



PPD 542 Policy and Program Evaluation

Units: 4.0

Summer 2019

In-person class meetings: 9am to 4pm with a one-hour break for lunch on your own from noon to 1pm. May 30, 31 and June 1 (June 1 class ends at 3pm); July 19 and 20; July 26 and 27.

Like all USC Price courses offered in the intensive format, this course has a 100% attendance requirement for the in-person class meetings.

Location: Dauterive Hall (VPD) 112

Instructor: Jennifer M. Miller, PhD

Office: Lewis Hall (RGL) 319

Office Hours: For this summer intensive course, office hours will be held online by appointment.

Contact Info: Email is preferred at mill136@usc.edu . Expect a response within 24 hours.

Most course-related calls will be held in Blackboard Collaborate. Please schedule calls in advance to the extent possible.

Project teams are encouraged to schedule regular meetings with faculty throughout the course.

IT Help: USC ITS.

Hours of Service: 24/7

Contact Info: consult@usc.edu, 213-740-5555, blackboard@usc.edu

Please make technical support your first point of contact for any purely technical issues such as error messages or inability to access systems or resources.

Course Description

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:

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

This course will introduce you to the art and science of policy evaluation. You will learn methods of collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and communicating information used in evaluation studies.

Learning Objectives

Through successful completion of the course, students develop the ability to perform the following activities related to policy and program evaluation:

- Design a comprehensive start-to-finish program evaluation based on sound principles and practices.
 - Create logic models for policies and programs.
 - Recommend an appropriate evaluation design that responds to constraints and priorities of the evaluation setting.
 - Write an evaluation proposal.
- Collect data for use in policy and program evaluation.
- Evaluate a policy or program based on review of materials and data provided and/ or collected.
 - Analyze evaluation data using descriptive statistics and simple inferential statistics.
 - Present recommendations supported by evidence from a program evaluation.
- Identify the strengths and weaknesses of published evaluation studies, including those using randomized controlled trials, multiple regression, and case study methods.

Practice Objectives:

The course also supports the following practice objectives within the Master of Public Administration:

- 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.
- Teamwork and project management. Students will need to collaborate to complete the case study activities in an efficient and fair manner.
- Professional writing. Students will apply and polish skills required for effective practice.
- Communication. Student teams will present teaching cases to the class.
- Producing evaluation research. Learn how to write an effective evaluation proposal and how to conduct evaluation research.
- Consuming evaluation research. Learn how to comprehend and critique evaluation studies published by think tanks, government agencies, or academic journals.

Limitations

This course introduces you to a menu of evaluation methods and helps you learn to select appropriate methods based on an evaluation question and available resources. The application of a specific method,

such as multivariate analysis or survey design, in a professional capacity is likely to require graduate coursework or other additional training in that specific method. To the extent practical, students with an interest in particular methods are encouraged to incorporate them into their team projects or evaluation proposals.

While it may be possible to work ahead at some points during the course, it may not always be possible to access all course materials in advance.

Prerequisite(s): 502x Statistical Foundations for Public Management and Policy (or equivalent).

Course Notes

This course is offered in the intensive format with seven six-hour in-person class meetings. One contact hour of course material will be provided through asynchronous lecture weekly during the weeks when the course does not meet in person. The course is organized into weeks starting on Wednesdays.

For each contact hour you should expect to spend at least two hours outside of class reading, completing assignments or otherwise preparing for class. Estimated weekly time commitments are listed on the detailed course schedule.

Technological Proficiency and Hardware/Software Required

Students are expected to have a working knowledge of office software including word processing, presentation software, and spreadsheets (e.g., Microsoft Office). Students should be comfortable performing activities such as saving files, formatting text, inserting page breaks, and adjusting column widths, consulting resources like the MS Office help documentation or Lynda.com tutorials as needed. Course instruction will be provided on Excel features for performing calculations and analyses. An optional Excel preparation assignment for beginners is provided and may be completed for class participation credit.

Students will need to install MS Excel with the Data Analysis Toolpak (MS Office, including Excel, available here <https://itservices.usc.edu/officestudents/>). Instructions for installing the Toolpak are here <https://support.office.com/en-us/article/Load-the-Analysis-ToolPak-in-Excel-6a63e598-cd6d-42e3-9317-6b40ba1a66b4>). On MacOS, the Data Analysis Toolpak requires Excel 2016 or later.

Students will need access to laptop computers to complete in-class labs. The university has loaner laptops available <https://itservices.usc.edu/spaces/laptoploaner/>.

Required Readings and Supplementary Materials

Text to purchase (Available through the USC Bookstore; Used and online versions are acceptable.):

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 (This text is often used in multiple courses in public policy and administration. I recommend you purchase this text rather than rent. Earlier editions are acceptable.)

Texts to download:

Frechtling, J. A., Mark, M. M., & National Science Foundation (NSF) (U.S.). (2010). *The 2010 user-friendly handbook of project evaluation*. Arlington, VA: NSF, Directorate for Education and Human Resources, Division of Research and Learning in Formal and Informal Settings.

Download available from

<http://www.informalscience.org/sites/default/files/TheUserFriendlyGuide.pdf>

Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2012). *Designing evaluations*. (GAO-12-208G). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/588146.pdf>

Optional purchase:

Trochim, W., Arora, K., & Donnelly, J. (2016). *Research methods: The essential knowledge base* (2nd ed.): CENGAGE Learning.

Many readings will be assigned from this text. The text is available to students at no charge as an e-book from the USC Libraries website. However, some students may prefer hardcopy, in which case a used copy of this text would be suitable.

You may choose to purchase any of the following optional resources about teaching case studies to help with your team project.

Brent Beal, Karen MacMillan, Meredith Woodwark, Karin Schnarr (2016). *The case project guide: How to write a great business case as a class project*, Ivey Publishing, Canada. (approximately \$11.25) <https://www.iveycases.com/ProductView.aspx?id=79115>

The Case Centre (2018). *Learning with cases: An interactive study guide*. The Case Centre. (approximately \$6.50) www.thecasecentre.org/LWCinteractiveguide.

Robert D. Austin and Robert L. Kelley (2014). *Case analysis coach*. Harvard Business Publishing (approximately \$9.00) <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/product/4380-STM-ENG>

Additional readings will be available through Blackboard, the USC Libraries website, and Online Course Reserves [ARES].

Description and Assessment of Assignments

Participation

The instructor will assign a participation grade based on observation of in-class and online engagement. Participation grades are assigned taking into account how your level of engagement contributed to the class experience for others and to your own success in demonstrating mastery of the course material.

Online Discussion using hypothes.is Annotations

We will use hypothes.is software for ongoing class discussion during the weeks the class does not meet in person. You are encouraged to post comments and questions for your peers and/or faculty on one or more target readings for each week. There is no specific requirement for a number of annotations to post and annotations will not be graded. Quality and quantity of annotations will be observed as they are for in-person class discussions. The hypothes.is annotations will allow the class to maintain an ongoing conversation about the course material during the weeks we do not meet in person.

Interactive Presentations

During the weeks we do not meet in person, approximately one hour of material will be delivered through asynchronous interactive presentations. These modules include ungraded comprehension questions. Engagement with these presentations is also observed as part of your participation grade.

Quizzes

During the weeks we do not meet in person, you will have an online self-grading quiz in Blackboard. Grades will be based on points earned for each question answered correctly. You are allowed unlimited attempts to complete the quiz. The quizzes are untimed and open book. The lowest quiz grade will be dropped.

Assignments

Assignments will be graded based on points earned for each part of the assignment. Submissions will typically consist of a spreadsheet containing data and calculations and responses to written prompts. Most assignments will involve a data analysis completed in class and a write-up completed outside of class. The final assignment will require preparation outside of class and include an informal team presentation component during the final class meeting. Students may work together on assignments, but this collaboration should not take the form of “divide and conquer” and each student is responsible for completing and submitting the full assignment. The lowest assignment grade will be dropped.

Team Case Project

In teams of approximately five, you will develop a publication-quality teaching case manuscript that poses a program evaluation decision problem to a specific protagonist, present your case to the class, work a case presented by your classmates, and refine your manuscript based on experience and feedback. Your case must feature real events, although names may be changed.

Case manuscripts must be based on real situations and should follow the format and policies of the Society for Case Research (SCR): http://www.sfcr.org/docs/SCR_Manuscript_Guidelines_for_Authors.pdf The case narrative should be 3,500 to 5,000 words and be accompanied by a teaching note of approximately equal length (total 7,000 – 10,000 words, not including references and supplementary materials). Teams will be encouraged to submit their manuscripts to the *Journal of Case Studies* for publication or conference presentation.

Each team must designate members to take on the following two roles within the team:

Research Ethics Representative: At least one member of the team must complete the CITI Human Subjects Research Certification (social-behavioral), available from USC’s Office for the Protection of Research Subjects here <https://oprs.usc.edu/training/citi/> This team member develops additional expertise to advise your team on how to conduct research for an ethical and publishable teaching case study. Of course, we are all accountable for conducting research within the bounds of legal requirements and university policy. Further, the ethical principles of respect for persons (including informed consent), beneficence, and justice apply even when not subject to institutional review.

This role may be filled by a team member who already holds the appropriate CITI certification, which remains current for 3 years. If no team member is currently certified, this role may be a good fit for a student who hopes to work as a Research Assistant or pursue a doctoral degree.

Feedback Ambassador: Consolidate feedback from team members on the case that you work as students and share this feedback with the team that authored the case during an approximately 30 minute “workshop” during the last day of class.

Teams will use CATME templates and software to develop a team charter and to evaluate individual contributions to team case activities.

Seven (7) graded parts of this project fit together to guide your team through the project. All team members will receive the same grade for parts 1-6.

1. **Team charter (5 % of project grade):** Complete the team charter template provided, representing your team's agreement for working together. Charter should include your team's designations of Research Ethics Representative and Feedback Ambassador. Full credit will be awarded for charters submitted on time.

2. **Topic proposal and logic model (5 % of project grade):** Select a program to evaluate. Create a logic model for your program or, if a logic model already exists for the program, provide a 250-300 word summary of the logic model. Include a name and job title for at least one specific protagonist who could be asked to make a decision based on an evaluation of the program. The identification of an appropriate protagonist and decision is essential to a successful case. Feel free to propose more than one option at this stage. Full credit will be awarded for proposals submitted on time.

3. **Data collection plan (15 % of project grade):** In 300-500 words, describe the data collection efforts your team will undertake to research the case, making sure to include both qualitative and quantitative evidence of program effectiveness. A premium will be placed on variety and richness of evidence. The plan should be focused on identifying evidence relevant to a specific decision faced by the protagonist of your case. Your data collection plan must be consistent with the ethics of human subjects research for a published teaching case study. This assignment submission must be accompanied by the CITI certification for your team's research ethics representative.

4. **Draft manuscript (25% of project grade):** Prepare the manuscript that will be provided to the team of classmates who will work your case. The manuscript should also include a draft of your teaching note, which outlines a plan for how students should be led through the case. The case itself should be 3,500-5,000 words and the teaching note should also be 3,500-5,000 words for a total length of 7,000-10,000 words, not counting supplementary materials or references. The manuscript must be prepared according to the SCR Manuscript Guidelines for Authors, including citation of all quoted or paraphrased material.

The draft manuscript will be graded on the following criteria according to the rubric provided:

Writing quality	20%
Evaluation question	20%
Logic and theory of program	20%
Variety of evidence	20%
Relevance to learning objective(s)	20%

5. **Presentation (10% of project grade)** A 20-minute presentation in which you introduce the case to the classmates who will work your case. It will be followed by 20 minutes of Q&A. Your team is free to divide responsibility for presentation development and delivery for optimal results. The recommended length of your presentation is 10-15 slides.

6. **Final manuscript (40% of project grade)** Incorporate feedback from faculty and classmates as well as your own experience presenting the case. The case itself should be 3,500-5,000 words and the teaching note should also be 3,500-5,000 words for a total manuscript length of 7,000-10,000 words, not counting supplementary materials or references.

Like the draft, the final manuscript will be graded on the following criteria:

Writing quality (including feedback)	20%
Evaluation question	20%
Logic and theory of program	20%
Variety of evidence	20%
Relevance to learning objective(s)	20%

7. CATME Surveys and observation (project grade multiplier). You will be asked to complete two CATME BARS (behaviorally-anchored rating scale) surveys evaluating your own and your teammates' contributions. Your individual grade for the team project will be multiplied by a weighting factor based on 1) survey responses 2) faculty observation of teamwork and 3) your timely submission of CATME BARS surveys. The multiplier may increase or decrease your project grade. The multiplier is not competitive. In teams where everyone contributes equally to excellent work, no one's project grade will be reduced by the multiplier.

Evaluation Proposal

The evaluation proposal is an individual assignment but should relate to the subject matter of your team's project. You will select a published evaluation and rewrite it in the form of a 1,000 –1,500 word proposal based on publicly available information.

Select and read a published evaluation. This evaluation should relate to the subject area of your team case project. By selecting a case in that subject area, it helps build knowledge within your team about how that type of evaluation is conducted. The evaluation on which you base your proposal can be in the form of a research report (gray literature, such as from a think tank or consultancy) or a peer-reviewed journal article. For best results, base your proposal on a document that has evaluation as its sole or primary purpose and includes a thoroughly documented methods section. You are encouraged to consult with the instructor to confirm you have chosen a suitable document on which to base your proposal.

Consult the evaluation proposal process documents, especially the CDC State Asthma Program Appendix F. Individual Evaluation Plan Outline, to understand the general expectations of an evaluation proposal.

Include the following 4 sections in your evaluation proposal: Executive Summary, Rationale, Data Collection, Data Analysis. You may choose to include subheadings or other headings. Although the Executive Summary will appear at the beginning of the proposal, it should be the last section you write. Consult the rubric, included on the syllabus, to understand the criteria on which each section will be graded.

Write your evaluation proposal through a process like "reverse engineering." That is, you will mentally go back in time to before this evaluation was conducted and write a proposal to carry out the evaluation described in the publication. Example: If they report that they conducted a randomized controlled trial with 50 participants, you will propose to conduct a randomized controlled trial with 50 participants. Your proposal should not include any information about the results of the evaluation.

Prepare the executive summary after writing the rest of the proposal. Summarize the key points from the other parts of the proposal. An executive summary is not an introduction and should not introduce any information not found elsewhere in the proposal. The idea behind an executive summary is that it should be able to take the place of the document if the executive is very pressed for time. An executive summary is typically about 10% of the length of the document.

Manage expectations. It might be more accurate to describe this assignment as a draft or outline of an evaluation proposal rather than a true proposal. You are not expected to carry out any data collection or analysis. Research and sources cited probably do not need to go beyond the published evaluation and the organization's website. You are required to cite the evaluation on which you base your proposal and any other sources used.

Submit your completed proposal through the turnitin item on Blackboard

Grading Breakdown

Assignment	% of Grade
Quizzes (9, drop lowest 2)	10
Assignments (5)	20
Evaluation proposal	10
Team case project	50
Participation (online and in person)	10
TOTAL	

All assignments will be graded out of 100 points.

Grading Scale

Course final grades will be determined using the following scale. Grades will be rounded up or down based on calculations in Blackboard.

A	93-100
A-	90-92
B+	87-89
B	83-86
B-	80-82
C+	77-79
C	73-76
C-	70-72
D+	67-69
D	63-66
D-	60-62
F	59 and below

A spreadsheet is available on Blackboard under Syllabus to assist you in estimating your course grade.

Assignment Rubrics

Grading Criteria for Data Collection Plan	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Relevance to Protagonist's Decision (25 points)	Data collection plan is centered around a specific decision faced by a protagonist who made use of evaluation evidence. Choice of protagonist and/or decision is	Data collection plan is centered around a specific decision faced by a protagonist who will make use of evaluation evidence. (23)	Data collection plan references a specific protagonist and decision. (20)	Data collection plan does not identify a specific protagonist and decision. (20)

Grading Criteria for Data Collection Plan	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
	especially novel or engaging. (25)			
Variety of evidence (25 points)	Includes plans to collect specific quantitative and qualitative evidence used in program evaluation. Plan identifies types of evidence that will be especially rich, varied, and/or engaging for students. (25)	Includes plans to collect specific quantitative and qualitative evidence used in program evaluation. (23)	Omits quantitative or qualitative evidence or does not focus on evidence relevant to program evaluation. (20)	Does not include specific plans to collect evidence relevant to program evaluation. (0)
Human Subjects Research Compliance (50 points)	N/A	Plan relies on published sources OR plan documents intent to engage in human subjects research and for IRB review. Research Ethics Representative provides evidence of certification. (50)	Plan relies on published sources. Research ethics certification not provided. (30)	Plan proposes human subjects research that would not comply with USC policy or principles of research ethics. (0)

Grading Criteria for Evaluation Proposal	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Executive Summary (15 points)	Briefly summarizes all essential elements of the rationale and methods of the target study with an appropriate level of detail for executive decision making. (15)	Briefly summarizes most important elements of the rationale and methods of the target study with a level of detail adequate for executive decision making. (10)	Summarizes the target study, but leaves out some elements essential for executive decision making. (5)	Missing or significantly inaccurate. (0)

Grading Criteria for Evaluation Proposal	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Rationale (15 points)	Identifies theoretically grounded evaluation questions and approach and provides reasonable justification for the target study. (15)	Identifies evaluation questions and approach and provides justification for the target study. (10)	Evaluation questions and/ or justification for the target study are incompletely described or contain some inaccuracies. (5)	Does not identify a rationale for the target study. (0)
Data Collection (15 points)	Accurately describes and appropriately advocates for data collection methods used in the target study. (15)	Accurately describes data collection methods used in the target study. (10)	Description of data collection methods contains some inaccuracies. (5)	Description of data collection methods is missing or substantially incorrect. (0)
Data Analysis (15 points)	Accurately describes and appropriately advocates for data analysis methods used in the target study. (15)	Accurately describes data analysis methods used in the target study. (10)	Description of data analysis methods contains some inaccuracies. (5)	Description of data analysis methods is missing or substantially incorrect. (0)
Proposal (20 points)	Presents the target study to an appropriate client in the form of an evaluation proposal. Demonstrates an understanding of stakeholder interests and purpose of the proposal. (20)	Presents the target study to in the form of a proposal. Demonstrates some awareness of stakeholder interests and purpose of the proposal. (15)	Summarizes the target study without reflecting context of stakeholder interests or purpose and structure of an evaluation proposal. (10)	Does not summarize the target study. (0)
Writing Quality (20 points)	Writing style is clear, concise, inviting, and free of mechanical errors. (20)	Some stylistic problems or mechanical errors (15)	Multiple errors or patterns of errors (10)	Errors are frequent and severe (0)

Grading Criteria for Draft and Final Case Manuscripts	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Writing quality (20 points)	Writing style is clear, concise, inviting, and free of mechanical errors. Manuscript format follows SCR guidelines. (20)	Writing style is generally clear, concise, and inviting. Manuscript format approximates SCR guidelines. (15)	Writing style lacks clarity and appeal. Manuscript format deviates from SCR guidelines. (10)	Writing style detracts substantially from the case. Manuscript does not follow SCR guidelines. (0)
For final manuscript only, a score above Unsatisfactory in the writing quality category requires 1) incorporating feedback on the draft manuscript and 2) completion of the Feedback Ambassador process.				
Evaluation question (20 points)	Case is centered around a program evaluation question facing a specific protagonist. Supporting evaluation questions grounded in theory enhance the case. (20)	Case highlights a program evaluation question. (15)	A program evaluation question is not central to the case. (10)	Case does not contain a program evaluation question. (0)
Logic & theory (20 points)	Teaching note outlines a response to the case grounded in theory and the program's logic model. Sufficient detail is included in the student case to apply a theory-driven approach to case analysis. (20)	Teaching note describes the program's logic model and relevant theory. Sufficient detail is included in the student case to enable a case analysis informed by theory. (15)	Teaching note and student case contain mostly facts with little theoretical grounding or structure. (10)	Teaching note and case do not include logic model or ground the evaluation question in theory. (0)

Grading Criteria for Draft and Final Case Manuscripts	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Variety of Evidence (20 points)	The case presents a variety of evidence to inform the case analysis, including both qualitative and quantitative evidence. Case includes some creative or innovative types supporting material. (20)	The case presents a variety of evidence to inform the case analysis, including both qualitative and quantitative evidence. (15)	Case relies on limited evidence. (10)	Case does not include evidence or includes evidence that detracts from the case with errors or poor quality. (0)
Relevance to Learning Outcomes (20 points)	Case provides a concrete opportunity to practice a specific skill that contributes to mastery of one or more of the course learning outcomes. (20)	Case makes an identifiable connection to a specific course learning outcome. (15)	Case relates to course learning outcomes in a general sense. (10)	Case is unrelated to the course's stated learning outcomes. (0)

Grading Criteria for Case Presentation	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Engaging Introduction (20 points)	Captures the attention of the class and communicates the educational value of the case. (20)	Accurately conveys the topic of the case. (15)	Conveys the topic of the case, with only minimal inaccuracy or confusion. (10)	Missing or significantly inaccurate. (0)

Grading Criteria for Case Presentation	Superior	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Unsatisfactory
Relevant Content (20 points)	Presentation content includes complete information relevant to the facts of the case, the decision problem facing the protagonist, and learning outcomes. (20)	Presentation content includes substantial information relevant to the facts of the case, the decision problem facing the protagonist, and learning outcomes. (15)	Presentation content includes information relevant to the facts of the case, the decision problem facing the protagonist, and learning outcomes, with some omissions or confusion. (10)	Presentation content omits significant information relevant to the facts of the case, the decision problem facing the protagonist, and/ or the learning outcomes (0)
Visual Appeal (20 points)	Materials used to present the case are clear and visually appealing. (20)	Materials used to present the case are clear. (15)	Materials used to present the case are generally clear, with some minor points of confusion. (10)	Materials used to present the case are substantially unclear. (0)
Presentation Delivery (20 points)	Presentation delivery was clear and exceptionally engaging (eye contact, minimal notes, tone of voice), projected credibility, adhered to time limits. (15)	Presentation delivery was clear, projected credibility, adhered to time limits.	Presentation delivery was generally clear and projected credibility, with some minor points of confusion. Adhered to time limits.	Presentation delivery was significantly unclear or did not project credibility. Deviated from time limits.
Questions and Answers (20 points)	Effectively engaged the class during question and answer period. Generated discussion and was well-prepared for relevant questions. (20)	Responded to questions posed during question and answer period. (15)	Responded to questions posed during question and answer period with some minor gaps or confusion. (10)	Question and answer period showed a lack of preparation or engagement. (0)

Assignment Submission Policy

Assignments will be submitted on Blackboard according to the instructions in each assignment description. Except for the final case submission, late assignments will be accepted with a 10 percentage point per day late penalty. Assignment deadlines are (generally) 6pm on a weekday to facilitate your access to adequate technical support if needed. The final case project submission must be submitted on time per USC's final exam policy.

Grading Timeline

Final course grades will be posted within four business days of the last day of the summer session. Every effort will be made to grade assignments within one week if they are submitted by the assignment deadline.

Additional Policies

Attendance is **required** at all in-person class meetings. This is a university policy that applies to all courses offered in the intensive format.

As graduate and professional students you are expected to exercise good judgment about use of technology in the classroom, including its potential to detract from your learning experience and that of other students. Refrain from using a laptop or other device during student or guest speaker presentations unless you have received permission from the instructor.

Course Schedule: A Weekly Breakdown

	Topics/Daily Activities	Readings and Homework	Deliverable/ Due Dates
Week 1 May 15-21 Approx. 21 hours	Introduction to program theory and evaluation	<p>Introduction to Program Evaluation</p> <p>Fink, A. (2005). Program evaluation: A prelude. <i>Evaluation fundamentals: Insights into program effectiveness, quality, and value</i> (3rd ed., pp. 3-38). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.</p> <p>Spiel, C., Schober, B., & Bergsmann, E. (2015). Program evaluation. In J.D. Wright (Ed.), <i>International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences</i> (pp. 117–122). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier, Ltd.</p> <p>** American Evaluation Association (AEA) (2018). Guiding principles for evaluators. https://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51</p> <p>Public Domain Handbooks for Program Evaluation</p> <p>* NSF (2010). Introduction, Reasons for evaluation, Evaluation prototypes, <i>The 2010 user-friendly handbook of project evaluation</i>, pp. 1–14. Arlington, VA: NSF.</p> <p>* GAO (2012) The importance of evaluation design, <i>Designing Evaluations</i> (GAO-12-208G) (pp. 1-8). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.</p> <p>Program Evaluation Example</p> <p>** Riccio, J., Dechausay, N., Greenberg, D., Miller, C., Nunez, S., Rucks, Z., & Verma, N. (2010) Executive summary. <i>Towards reduced poverty across generations: Early findings from New York City's conditional cash transfer program</i>. New York: MDRC. pp. 1-30.</p> <p>* Available for annotation in Hypothesis</p> <p>** Weekly target reading for annotation in Hypothesis</p>	<p>Project topic interest survey due Friday, May 17, 6pm.</p> <p>Program evaluation quiz 1 due Tuesday, May 21, 6pm.</p> <p>Optional Excel preparation for beginners. Recommend completion before first in-person meetings.</p>
Week 2 May 22-28	Program theory and		Measurement and descriptive statistics

Approx. 21 hours	evaluation, cont'd: Public policy analysis, logic models, evaluation questions and hypotheses, measurement, descriptive statistics; Teaching cases.	<p>Public Policy Analysis</p> <p>Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) Introduction; Appendix B: things governments do, <i>A practical guide for policy analysis. The eightfold path to more effective problem solving</i>. (5th ed., pp. xv-xx, 155-164). CQ Press.</p> <p>Logic Models</p> <p>* W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2004) Introduction to logic models, Creating a basic logic model for your program, <i>Logic model development guide: Using logic models to bring together planning, evaluation, and action.</i>, pp. 1-25, https://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide</p> <p>Evaluation Questions</p> <p>Fink, A. (2005). Evaluation questions and evidence of merit. <i>Evaluation fundamentals: Insights into program effectiveness, quality, and value</i> (3rd ed., pp. 39-66). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.</p> <p>Hypotheses, Measurement, and Descriptive Statistics</p> <p>Trochim, W., Arora, K., & Donnelly, J. (2016). Hypotheses (1.3e), Variables (1.3f), Introduction to measurement (Part 3, Chapter 5), Indexes (Section 6.4), Descriptive statistics (Section 11.4), <i>Research methods: The essential knowledge base</i> (2nd ed., n.p.): CENGAGE Learning.</p> <p>Lane, David et al. Summarizing distributions (Sections 1-9, 12-14), Describing bivariate data (Sections 1-6), <i>Online statistics education: An interactive multimedia course of study</i> http://onlinestatbook.com/2/index.html</p> <p>Farley, R. (2011). Racial identities in 2000. <i>The Inequality Reader: Contemporary and Foundational Readings in Race, Class, and Gender</i>, (2nd ed., pp. 228-236).</p> <p>Teaching Cases</p> <p>Society for Case Research Guidelines for Authors http://www.socr.org/docs/SCR_Manuscript_Guidelines_for_Authors.pdf</p>	quiz 2 due Tuesday, May 28, 6pm.
------------------	---	---	----------------------------------

		** Lutz, R., J. Li, M. Mabie, & S. Southivilay Opportunity NYC: Conditional cash transfer program (under review at the <i>Journal of Case Studies</i>), pp. 1-33.	
Week 3 17 contact hours		Recommended: Breakfast, lunch, or dinner meetings with your teams	
In-class Day 1 Thursday, May 30	Overview, program evaluation, logic models, evaluation questions.		
Friday, May 31	Measurement, hypotheses, descriptive statistics	In-class measurement lab: Race, ethnicity, and residential segregation	
Saturday, June 1	Descriptive statistics application, teaching case studies.	In-class descriptive statistics lab: Michigan Medicaid	
Tuesday, June 4			Team charter, Assignment 1 Measurement lab write-up, and Assignment 2 Descriptive statistics lab writeup due 6pm Tuesday, June 4.
Week 4 June 5-11 Approx. 7-10 hours	Best practice reviews, literature	Best Practice Reviews	Project proposal and logic model, due 6pm Tuesday, June 11.

	reviews, and meta-analysis.	<p>Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) Smart (best) practices research, <i>A practical guide for policy analysis. The eightfold path to more effective problem solving</i>. (5th ed., pp. 125-140). CQ Press.</p> <p>Literature Reviews and Meta-Analysis</p> <p>Denney, A. S., & Tewksbury, R. (2013). How to write a literature review. <i>Journal of Criminal Justice Education</i>, 24(2), 218-234.</p> <p>Trochim, W., Arora, K., & Donnelly, J. (2016). Research syntheses and guidelines (Section 1.1c), <i>Research methods: The essential knowledge base</i> (2nd ed., n.p.): CENGAGE Learning.</p> <p>Examples of Meta-analyses (read one, skim the other)</p> <p>** McEwan, P.J. (2015). Improving learning in primary schools of developing countries: A meta-analysis of randomized experiments. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> 85(3), 353-394.</p> <p>** Whiting, P.F., R.F. Wolff, S. Deshpande, M. Di Nisio, S. Duffy, A.V. Hernandez, J.C. Keurentjes et al. (2015). Cannabinoids for medical use: A systematic review and meta-analysis." <i>JAMA</i> 313(24), 2456-2473.</p>	Literature review, meta-analysis, and use of sources quiz 3 due 6pm Tuesday, June 11.
Week 5 June 12-18 Approx. 7-10 hours	Evaluation design	<p>* NSF (2010) Develop an evaluation design, <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. pp. 30-37.</p> <p>* GAO (2012) Defining the evaluation's scope, The process of selecting an evaluation design, Designs for assessing program implementation and effectiveness, <i>Designing Evaluations</i>. (pp. 10-49). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.</p> <p>Trochim, W., Arora, K., & Donnelly, J. (2016). Introduction to design (Part 4, Chapter 8), Foundations of experimental design, Introduction: the origins of experimental design (Sections 9.1 and 9.2), <i>Research methods: The essential knowledge base</i> (2nd ed., n.p.): CENGAGE Learning.</p> <p>Higgins, Julian PT, Douglas G. Altman, Peter C. Gøtzsche, Peter Jüni, David Moher, Andrew D. Oxman, Jelena Savović, Kenneth F. Schulz, Laura Weeks, and Jonathan AC Sterne. "The</p>	<p>Evaluation design quiz 4 due 6pm Tuesday, June 18.</p> <p>Data collection plan due 6pm Tuesday, June 18.</p>

		<p>Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials." <i>BMJ</i> 343 (2011): d5928.</p> <p>** Continue discussion of McEwan and Whiting et al. meta-analyses from week 4.</p>	
<p>Week 6 June 19-26 Approx. 7-10 hours</p>	<p>Data collection Part 1, surveys and focus groups</p>	<p>Survey Research</p> <p>Trochim, W., Arora, K., & Donnelly, J. (2016). Sampling (Part 2, Chapter 4), Survey research (Part 3, Chapter 7, Sections 7.1-7.4), <i>Research methods: The essential knowledge base</i> (2nd ed., n.p.): CENGAGE Learning.</p> <p>University of Wisconsin (2010) Survey fundamentals: A guide to designing and implementing surveys, pp. 1-20.</p> <p>Dillman, D., Smyth, J., & Christian, L. (2014). Chapter 1 Sample surveys in our electronic world and Chapter 12 Responding to societal change and preparing for what lies ahead. <i>Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: the tailored design method</i> (Fourth edition.). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley.</p> <p>Focus Groups Asbury, J. (1995) Overview of focus group research," <i>Qualitative Health Research</i> 5(4), 414-420.</p> <p>Cultural Competence * NSF (2010) <i>The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i>. "Section 7: A Guide to Conducting Culturally Responsive Evaluations." p. 75–96.</p> <p>Evaluation Example (Surveys and Focus Groups): ** 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.</p>	<p>Surveys and focus groups quiz 5 due 6pm Tuesday, June 26.</p> <p>Mid-semester CATME Survey due 11:59 PM Tuesday, June 26.</p>
<p>Week 7 June 27 – July 2 Approx. 7-10 hours</p>	<p>Data collection, Part 2. Case studies, narrative,</p>	<p>Case Study Research</p> <p>Yin, R.K. (1998) The abridged version of case study research, Ch. 8 in L. Bickman & D.J. Rog (Eds.) <i>Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods</i>. (pp. 229-259). Sage Publications.</p>	<p>Case study research and social media quiz 6 due 6pm Tuesday, July 2.</p>

	interviews, social media	<p>Trochim, W., Arora, K., & Donnelly, J. (2016). Interviews (Section 7.5), <i>Research methods: The essential knowledge base</i> (2nd ed., n.p.): CENGAGE Learning.</p> <p>The California Endowment. Storytelling approaches to program evaluation: An introduction.</p> <p>** Mustard, C. A., Skivington, K., Lay, M., Lifshen, M., Etches, J., & Chambers, A. (2017). Implementation of a disability management policy in a large healthcare employer: a quasi-experimental, mixed-methods evaluation. <i>BMJ open</i>, 7(6), e014734 https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/7/6/e014734</p> <p>Social Media in Evaluation</p> <p>Neiger, B. L., Thackeray, R., Van Wagenen, S. A., Hanson, C. L., West, J. H., Barnes, M. D., & Fagen, M. C. (2012). Use of social media in health promotion: purposes, key performance indicators, and evaluation metrics. <i>Health promotion practice</i>, 13(2), 159-164.</p> <p>** Emery, S.L., G. Szczypka, E. P. Abril, Y. Kim, and L. Vera. (2014). Are you scared yet? Evaluating fear appeal messages in tweets about the tips campaign. <i>Journal of Communication</i> 64(2), 278-295.</p>	
Week 8 July 3-9 Approximately 7-10 hours	Program management and formative evaluation; The evaluation proposal business process	<p>Program Management and Formative Evaluation</p> <p>Rossi, P.H., M.W. Lipsey, and H. E. Freeman. (2004). Assessing and monitoring program processes, <i>Evaluation: A systematic approach</i>, (6th ed., pp. 169-201). Sage Publications..</p> <p>** Weiss, J. (2018). <i>A framework for improving federal program management</i>. IBM Center for the Business of Government, 1-48.</p> <p>The Evaluation Proposal Business Process</p> <p><u>Guide to Preparing Better Evaluation RFPs</u></p> <p>Public Profit, (n.d.) Public profit evaluation RFP guide, pp. 1-7.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Evaluation Proposal Process Documents (skim)</p> <p><u>Examples of Evaluation RFPs</u></p> <p>* Appalachian Regional Commission (2012) Request for proposals: program evaluation of the Appalachian Regional Commission's health projects, pp. 1-8.</p>	<p>Program management, formative evaluation, and evaluation proposal business process quiz 7 due 6pm Tuesday, July 9.</p> <p>Optional but recommended: Select the published evaluation you will use for Evaluation Proposal assignment and review with faculty.</p>

		<p>* Awo Taan Healing Lodge Society (2017) Program evaluation: emergency women's shelter pp. 1-2.</p> <p>* LightHouse for the Blind San Francisco (2018) LightHouse program evaluation, pp. 1-2.</p> <p>* National Endowment for Financial Education (2016). High school financial planning program program evaluation request for proposals pp. 1-5.</p> <p>* San Francisco Public Schools Request for proposal (RFP) for Student Support Services Department: program evaluation, pp. 1-18.</p> <p><u>Evaluation Proposal Template</u></p> <p>CDC asthma program evaluation guide</p> <p><u>Evaluation Proposal Examples</u></p> <p>ADB (2011) Impact evaluation study proposal for RDTA 7680: implementing impact evaluation at ADB, pp. 1-6.</p> <p>Partnership for Child Development, An impact evaluation of the Uganda Multi-Sectoral Food Security and Nutrition Project (UMFSNP)", pp. 1-20.</p>	
<p>Week 9 July 10 -16 Approx. 7-10 hours</p>	<p>Policy analysis, data analysis, inferential statistics for program evaluation</p>	<p>Policy Analysis</p> <p>Bardach, E. and E. Patashnik (2015) <i>The eightfold path, A practical guide for policy analysis. The eightfold path to more effective problem solving.</i> (5th ed., pp. 1-82). CQ Press.</p> <p>Example: Criteria-Alternatives Matrix</p> <p>** Hurley, W.J. and Andrews, W.S. (2003). Option analysis: Using the method of even swaps, <i>Canadian Military Journal</i>, 43-46. http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo4/no3/operatio-eng.asp</p> <p>Data Analysis</p> <p>Newcomer, K.E. & D. Conger (2010) Using statistics in evaluation. Ch. 20 in Wholey, J., Hatry, H., & Newcomer, K., Eds. <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i>, (3rd ed., pp. 454-492), Jossey-Bass.</p> <p>Inferential Statistics for Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Evaluation Proposal due 6pm Tuesday, July 16.</p> <p>Inferential statistics quiz 8 due 6pm Tuesday, July 16.</p>

		<p>Lane, D., et al. Logic of hypothesis testing (Sections 1-12), Tests of means (Sections 1-4), Regression (Sections 1-11), <i>Online Statistics Education: An Interactive Multimedia Course of Study</i> http://onlinestatbook.com/2/index.html</p> <p>** Long, A. (n.d) 10 Things to Know About Reading a Regression Table, Evidence in governance and politics, http://egap.org/methods-guides/10-things-know-about-reading-regression-table</p> <p>Example (Regression and program evaluation)</p> <p>** Asunka, J., Brierley, S., Golden, M., Kramon, E., & Oforu, G. (2014). Protecting the polls: the effect of observers on election fraud. <i>Unpublished manuscript, Dept of Polit Sci, Univ of California Los Angeles.</i></p> <p>Optional: This reading is for those with an interest in the application of advanced quantitative methods to program evaluation. It assumes statistics background beyond the level of this course:</p> <p>Abadie, A., & Cattaneo, M. D. (2018). Econometric methods for program evaluation. <i>Annual Review of Economics</i>, 10(1), 465–503.</p>	
Week 10 July 17-23 12 contact hours			Draft case manuscript due 6pm Wednesday, July 17.
		Recommended: Schedule a presentation rehearsal over breakfast, lunch, or dinner on Saturday.	
In-class Day 4 July 20	Policy analysis, regression analysis for policy evaluation	In-class regression analysis lab	
In-class Day 5 July 21	Case presentations		Case presentations

Tuesday, July 23			Assignment 3 Regression analysis assignment due 6pm Tuesday, July 23.
Week 11 July 24-31 12 contact hours			
Wednesday, July 24			Assignment 4 Case response assignment due 6pm Wednesday, July 24.
Thursday, July 25			Feedback Ambassadors synthesize case reviews
In-class Day 6 July 26		In class survey data lab	
In-class Day 7 July 27	Present case responses and debrief case activity through Feedback Ambassador process, course evaluations.		
Tuesday, July 30			Assignment 5 Survey data assignment due 6pm Tuesday, 7/30.

Week 12 August 1-7 Approx. 7-10 hours	Presentation of evaluation data	Tufte, E. (2001). Chapter 1: Graphical excellence, Chapter 2: Graphical integrity, <i>The visual display of quantitative information</i> , (2 nd ed., pp.), Graphics Press LLC.	Presentation of evaluation data quiz 9 due 6pm Tuesday, August 6.
FINAL			Final case and teaching note manuscripts and CATME survey due by midnight August 7. This is a firm deadline following USC's final exam policy.

STATEMENT FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

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 (or to TA) 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. Website for DSP and contact information: (213) 740-0776 (Phone), (213) 740-6948 (TDD only), (213) 740-8216 (FAX) ability@usc.edu.

STATEMENT ON 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 University Student Conduct Code (see University Governance, Section 11.00), while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS/COURSE CONTINUITY IN A CRISIS

In case of a declared emergency if travel to campus is not feasible, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technologies. See the university's site on [Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness](#).

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" 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. 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. www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org

Relationship and 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. 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: 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. 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. studentaffairs.usc.edu/bias-assessment-response-support

The Office of Disability Services and Programs

Provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange relevant accommodations. dsp.usc.edu

Student Support and Advocacy – (213) 821-4710

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

Diversity at USC

Information on events, programs and training, the Diversity Task Force (including representatives for each school), chronology, participation, and various resources for students. diversity.usc.edu

USC Emergency Information

Provides safety and other updates, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible. emergency.usc.edu

USC Department of Public Safety – UPC: (213) 740-4321 – HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24-hour emergency or to report a crime. Provides overall safety to USC community. dps.usc.edu