) “The Problem With Evidence-Based Policies.” <i>Project Syndicate</i>, February 25, 2016. Berlin, Gordon L. (2016) “Using Evidence as the Driver of Policy Change: The Next Steps in Supporting Innovation, Continuous Improvement, and Accountability.” Testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, May 10, 2016. 	~	~
Week 03 Live Session	Day 1	~
Week 03 Discussion 01: True Experiments and Quasi Experiments	<i>Initial:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies:</i> Day 7	20
Week 03 Quiz 01	Day 7	10
Week 04: Scoping the Evaluation - Problem Definition and Researchable Questions		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives	~	~

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and frame researchable questions based on the political and organizational context of the evaluation, feasibility considerations, the needs of the evaluation sponsor, and interests of key stakeholders. Develop a strategy for identifying key stakeholder groups, and involving them in the evaluation process as appropriate. 		
Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2: "Evaluations Questions and Evidence of Merit" pp. 39-66. 	~	~
Week 04 Live Session	Day 1	~
Week 04 Live Session with Section Instructor	TBD	~
Week 04 Blog 01: Scope, Stakeholders, and Researchable Questions	Day 7	20
Week 04 Quiz 01	Day 7	10
Week 05: Sampling and Measurement- Validity & Reliability, Indexes & Scales		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the purpose of sampling, and the strengths and limitations of various types of sampling strategies. Compare and contrast random sampling versus random assignment. Operationalize a concept by designing valid and reliable measures. Use indexes and scales to develop measures with content validity. 	~	~
Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Ch. 4: Sampling." pp. 101-110. "Ch. 6: Evaluation Measures." pp. 147-164. <u>Evaluation Example:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leach, William D., Neil W. Pelkey, and Paul A. Sabatier (2002) "Stakeholder partnerships as collaborative policymaking: Evaluation criteria applied to watershed management in California and Washington." <i>Journal of Policy Analysis & Management</i> 21(4): 645-70. 	~	~
Week 05 Live Session	Day 1	~

Week 05 Discussion 01: Sampling and Measurement	<i>Initial: Day 5 Replies: Day 7</i>	20
Week 05 Quiz 01	Day 7	10
Week 06: Data Collection I - Surveys and Focus Groups		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the advantages and limitations of various types of data collection methods including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. Design data collection instruments, such as surveys and interview protocols, to measure variables in a valid and reliable fashion. 	~	~
Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Ch. 5: Collecting Information.” pp. 119-130 <i>only</i>. NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Section 6: Review and Comparison of Selected Techniques.” pp. 58–61, 64-65 <i>only</i>. <p><u>Surveys</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Krosnick, Jon A. & Stanley Presser (2010) “Question and Questionnaire Design” Ch. 9 in <i>Handbook of Survey Research, 2nd Edition</i>. Emerald Group Publishing. University of Wisconsin (2010) “Survey Fundamentals: A Guide to Designing and Implementing Surveys.” <p><u>Focus Groups</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asbury, Jo–Ellen (1995) “Overview of Focus Group Research,” <i>Qualitative Health Research</i> 5(4): 414-420. Cohen, Joel, (2000) “Focus Groups: A Valuable Tool for Public Policy.” California Research Bureau, CRB Note 7(1). <p><u>Evaluation Example:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schachter and Liu (2005) "Policy Development and New Immigrant Communities: A Case Study of Citizen Input in Defining Transit Problems" <i>Public Administration Review</i> 65(5): 614-623. 	~	~
Week 06 Live Session	Day 1	~
Week 06 Discussion 01: Surveys, Interviews, Focus Groups	<i>Initial: Day 5</i>	20

	Replies: Day 7	
Week 06 Live Session with Section Instructor	TBD	~
Week 06 Blog 01: Program Theory and Logic Model	Day 7	20
Week 06 Quiz 01	Day 7	10
Week 07: Data Collection II - Interviews, Content Analysis, Secondary Data		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the advantages and limitations of data collection methods such as observation, content analysis, and secondary data. 	~	~
Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. "Content Analysis" pp. 204-210. Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) <i>A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition</i>. CQ Press. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Part II: Assembling Evidence." pp. 83-112. <u>Interviews (recommended readings)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hammer, Dean and Aaron Wildavsky (1993) "The Open-Ended, Semi-Structured Interview: An (Almost) Operational Guide, Ch. 5 in Wildavsky, <i>Craftways</i>. Transaction Publishers. Leech, Beth L. (2002) "Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews," <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i> 35(4):665-668. <u>Content Analysis (recommended readings)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campbell, J. L., Quincy, C., Osserman, J., & Pedersen, O. K. (2013). "Coding in-depth semistructured interviews: Problems of unitization and intercoder reliability and agreement. <i>Sociological Methods & Research</i> 42(3):294-320. Garrison, D. R., Cleveland-Innes, M., Koole, M., & Kappelman, J. (2006) "Revisiting methodological issues in transcript analysis: Negotiated coding and reliability." <i>The Internet and Higher Education</i> 9(1):1-8. Blair, B., Heikkila, T., & Weible, C. M. (2016). "National Media Coverage of Hydraulic Fracturing in the United States: Evaluation Using Human and Automated Coding Techniques." <i>Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy</i> 7(3):114-128. 	~	~

Week 07 Live Session	Day 1	~
Week 07 Discussion 01: Content Analysis	<i>Initial: Day 5</i> <i>Replies: Day 7</i>	20
Week 07 Quiz 01	Day 7	10
Week 08: Data Analysis I - Descriptive Statistics and Data Visualization		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the differences between descriptive and inferential data analysis, and their implications for research design and data collection. Articulate and implement sound practices for data display and visualization. 	~	~
Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Ch. 8: Analyzing Evaluation Data.” pp. 187-191 <i>only</i>. Edward Tufte. (2001). <i>The Visual Display of Quantitative Information</i>, Second Edition, Graphics Press LLC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1: Graphical Excellence Chapter 2: Graphical Integrity. <p><u>Recommended (optional):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bergstrom, Carl and Jevin West (2016) "Visualization: Misleading axes on graphs." Johnson, Gail (2002) “Data Analysis for Description” in <i>Research Methods for Public Administrators</i>. Quorum Books. Patton, M. Q. (1999) “Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis.” <i>Health services research</i>, 34(5 Pt 2), 1189. Miles, Matthew B., & A. Michael Huberman (1994) <i>Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods</i>. Sage Publications. Chapter 7: Cross–Case Displays: Exploring and Describing. 	~	~
Week 08 Live Session	Day 1	~
Week 08 Assignment 01: Data Analysis Lab #1	Day 5	100
Week 08 Blog 01: Hypothesis and Research Design	Day 7	20
Week 08 Quiz 01	Day 7	10

Week 09: Data Analysis II - Comparing Means and Proportions

Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Test hypotheses by conducting and interpreting simple inferential analyses of evaluation data. ● Understand the difference between statistical significance, effect size, and policy significance. 	~	~
<p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ch. 8: “Analyzing Evaluation Data.” pp. 187-199. ● Newcomer, Kathryn E. & Dylan Conger (2010) “Using Statistics in Evaluation.” Ch. 20 in Wholey, J., Hatry, H., & Newcomer, K., Eds. <i>Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd Edition</i>. Jossey–Bass, pp. 454-492. ● Lane, David et al. <i>Online Statistics Education: An Interactive Multimedia Course of Study</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ XI. “Logic of Hypothesis Testing” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/logic_of_hypothesis_testing/logic_hypothesis.html ○ XII “Tests of Means” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/tests_of_means/testing_means.html ○ XVII “Chi-Square Contingency Tables” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/chi_square/contingency.html <p>Recommended (optional):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Schmuller. J. 2013. <i>Statistical Analysis with Excel for Dummies</i>. (e-book available through USC) https://library.usc.edu/uhtbin/cgisirsi/?ps=zkg8o1aCug/DOHENY/237720203/9 	~	~
Week 09 Live Session	Day 1	~
Week 09 Assignment 01: Data Analysis Lab #2	Day 5	100
Week 09 Quiz 01	Day 7	10
Week 10: Data Analysis III - Measuring Correlation Between Two or More Variables		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale

<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Test hypotheses by conducting and interpreting simple inferential analyses of evaluation data. ● Calculate and interpret correlation coefficients correctly, and understand their utility and limitations for causal inference. ● Read and understand studies using more complex data analysis, including linear regression models. 	~	~
<p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lane, David et al. <i>Online Statistics Education: An Interactive Multimedia Course of Study</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Describing Bivariate Data” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/describing_bivariate_data/bivariate.html ○ “Regression” http://onlinestatbook.com/2/regression/regression.html 	~	~
Week 10 Live Session with Section Instructor	TBD	~
Week 10 Assignment 01 and 02: Data Analysis Lab #3 (Two Parts)	Day 5	100
Week 10 Blog: Data Collection - Samples, Measures, Instruments	Day 7	20
Week 10 Quiz	Day 7	10
Week 11: Best Practice Reviews, Literature Reviews, Meta-analyses		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Understand evaluation as a form of applied case study research. ● Compile a set of professional “best practices” through a review of primary research (e.g. case studies) and secondary research (e.g., literature reviews), and by conducting original interviews with leading practitioners in a given field. ● Understand how a formal and systematic review of a body of literature can establish what is known in a particular field, and can identify important unanswered questions. ● Appreciate the strengths and limitations of quantitative meta-analyses. 	~	~
<p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fink, A. (2015) <i>Evaluation Fundamentals</i>. Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Ch. 5: Collecting Information.” pp. 135-140 <i>only</i>. 	~	~

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) <i>A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition</i>. CQ Press. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part IV, “Smart (Best) Practices Research.” pp. 125-140. ● Yin, Robert K. (1998) “The Abridged Version of Case Study Research,” Ch. 8 in Bickman, Leonard & Debra J. Rog Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods. Sage Publications. 		
Week 11 Live Session	Day 1	~
Week 11 Discussion 01: Evaluation as Case Study Research	<i>Initial:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies:</i> Day 7	20
Week 11 Assignment 01: Partial Draft of Evaluation Proposal	Day 7	10
Week 12: Criteria Alternative Analysis		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Construct a criteria alternatives matrix to aid public policy decisions. ● Describe the benefits and potential pitfalls of weighting each criterion to rank policy alternatives. 	~	~
Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) <i>A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving, 5th Edition</i>. CQ Press. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Introduction.” pp. Xv-xix. ○ “Part I: The Eightfold Path.” pp. 1-82. ● Munger, Michael C. (2000) <i>Analyzing Policy: Choices, Conflicts, and Practices</i>. W.W. Norton. Ch. 1 “Policy analysis as a profession and a process.” pp. 3-29. 	~	~
Week 12 Discussion 01: Criteria Alternatives Analysis	<i>Initial:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies:</i> Day 7	20
Week 12 Blog 01: Data Analysis and Design Matrix	Day 7	20
Week 13: Formative Evaluation and Outcome Monitoring		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale

<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulate the purposes and differences between exploratory evaluation, formative evaluation, summative evaluation, performance management, and implementation assessment. Describe the key steps involved in formative evaluation and outcome monitoring. 	~	~
<p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rossi, Peter H., Mark W. Lipsey, and Howard E. Freeman (2004) <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach</i>, Sage Publications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6: “Assessing and Monitoring Program Processes” pp. 169-201. AHRQ [Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality] (2013) “Formative Evaluation: Fostering Real-Time Adaptations and Refinements to Improve the Effectiveness of Patient-Centered Medical Home Interventions.” pp.1-7. <p><u>Evaluation Example:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Musso, J., et. al., (2002) “Planning Neighborhood Councils in Los Angeles: Self Determination on a Shoestring.” <p><u>Recommended (optional):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nelson, Geoffrey et al (2014) “Early implementation evaluation of a multi-site housing first intervention for homeless people with mental illness: A mixed methods approach.” <i>Evaluation and Program Planning</i> 43:16–26 	~	~
<p>Week 13 Discussion: Formative Evaluation</p>	<p><i>Initial:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies:</i> Day 7</p>	20
<p>Week 13 Assignment: Full Draft of Evaluation Proposal</p>	Day 7	10
<p>Week 14: Incorporating Evaluation in Program and Policy Change</p>		
<p>Learning Activity Due Date Scale</p>		
<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Position an evaluation study for maximal impact on planning, policy, or implementation. Communicate the goals, methods, and findings of an evaluation study to professional, lay audiences. 	~	~
<p>Readings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. 	~	~

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Section 7: A Guide to Conducting Culturally Responsive Evaluations.” p. 75–96. ● AEA [American Evaluation Association] (2004) “Guiding Principles for Evaluators.” ● Wildavsky, Aaron (1972) “The Self-Evaluating Organization.” <i>Public Administration Review</i> 32(5): 509–520. <p><u>Recommended (optional):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Patton, Michael Quinn (2017) <i>Facilitating Evaluation: Principles in Practice</i>. Sage. 		
Week 14 Live Session with Section Instructor	TBD	~
Week 14 Discussion 01: Evaluation Efficacy and Ethics	<i>Initial:</i> Day 5 <i>Replies:</i> Day 7	20
Week 14 Assignment 01: Project Pitch (VoiceThread)	Day 7	100
Week 15: Evaluation Proposals- Final Draft		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Scale
Learning Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Write an effective evaluation proposal. ● Critique published evaluation research. ● Work effectively with professional evaluation consultants. 	~	~
Week 15 Checkpoint 01: Course Evaluation	Day 7	-
Week 15 Discussion 01: Group Presentations Discussion	Day 5	20
Week 15 Discussion 02: Course Reflection	Day 5	20
Week 15 Assignment 01: Final Proposal	Day 7	100
Week 15 Assignment 02: CATME Teammate Assignment	Day 7	20