

USC Price

*In Sacramento
Master of
Public
Administration*

PPD 542, Policy and Program Evaluation
4 units, Summer 2021

All class meetings will be online via Zoom; teams may use other co-working platforms for team work	Contact Hours
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recorded online lectures (12 Zoom-powered sessions on Saturdays, 9:00-10:30 am Pacific for students who would like to attend the session “live”) 	18
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asynchronous activities (e.g., weekly Journal entries, Discussion Board posts, videos, other activities) 	35.5
Total contact hours	53.5

Instructor: Lois Takahashi

Office Hours: Saturdays via Zoom directly following online class, and by appointment

Contact Info: lmatakaha@usc.edu (instructor will respond within 48 hours)

Course Description

PPD 542, an overview of policy and program evaluation, is designed to introduce you to the main frameworks, theories, and practice of policy and program evaluation. You will learn how policy and program context, evaluators, and evaluation interact with one another in real-world settings. Through your work in the course, you will hone and demonstrate these abilities that are identified as universal competencies for all accredited schools of public affairs and administration:

- to participate in and contribute to the policy process;
- to analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems and make decisions.

The primary differences between policy and program evaluation are the following:¹

- policy evaluation usually focuses on the system or jurisdictional level, while program evaluation usually focuses on a specific program;
- policy evaluation may be more challenging in terms of identifying roles and responsibilities, and accountability, because the scale of the policy is usually greater than in program evaluation;
- policy evaluation may use more administrative data than program evaluation;
- stakeholder types and number of relevant stakeholders may differ between policy and program evaluation.

An explicit goal of this course is to provide you with the skills and knowledge needed for successful completion of PPD 546, the MPA capstone course, usually taken in the last semester of the MPA degree program.

Prerequisite: PPD 504 Essential Statistics for Public Management or equivalent

Co-Requisite(s): none

Concurrent Enrollment: none

Recommended Preparation: none

¹ <https://www.cdc.gov/injury/pdfs/policy/Brief%201-a.pdf>

Learning Objectives

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

- Recognize key differences and similarities between research and evaluation
- Communicate the standards and ethical practices of evaluators
- Apply key models, theories, and strategies of evaluation practice
- Develop a program evaluation plan
- Develop a policy evaluation plan

Course Notes

Required Textbook:

Fink, A. (2015, 3rd edition). *Evaluation fundamentals: Insights into program effectiveness, quality, and value*. SAGE Publications.

The text is available from the USC bookstore at usctext.com. The text is also available via an electronic version (purchase or rent) through the publisher's website (please see right hand tab for purchasing or digital rental options): <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/evaluation-fundamentals/book240174>

Additional Required Readings:

Additional required readings are listed in the detailed course schedule and are either available through the web, USC Library online, or are available in the Blackboard course page in the week's Content folder.

Individual and Team Assignments:

You will work individually to deliver components of program and policy evaluation plans, and also work with other students in teams (maximum of 5 students per team) to develop a final program evaluation and a final policy evaluation. Should team issues arise, please contact the instructor as soon as possible. In extreme circumstances, violations of academic integrity, individual non-performance (lack of course or assignment progress) or when attempts to address team issues do not succeed, the instructor reserves the right to reorganize teams and re-assign individuals.

You are individually responsible for keeping up to date with the assignments and teamwork in accordance with the assignment instructions in this syllabus and on the Blackboard course page. Individual and team notes, documents, files, drafts, feedback, graphics and other course deliverables must be maintained in an orderly and comprehensive manner within each team on Blackboard or other project management platform, and may be reviewed by the instructor for evaluation (if you use a different project management platform than Blackboard, such as Google Docs, Basecamp, Microsoft Teams, Slack, etc., **please provide access to the instructor**).

Technological Proficiency and Hardware/Software Required:

You will need to be able to access USC Blackboard, TurnItIn through USC Blackboard, LinkedIn Learning through the USC website, Zoom, and YouTube. Assignments will be submitted electronically using a two-step process: (Step 1) submit through TurnItIn link via the Content folder on the Blackboard course site, and make sure that you review not only the similarity index but also the highlighted text in the TurnItIn analysis; please add quotation marks and full citations for highlighted

text passages; and (Step 2) after making corrections using the TurnItIn highlighted text analysis, submit through the appropriate Blackboard assignment link in the Content folder. If you need a refresher, there is a tutorial for Blackboard:

<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLontYaReEU1seUE3ACG3sEc3zR7Br7URU>.

The instructor will use the Blackboard Announcements section to provide an update at the beginning of each week on the week's tasks and assignments, and any changes to assignment due dates or syllabus. All enrolled students receive an email indicating when new Announcements are posted. You can also check current and previous announcements on the Announcements section on the Blackboard course page.

The course also has a Slack account, which is a collaborative hub that may be used for a variety of purposes, including but not limited to additional peer discussions, interactions with the course assistant or instructor, and project team work.

- Prior to the start of classes, please be sure to **set up your Slack account** at <https://usc.enterprise.slack.com/> and familiarize yourself with our class channel. Additional reference guides and resources can be found on this website: <https://keepteaching.usc.edu/students/student-toolkit/>.
- As a reminder, all **Slack conduct must be in line with USC policies** (see below). Any behavior that breaks outlined policies will be subject to discipline.

Weekly Recorded Lectures (optional: can be viewed live):

The instructor will deliver weekly online sessions via Zoom, starting on Saturday of Week 1 of class (9:00-10:30 am Pacific), with office hours online immediately following (you may also email the instructor to schedule meetings by appointment). If you are unfamiliar with Zoom or do not have a USC Zoom account, instructions are available at this website:

<https://keepteaching.usc.edu/students/student-toolkit/classroom/zoom/>.

- You may view the recorded lecture anytime during the week after Saturday. The link to the Zoom recording will be provided via Blackboard (click on "USC Zoom Pro Meeting" in the week's Content folder, or via the Tools link; click on "Cloud Recordings").
- If you would like to join the session live, you may join the session online with video on your computer, tablet, or smartphone; computers are preferable so that you can view slides and documents shared onscreen, and participate in discussions.
- If you need a virtual background, USC has made several available (e.g., <https://libraries.usc.edu/studyon/usc-libraries-virtual-backgrounds>). There are also USC Price branded Zoom backgrounds on the Blackboard course site via the Content tab in the USC Price Zoom Virtual Backgrounds folder.

You should follow the university's guidelines for appropriate use and handling of any course materials, including recordings.

- Please see SCampus policies regarding class notes: <https://policy.usc.edu/files/2020/07/SCampus-Part-C-1.pdf> (section C.1)

“Notes or recordings made by students based on a university class or lecture may only be made for purposes of individual or group study, or for other usual non-commercial purposes that reasonably arise from the student’s membership in the class or attendance at the university. This restriction also applies to any information distributed, disseminated or in any way displayed for use in relationship to the class, whether obtained in class, via email or otherwise on the internet, or via any other medium. Actions in violation of this policy constitute a violation of the Student Conduct Code, and may subject an individual or entity to university discipline and/or legal proceedings.”

- Please see SCampus policies regarding student conduct violations:
<https://policy.usc.edu/files/2020/07/SCampus-Part-B-2.pdf> (section 11.12)

“Recording a university class without the express permission of the instructor and announcement to the class. Recording can inhibit future free discussion and thus infringe on the academic freedom of other students as well as the instructor.”

Per university policy you are not permitted to create your own class recordings of lectures or any class activity without the instructor’s permission. Violations of these policies will be met with the appropriate disciplinary sanction. In other words, please do not make or share any recordings of Zoom class sessions with anyone outside of the class. Please do not share any recordings of team work or any conversations via Slack or any other team platform with anyone outside of class. Violations of these policies will be met with the appropriate disciplinary sanction.

(N)etiquette

This class will engage current events, and possibly controversial and sensitive programs, policies, and topics. We will work to engage sensitive and controversial topics by (1) articulating our own political, ideological, or personal values (or “where we are coming from”) and understanding and clarifying how those frame our judgment of problems, methods, and recommendations; (2) relying on valid social scientific or scientific evidence to back up any claims we make; and (3) listening respectfully to and learning from differing viewpoints to promote understanding. Please remember to engage in all discussions with decorum and without ad hominem/personal attacks on anyone, including class members, elected officials/politicians, or anyone else. Developing civil discussion strategies even when dealing with highly polarizing issues is a skill you will develop in this class.

To help develop and hone this skill, you are required to use three steps for all questions or feedback provided by you in class discussions, with your team, via Discussion Board or Slack posts, or any other engagement:

- (1) identify strengths, elements you found engaging or useful in the draft, comment, question, or feedback provided by a team or class colleague,
- (2) provide questions you have, identify gaps you found, or show problems that you see, and
- (3) for each question, gap, and problem you identify, you MUST provide at least one solution (if you provide a question, gap, or problem but no solution, you will have points deducted, and more importantly, you are not developing and honing your civil discussion skills!).

Assignment Description

Categories	Due Date	% of Grade
Asynchronous Tasks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal Entries • Discussion Board Posts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Via Journal Entry link in week's Content folder • Via Discussion Board link in week's Content folder 	8% 7%
Program Evaluation Plan: Proposed Team	Tuesday, May 25 via Blackboard Groups function	0%
Program Evaluation Plan: Proposed Team Program	Tuesday, June 1 via email to instructor (lmtakaha@usc.edu)	0%
Program Evaluation Plan: Team Logic Model PowerPoint Slide Deck	Draft posted to Discussion Board by Friday, June 11; revision using Discussion Board feedback due by Tuesday, June 15	5%
Program Evaluation Plan: Individual Program Evaluation Design Memo	Draft of process evaluation plan posted to Discussion Board by Friday, June 18; draft of outcome evaluation plan posted to Discussion Board by Friday, June 25; revision using Discussion Board feedback due by Tuesday, June 29	20%
Program Evaluation Plan: Individual Pilot Data and Analysis Memo	Draft posted to Discussion Board by Friday, July 16; revision using Discussion Board feedback due by Tuesday, July 20	20%
Policy Evaluation Plan: Team Proposed Policy	Due Saturday, July 24 via email to instructor (lmtakaha@usc.edu)	0%
Program Evaluation Plan: Team Final Plan memo	Due Tuesday, July 27	15%
Policy Evaluation Plan: Team PowerPoint slide deck (content, implementation, impact)	Draft posted to Discussion Board by Friday, July 30; revision using Discussion Board feedback due Tuesday, August 3	5%
Policy Evaluation Plan: Individual Policy Evaluation Plan memo	Draft posted to Discussion Board by Saturday, August 7; revision using Discussion Board feedback due Tuesday, August 10	20%
TOTAL		100%

Overview. The main assignments for this course are to develop two different evaluation plans, one focused on a program (any set of activities, services, or events that aim for an effect on a target population), and one focused on a policy (existing legislation/policy or proposed bill/ordinance). The individual and team assignments will require you to apply all of the concepts in the course. The individual evaluation plans will be used by the team to create a comprehensive evaluation plan for the program. Grading rubrics for each of the assignments are provided with the detailed assignment descriptions below and on the Blackboard course page.

Teams. You will select or initiate a team on the Blackboard Groups site on the course page (see link in the Week 01 Content folder). Each team will have a maximum of 5 individuals. You and your team members will select a program for which you will develop an individual program evaluation plan and an individual pilot data or data validation memo. The team will then create a comprehensive program evaluation plan based on the individual memo assignments. You and your team will then select a bill/policy under consideration (city/county, special district, state legislative, or congressional) or current policy (municipal ordinance, state law, federal law/policy) for which the team will develop a draft policy evaluation plan, and you will expand and deepen this draft plan to develop an individual policy evaluation plan. All proposed programs or policies for the course assignments need approval by the instructor.

- **Asynchronous Tasks:** This class will engage current events, successful and failed programs and policies, and other topics that may be politically sensitive. We will work to engage sensitive topics by (1) articulating our own political, ideological, or personal values (or “where we are coming from”) and understanding and clarifying how those frame our judgment of programs and policies; (2) relying on valid social scientific or scientific evidence to back up any claims we make about the design and effects of programs and policies; and (3) listening respectfully to and learning from differing viewpoints. Please remember to engage in all discussions with your team or classmates, during class, or via the Discussion Board or Slack or other engagement platform, with respect, decorum, and without ad hominem/personal attacks on anyone, whether class members, political officials, or other individuals or organizations. All posts commenting on drafts should include the following: (1) description of strengths of the post or draft, (2) questions or gaps, and (3) at least one option/solution for each question or gap – if you post any questions or gaps without at least one option/solution, then you will have points deducted.
- **Journal Entries (Variable due dates, starting Week 04; see Course Schedule):** Journal entries are individual and non-public reflections of the week’s readings, lectures, and assignments only viewable by the instructor. Journal entries provide a way for you to document your thinking about the issues, the skills you are learning, and questions that emerge. This also gives you the opportunity to let the instructor know of any issues during the class; the instructor will provide feedback to weekly entries.
 - **Step 1: review the prompt on the syllabus and Blackboard course page, and guidance in the Zoom online session for the journal entry; you are welcome to comment on any aspect of the class (what are you learning?, what is confusing?, what is surprising?, how is the class working for you?, how is the team working together?)**

- **Step 2:** write a draft journal entry in a word processing program that addresses the prompt/guidance or other issues raised in the online sessions
- **Step 3:** check the draft journal entry for spelling and grammatical errors and read the entry aloud to yourself to make sure that it makes sense (e.g., not missing words)
- **Step 4:** submit your journal entry to the link “Journal entry” in the week’s Content folder, and use the “create new journal entry” button; do not forget to “submit” (please do NOT submit under the “group” journal entry, that journal entry is for your team’s internal discussions)

Name	Journal Grading Rubric		
Description			
Rubric Detail			
	Levels of Achievement		
Criteria	Novice	Competent	Proficient
Topic and Reflection	0.00 to 79.99 % * topic does not match syllabus * no reflection	80.00 to 89.99 % * topic somewhat matches syllabus * some reflection	90.00 to 100.00 % * topic matches syllabus * reflection is insightful
Weight 90.00%			
Grammar and Spelling	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 1 spelling error * more than 1 grammatical error	80.00 to 89.99 % * 1 spelling error * 1 grammatical error	90.00 to 100.00 % * no spelling errors * no grammatical errors
Weight 10.00%			

- O **Discussion Boards (Variable due dates via Blackboard Discussion Groups, starting Week 01; see Course Schedule):** Posts to the Discussion Board provide a way for you to reflect on the course material, to deepen your evaluation design for the program/policy that you and your team are investigating, and to provide peer supportive feedback on drafts. An ideal way to submit your posts is to write them first in a word processing program (please spell check and check grammar), and then cutting and pasting the text into the Blackboard Discussion Board course site (the link will be available in the week’s Content folder). You should post your initial posts usually consisting of assignment drafts (usually by Friday by 11:59 pm Pacific), and post supportive feedback to at least one other student’s or team’s post (usually by Saturday by 11:59 pm Pacific) using rational, evidence based arguments.
- **Step 1:** review the prompt on the syllabus, the guidance in the Zoom online session, or the Blackboard course site guidance for the week’s Discussion Board; the link to the week’s Discussion Board is in the week’s Content folder; for providing supportive feedback, please select a draft that does not have any individual or little team feedback

- **Step 2:** write a draft initial post (usually a draft of the upcoming memo in Word or slide deck in PowerPoint that is due), and use a word processing program to write your supportive feedback to another student's or team's post/draft
- **Step 3:** check your draft post or supportive feedback for spelling and grammatical errors and read the post or supportive feedback aloud to yourself to make sure that it makes sense (e.g., not missing any words)
- **Step 4:** submit your initial post or cut and paste your supportive feedback to the Discussion Board link in the week's Content folder; please do not forget to "submit"

Name Discussion Board Grading Rubric

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Novice	Competent	Proficient
Complete and Supportive Replies Postings Weight 90.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * initial post missing * reply to at least one other student's initial post missing or not supportive * response to student reply missing or not respectful	80.00 to 89.99 % * initial post somewhat addresses the topic in the syllabus * supportive reply without new insights to another student's initial post * respectful response to student reply lacking in detail	90.00 to 100.00 % * initial post that addresses the topic in the syllabus * supportive reply to at least one other student's initial post * respectful response to student reply
Grammar and Spelling Weight 10.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 1 spelling error * more than 1 grammatical error	80.00 to 89.99 % * 1 spelling error * 1 grammatical error	90.00 to 100.00 % * no spelling errors * no grammatical errors

■ **Program Evaluation Project (various deadlines, below).**

- **Team Proposal for Proposed Program (one team member should email the proposed program by Tuesday, June 1 by 11:59 pm Pacific to instructor (lmtakaha@usc.edu); your team's proposed program must be approved before moving forward on your individual assignments.**

- **Step 1:** meet with your team to collectively decide on a program that everyone on the team will use for the individual and team program evaluation plan assignments; for team brainstorming, consider using collaboration platforms such as Miro, Mural, Padlet, Google Jamboard
- **Step 2:** decide on a team working platform (e.g., Google Docs, Microsoft Teams, Box, Dropbox, Slack, etc.) so that everyone on the team has access to all team documents; provide access to the platform to the instructor (lmtakaha@usc.edu)

- **Step 3:** use a word processing program to draft a team proposal that includes the name of the program and a brief description of the program (2-3 sentences) on the team working platform; for team brainstorming, consider using collaboration platforms such as Miro, Mural, Padlet, Google Jamboard
 - **Step 4:** everyone on the team should check the draft for spelling and grammatical errors and read the proposal aloud to yourselves to make sure that proposal makes sense
 - **Step 5:** email the team proposal, and cc all team members, to the instructor for approval (lmtakaha@usc.edu)
- O Team Program Logic Model PowerPoint slide deck (one team member should post the draft to the Discussion Board by Friday, June 11 by 11:59 pm Pacific; you should post supportive feedback for at least one other team's draft by Saturday, June 12 by 11:59 pm Pacific; you and your team should revise the PowerPoint slide deck using the Discussion Board feedback and submit by Tuesday, June 15 by 11:59 pm Pacific. Please submit using the two step procedure for this class: (step 1) submit to TurnItIn link in week's Content folder, review text passages that are highlighted, and add quotation marks around those highlighted text phrases and provide complete citations including page number of quoted text; (step 2) submit revised and corrected document via Assignments link in the week's Content folder. The slide deck should include: brief description of the program, explanation of the logic model elements, and a logic model diagram. Format: 10 slide maximum including cover slide (with program name and team member names) and end slide (with contact information for team members), at least 20 point font.
- **Step 1:** meet with your team to collectively work on the logic model using your team working platform; start with the program description, search for publicly available information on the program, and complete each logic model component; for team brainstorming, consider using collaboration platforms such as Miro, Mural, Padlet, Google Jamboard
 - **Step 1a:** Complete the Outcomes component (the program's stated goals for change in the target population or system)
 - **Step 1b:** Complete the Inputs/Resources component (the program's target population; staffing, including volunteers and speakers; funding; material tools needed including space)
 - **Step 1c:** Complete the Activities component (the program's workshops, trainings, and any other tasks that the program requires of its target population and staff)
 - **Step 1d:** Complete the Outputs component (for each Activity, there should be an Output – answer the question: what was the program supposed to complete in terms of each Activity?); draw an arrow from each Activity to the appropriate Output
 - **Step 1e:** Iterate the Outcomes component (do all Activities link to at least one Outcome?) – if any Activity is not relevant to at least one Outcome, then reconsider including that Activity in the Activity component

- **Step 1f:** Complete the Impacts component (what are the longer term or wider population possible effects of the program that are not included in the Outcomes?)
- **Step 2:** work with your team on your team working platform to design the PowerPoint slide deck (10 slide maximum)
 - **Step 2a:** Decide on a template (there are USC Price templates available at the Blackboard course site via the Content tab in the USC Price PPT Templates folder)
 - **Step 2b:** Include a title page (with the program name, the names of the team members, the date, and the affiliation, such as PPD 542)
 - **Step 2c:** Include a final slide with the team names and email contact information
 - **Step 2d:** Include in the other 8 slides: the description of the program (1 slide), the logic model diagram (1 slide), descriptions of each of the components (5-6 slides)
- **Step 3:** you and your team should check the draft for spelling and grammatical errors, make sure that all text extracted from another source has quotation marks and a full citation at the bottom of the slide (12 point font is fine for the footnote), and review the slides to make sure that the slide deck makes sense
- **Step 4:** one team member should post the slide deck to the Discussion Board for the team; you should respectfully comment on at least one other team slide deck on the Discussion Board
- **Step 5:** you should review the comments on the Discussion Board, and you and your team should make revisions to improve the slide deck
- **Step 6:** Step 1: one team member should submit the slide deck to the TurnItIn link in the week's Content folder, you should review the similarity index and highlighted text, you should make sure that all highlighted text (except for the citations) have quotation marks and a full citation including the page number where the quoted text originally appeared; please try to use a citation management platform to help you organize your citations, such as Endnote online, Zotero, etc.
- **Step 7:** Step 2: one team member should submit the corrected slide deck via the Assignment link in the week's Content folder
- **Step 8:** (post submission) after receiving a grade and feedback on the submitted slide deck from the instructor, you should meet with your team to make final revisions and edits to strengthen the logic model for the remaining assignments

Name PowerPoint Slide Deck #1: Team Logic Model

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Novice	Competent	Proficient
Logic Model Weight 60.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * missing logic model elements * missing description of logic model elements	80.00 to 89.99 % * missing 1 logic model element * missing 1 logic model element description	90.00 to 100.00 % * all logic model elements included * all logic model elements included, with clear description
PPT Slide Deck Organization Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 10 slide limit * smaller than 20 point font * missing or inconsistent citations	80.00 to 89.99 % * slides not optimal (too much text, inconsistent format, evidence unclear) * inconsistent citations	90.00 to 100.00 % * slides format with clear concepts and evidence * consistent and complete citations
Spelling and Grammar Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 1 spelling error * more than 1 grammatical error	80.00 to 89.99 % * 1 spelling error * 1 grammatical error	90.00 to 100.00 % * no spelling errors * no grammatical errors

- O **Individual Evaluation Design Memo (you should post your draft process evaluation plan to Discussion Board by Friday, June 18 by 11:59 pm; you should provide supportive feedback for at least one draft process evaluation plan that does not already have feedback to the Discussion Board by Saturday, June 19 by 11:59 pm; you should post your draft outcome evaluation plan to the Discussion Board by Friday, June 25 by 11:59 pm; you should provide supportive feedback to at least one draft outcome evaluation plan that does not have any feedback to the Discussion Board by Saturday, June 26 by 11:59 pm; your final revised evaluation design memo is due by Tuesday, June 29 by 11:59 p.m. Pacific; please submit using the two step procedure for this class: (step 1) submit to TurnItIn link in week's Content folder, review text passages that are highlighted, and add quotation marks around the highlighted text passages and provide complete citations including page number where the quoted text originally appeared; (step 2) submit the revised and corrected document via link in the week's Content folder).** In this individual memo, you will describe an appropriate evaluation design for evaluating the program as depicted in the logic model. The evaluation design should include process (e.g., fidelity, participation, and/or satisfaction) and outcomes (e.g., outcome and impact). The evaluation design should include measures and metrics, data collection/validation strategy, and how the data should be analyzed. Format: 2 page maximum (including footnotes and embedded graphics, such as the logic model, but not including

appendices), single-spaced, memo format, 12 point font, 1 inch margins, with full and complete citations.

- **Step 1: review the revised team logic model, and note the Activities → Outputs links and Outcomes/Impacts components**
- **Step 2: for the Process Evaluation design, create a strategy for data collection/validation and analysis that includes all Activities → Outputs links**
 - **Step 2a: design any data collection tools needed (e.g., interview guide, survey questionnaire, observation guide, focus group guide) and include in the appendix; if there are data collection tools already existing that the program is using, include those in the appendix with appropriate citation of the source, and discuss how collected data will be used in the process evaluation plan**
 - **Step 2b: include a schedule for data collection (how many times should data be collected?, when should data be collected?, from whom should data be collected?) and an analysis plan (how should the collected data be analyzed?); also called a Gantt chart, these can be created in Excel:**
<https://www.linkedin.com/learning/search?keywords=gantt%20chart&u=76870426>
 - **Step 2c: post your draft process evaluation plan to the Discussion Board for peer supportive feedback**
 - **Step 2d: post supportive feedback to at least one draft process evaluation plan that does not already have feedback**
- **Step 3: for the Outcomes/Impacts Evaluation design, create a strategy for data collection and analysis that includes all Outcomes and Impacts**
 - **Step 3a: select from one of the evaluation design approaches discussed in the text and/or the online session (e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental, cross sectional, cohort, etc.)**
 - **Step 3b: design any data collection tools needed and include those tools in the appendix (e.g., interview guide, survey questionnaire, observation guide, focus group guide) and include in the appendix**
 - **Step 3c: if there are data already existing (e.g., case control design), include a description with appropriate citation of the source and an approach for data validation and analysis; include a schedule for data collection (how many times should data be collected?, when should data be collected?, from whom should data be collected?) and an analysis plan (how should the collected data be analyzed?); also called a Gantt chart, these can be created in Excel:**
<https://www.linkedin.com/learning/search?keywords=gantt%20chart&u=76870426>
 - **Step 3d: post your draft outcome evaluation plan to the Discussion Board for peer feedback**
 - **Step 3e: post supportive feedback to at least one draft outcome evaluation plan that does not already have feedback**

- **Step 4:** using the Discussion Board feedback, revise your process and outcome evaluation plan design, and put these sections (program description, process evaluation design, outcomes/impacts evaluation design) into memo format; use descriptive subheadings for each section; include the revised team logic model diagram in the appendix; make sure to include quotation marks for text that you have taken from existing sources and provide a complete citation as a footnote or endnote; please try to use a citation management platform to help you organize your citations, such as Endnote online, Zotero, etc.
- **Step 5:** write an Executive Summary that summarizes the most important “takeaways” of the memo and insert as the first section after the “To: “ section (hint: the reader should be able to read the subject line and the Executive Summary and understand exactly what you are proposing without reading the rest of the memo)
- **Step 6:** check the draft memo for spelling and grammatical errors and read the memo aloud to yourself to make sure that the memo makes sense
- **Step 7:** Step 1: submit the memo to the TurnItIn link in the week’s Content folder, review the similarity index and highlighted text, make sure that all highlighted text (except for the citations) have quotation marks and a full citation including the page number where the highlighted text appeared in the source; please try to use a citation management platform to help you organize your citations, such as Endnote online, Zotero, etc.
- **Step 8:** Step 2: submit the corrected memo via the Assignment link in the week’s Content folder

Name Memo #1: Individual Evaluation Design

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Novice	Competent	Proficient
Evaluation Design Weight 70.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * missing process eval design * missing outcomes eval design	80.00 to 89.99 % * process eval incomplete * outcomes eval incomplete	90.00 to 100.00 % * process eval complete and comprehensive * outcomes eval complete and comprehensive
Memo organization Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * not in memo format * lack of citations	80.00 to 89.99 % * memo format * no executive summary * lack of substantive subheadings * incomplete citations or inconsistent style	90.00 to 100.00 % * informative subject line, subheadings * executive summary includes most important information * citations are complete with consistent style
Spelling/Grammar Weight 10.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 1 spelling error * more than 1 grammatical error	80.00 to 89.99 % * 1 spelling error * 1 grammatical error	90.00 to 100.00 % * no spelling errors * no grammatical errors

- O Individual Pilot Data Collection and Analysis Memo (you should post your draft to the Discussion Board by Friday, July 16 by 11:59 pm; you should provide supportive feedback to the Discussion Board for a draft that does not yet have any feedback by Saturday, July 17 by 11:59 pm; you should revise your memo using the feedback from the Discussion Board; and submit your revised and corrected memo by Tuesday, July 20 by 11:59 p.m. Pacific; please submit using the two step procedure for this class: (step 1) submit to TurnItIn link in week's Content folder, review text passages that are highlighted by the TurnItIn analysis, and add quotation marks around the highlighted text and provide complete citations including the page number where the highlighted text appeared in the source; (step 2) submit revised and corrected document via Assignments link in the week's Content folder). The pilot data collection/validation and analysis memo will require that you collect pilot data that tests the data collection instruments or provide a data validation strategy for data that is already collected by the program. For proposed primary data collection, the pilot data memo should include the measures and metrics, data collection strategy, and analysis of your pilot data. For proposed secondary data analysis, you should focus

on a data acquisition and validation procedure. Data analysis should focus on improving the data collection instruments or creating a procedure for data validation and analysis for data already being collected by the program. Format: 2 page maximum (including footnotes and embedded graphics, such as the logic model, but not including appendices), single-spaced, memo format, 12 point font, 1 inch margins, with full and complete citations.

- **Step 1: for proposed primary data collection, test the preliminary data collection tools and make corrections to improve the proposed data collection tools; all data collected should correspond to the evaluation design and logic model (if you are not proposing primary data collection, please skip this step)**
 - **Step 1a: identify 2-3 individuals who would be appropriate for a pilot test of your data collection tools; you can choose any individuals, though ideally, these individuals should be similar to the program participants**
 - **Step 1b: have these 2-3 individuals complete all of your data collection tools, and provide feedback to you on ease of understandability (were they confused about any of the questions/tasks?), ease of completion (how long did they take to complete the tools?), validity (did they answer the questions/complete the tasks in the ways that you expected?)**
 - **Step 1c: write a brief description of the individuals who completed your data collection tools, their feedback, and your strategy to improve the tool(s) given the pilot tester feedback; provide the original data collection tools with markups and revised (clean without markups) versions of the data collection tools in the appendix**
 - **Step 1d: provide a timeline for data collection and analysis in a spreadsheet format, also called a Gantt chart, these can be created in Excel:**
<https://www.linkedin.com/learning/search?keywords=gantt%20chart&u=76870426>
 - **Step 1e: propose an analysis procedure, and design data reporting table templates for reporting (how will you report on the results of the proposed analysis of the data?)**
- **Step 2: for secondary data acquisition and analysis (for data that are already collected by the program), design a procedure that validates the data and provide an analysis strategy (if you are not planning on using secondary data analysis, please skip this step)**
 - **Step 2a: create a schedule/timeline for data acquisition (how often should data be collected?, and for how long of a period will data collection last?); all data should correspond to the evaluation design and logic model; also called a Gantt chart, these can be created in Excel:**
<https://www.linkedin.com/learning/search?keywords=gantt%20chart&u=76870426>

- **Step 2b:** provide a procedure for validating the data you acquire (how will you confirm that there are no errors in the data set, and that the data set includes all the variables that you need?)
 - **Step 2c:** propose an analysis procedure, and design table templates for data reporting (how will you report on the results of the proposed analysis of the data?)
- **Step 3:** include these sections for the memo
 - brief description of the program, include the logic model diagram in the appendix
 - a summary of the process and outcomes/impacts evaluation design
 - results
 - pilot data collection strategy and the results (and provide the original data collection tools with markups and revised set of data collection tools in the appendix) including data collection timeline and analysis strategy, and/or
 - data acquisition, validation, and analysis strategy (include data collection tools and reporting templates in the appendix)
- **Step 4:** put these sections into the memo format; put the logic model diagram in the appendix; use descriptive subheadings for each section; make sure to include quotation marks for text that you have taken from existing sources and provide a complete citation as a footnote or endnote
- **Step 5:** the memo should be addressed to a decision maker with interests in the program (please provide the name and the person's role/title in the "To:" line), and you should identify your position (please provide a role/title for yourself in the "From:" line; you could be internal or external to the decision maker's organization)
- **Step 6:** write an Executive Summary that summarizes the most important "takeaways" of the memo (hint: the reader should be able to read the subject line and the Executive Summary and understand exactly what you are proposing without reading the rest of the memo)
- **Step 7:** check the draft memo for spelling and grammatical errors and read the memo aloud to yourself to make sure that the memo makes sense
- **Step 8:** Step 1: submit the memo to the TurnItIn link in the week's Content folder, review the similarity index and highlighted text from the TurnItIn textual analysis, make sure that all highlighted text (except for the citations) have quotation marks and a full citation including the page number where the highlighted text appeared in the source; please try to use a citation management platform to help you organize your citations, such as Endnote online, Zotero, etc.
- **Step 9:** Step 2: submit the corrected memo via the Assignment link in the week's Content folder

Name

Memo #2: Individual Pilot Data Collection/Data Validation and Analysis

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Novice	Competent	Proficient
Pilot Test Weight 70.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * no pilot test/data validation	80.00 to 89.99 % * pilot test/data validation described * pilot test data/data validation not used to improve instruments/templates	90.00 to 100.00 % * pilot test description/data validation complete * pilot test/data validation data used to improve instruments/templates
Format Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * not in memo format * no executive summary * citations missing	80.00 to 89.99 % * memo format but missing substantive subheadings * executive summary is incomplete * citations incomplete or inconsistent style	90.00 to 100.00 % * memo format, within max page limit, substantive subheadings * executive summary includes all the important "takeaways" * complete citations
Spelling/Grammar Weight 10.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 1 spelling error * more than 1 grammatical error	80.00 to 89.90 % * 1 spelling error * 1 grammatical error	90.00 to 100.00 % * no spelling errors * no grammatical errors

- O **Team Program Evaluation Plan Memo (one team member should submit the team memo by Tuesday, July 27 by 11:59 p.m. Pacific; please submit using the two step procedure for this class: (step 1) submit to TurnItIn link in the week's Content folder, review text passages that are highlighted by the TurnItIn textual analysis, and add quotation marks around the highlighted text phrases and provide complete citations including the page number where the highlighted text phrase appeared in the source; (step 2) one team member should submit the revised and corrected memo in Word format via the Assignment link in the week's Content folder).** The team will use the individual memos (evaluation design and pilot data collection/data validation and analysis) to develop a final comprehensive team program evaluation plan memo. The team program evaluation plan memo should include: the team program logic model diagram (in the appendix), the best elements of the individual evaluation designs, the best elements of the individual data collection/validation and analysis memos. In addition, the team should include a section on evaluation plan limitations (what is the evaluation plan not able to measure or cover?) and a dissemination plan (how should the results be disseminated by the program or agency?). Format: 3 page maximum (including footnotes and embedded graphics, such as the logic model diagram if the diagram is inserted in the memo body, but not including appendices), single-spaced, memo format, 12 point font, 1 inch margins, with full and complete citations.
- **Step 1: meet with your team to collectively work together to discuss your individual evaluation design and pilot test data collection/data validation memos, and decide collectively on the best elements to include in the team program evaluation plan memo; for team brainstorming, consider using collaboration platforms such as Miro, Mural, Padlet, Google Jamboard**
 - **Step 2: work with your team to develop the final program evaluation plan**
 - **Step 2a: include the description of the program, the logic model diagram (in the appendix), the process evaluation design (with data**

collection tools/templates in the appendix), the outcomes/impacts evaluation design (with data collection/validation tools and templates in the appendix), a brief description of the pilot data collection/data validation and analysis results, and add a schedule for data collection or acquisition in the appendix (also called a Gantt chart, these can be created in Excel:

<https://www.linkedin.com/learning/search?keywords=gantt%20chart&u=76870426>)

- **Step 2b:** write a limitations section; what is this evaluation plan not able to cover?
- **Step 2c:** write a dissemination plan; how should the results of the evaluation, once implemented, be shared? (should the results be internal only and with the funder?, shared with board members?, shared with the wider public?)
- **Step 3:** put these sections (program description, process evaluation design, outcomes/impacts evaluation design, pilot data collection/data validation and analysis, limitations, dissemination) into the memo format; use descriptive subheadings for each section; include the logic model diagram and finalized data collection/validation tools, templates, and Gantt chart in the appendix; make sure to include quotation marks for text that you have taken from existing sources and provide a complete citation for each text passage as a footnote or endnote
- **Step 4:** write an Executive Summary that summarizes the most important “takeaways” of the memo (hint: the reader should be able to read the subject line and the Executive Summary and understand exactly what you and your team are proposing without reading the rest of the memo)
- **Step 5:** you and the team should check the draft for spelling and grammatical errors, make sure that all text extracted from another source has quotation marks and a full citation, and review the memo to make sure that the memo makes sense
- **Step 6:** Step 1: one team member should submit the memo to the TurnItIn link in the week’s Content folder, you and your team review the similarity index and highlighted text from the TurnItIn textual analysis, make sure that all highlighted text phrases (except for the citations) have quotation marks around the highlighted text phrases and a full citation including page number where the highlighted text phrase appeared in the source; please try to use a citation management platform to help you and your team to organize the team’s citations, such as Endnote online, Zotero, etc.
- **Step 7:** Step 2: one team member should submit the corrected memo via the Assignment link in the week’s Content folder

Description _____

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Novice	Competent	Proficient
Evaluation Design and Pilot/Validation Weight 60.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * missing process eval design * missing outcomes eval design * no pilot test/data validation	80.00 to 89.99 % * process eval incomplete * outcomes eval incomplete * pilot test/data validation described * pilot test data/data validation not used to improve instruments/ templates	90.00 to 100.00 % * process eval complete and comprehensive * outcomes eval complete and comprehensive * pilot test/data validation description complete * pilot test data/data validation used to improve instruments/ templates
Implementation and Dissemination Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * no implementation * no dissemination	80.00 to 89.99 % * implementation incomplete * dissemination incomplete	90.00 to 100.00 % * implementation complete * dissemination complete
Format Weight 10.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * not in memo format * citations missing	80.00 to 89.99 % * memo format but missing substantive subheadings * citations incomplete or inconsistent style	90.00 to 100.00 % * memo format, within max page limit, substantive subheadings * complete citations
Spelling/Grammar Weight 10.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 1 spelling error * more than 1 grammatical error	80.00 to 89.99 % * 1 spelling error * 1 grammatical error	90.00 to 100.00 % * no spelling errors * no grammatical errors

■ **Policy Evaluation Project (various deadlines, below).**

- **Team Proposal for Proposed Policy (one team member should email the proposed policy to the instructor by Saturday, July 24 by 11:59 pm Pacific); your team's proposed policy must be approved before moving forward on your individual assignments.**
 - **Step 1:** meet with your team to collectively decide on a policy that everyone on the team will use for the individual and team policy evaluation plan assignments; for team brainstorming, consider using collaboration platforms such as Miro, Mural, Padlet, Google Jamboard
 - **Step 2:** draft a team proposal that includes the name of the policy and a brief description of the policy (2-3 sentences)
 - **Step 3:** you and your team should check the draft for spelling and grammatical errors and read the proposal aloud to yourself to make sure that proposal makes sense
 - **Step 4:** one team member should email the team policy proposal, and cc all team members, to the instructor (lmtakaha@usc.edu)
- **Team Policy Evaluation Plan PowerPoint slide deck (one team member should post the draft slide deck to the Discussion Board by Friday, July 30 by 11:59 pm Pacific; you should post supportive feedback for at least one other team's draft by Saturday, July 31, by 11:59 pm Pacific; you and your team should revise the PowerPoint slide deck using the feedback from the Discussion Board; one team member should**

submit the revised and corrected slide deck by Tuesday August 3, by 11:59 pm Pacific; please submit using the two step procedure for this class: (step 1) one team member should submit to TurnItIn link in the week's Content folder, you and your team should review text passages that are highlighted via the TurnItIn textual analysis, and add quotation marks around the highlighted text passages and provide complete citations, including the page number where the highlighted text appeared in the source; (step 2) one team member should submit revised and corrected document via Assignments link in the week's Content folder). The slide deck should include: description of the policy, the policy content, implementation, and a preliminary impact evaluation design. Format: 10 slide maximum including cover slide (with title and team member names) and end slide (with contact information), at least 20 point font.

- **Step 1: meet with your team to collectively work on the policy evaluation plan components (policy description, content, implementation, and impact); start with the policy description, collect publicly available information, and use the publicly available information to complete each policy evaluation plan component; for team brainstorming, consider using collaboration platforms such as Miro, Mural, Padlet, Google Jamboard**
 - **Step 1a: Collect all publicly available information about the policy, and write a brief summary of the policy (including the reason for the policy, and a timeline)**
 - **Step 1b: Complete the Content component (include the policy goals and core policy elements from the policy text)**
 - **Step 1c: Complete the Implementation component (include the implementation plan, a discussion about whether the policy is being/will be implemented as intended and highlight the barriers and enablers for implementation across the policy elements; select an appropriate evaluation design, similar to the process evaluation strategy for program evaluation)**
 - **Step 1d: Develop a preliminary impact evaluation design component (include the intended results, target population or system, and how impact could be measured)**
 - **Step 1d.1: develop the most important policy impact questions to include in the policy evaluation plan (e.g., who is the policy designed to affect?; will the policy affect the target population?; what are the intended short-, intermediate-, and long-term effects?; are there any unintended consequences, positive or negative?)**
 - **Step 1d.2: select an impact evaluation design strategy (similar to the outcomes evaluation strategy for program evaluation, e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental, cross sectional, cohort, etc.) appropriate to the question(s) in Step 3a**
 - **Step 1d.3: design any data collection tools needed (e.g., interview guide, survey questionnaire, observation guide, focus group guide) and include in the Appendix; if there are data**

collection tools already existing, include those in the Appendix with appropriate citation of the source

- **Step 1d.4:** include a schedule for data collection (how many times should data be collected?, when should data be collected?, from whom should data be collected?); also called a Gantt chart, these can be created in Excel:
<https://www.linkedin.com/learning/search?keywords=gantt%20chart&u=76870426>

- **Step 2: work with your team to design the PowerPoint slide deck**
 - **Step 2a:** Decide on a template (there are USC Price templates available at the Blackboard course site via the Content tab in the USC Price PPT Templates folder)
 - **Step 2b:** Include a title page (with the policy name, the names of the team members, the date, and the affiliation, such as PPD 542)
 - **Step 2c:** Include a contact page on the final slide with the team names and email contact information
 - **Step 2d:** Include in the other 8 slides: the description of the policy (1 slide), Content (2 slides), Implementation (2-3 slides), Impact (2-3 slides)
- **Step 3:** you and your team should check the draft for spelling and grammatical errors, make sure that all text extracted from another source has quotation marks and a full citation at the bottom of the slide (12 point font is fine for the footnote, but all citations should be in a consistent style), and review the slides to make sure that the slide deck makes sense
- **Step 4:** one team member should post the slide deck to the Discussion Board for the team; you should provide supportive feedback to at least one other team slide deck
- **Step 5:** you and your team should review the Discussion Board feedback, and make revisions to improve the slide deck
- **Step 6:** Step 1: one team member should submit the slide deck to the TurnItIn link in the week's Content folder, you and your team should review the similarity index and the highlighted text from the TurnItIn textual analysis, you and your team should make sure that all highlighted text (except for the citations) have quotation marks and a full citation including the page number where the highlighted text appeared in the source; please try to use a citation management platform to help you organize your citations, such as Endnote online, Zotero, etc.
- **Step 7:** Step 2: one team member should submit the corrected slide deck via the Assignment link in the week's Content folder

Name PowerPoint Slide Deck #2: Team Policy Evaluation (Description, Content, Implementation)

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Novice	Competent	Proficient
Policy Description, Content, Implementation Weight 60.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * missing description of policy * missing description of content * missing description of implementation	80.00 to 89.99 % * description of policy, content, implementation incomplete	90.00 to 100.00 % * all elements included with clear description * slide deck is easy to understand
PPT Slide Deck Organization Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 10 slide limit * smaller than 20 point font * missing or inconsistent citations	80.00 to 89.99 % * slides not optimal (too much text, inconsistent format, evidence unclear) * inconsistent citations	90.00 to 100.00 % * slides format with clear concepts and evidence * consistent and complete citations
Spelling and Grammar Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 1 spelling error * more than 1 grammatical error	80.00 to 89.99 % * 1 spelling error * 1 grammatical error	90.00 to 100.00 % * no spelling errors * no grammatical errors

- O **Individual Policy Evaluation Plan Memo (you should post your draft to the Discussion Board by Saturday, August 7 by 11:59 pm; you should provide supportive feedback to at least one draft that does not already have feedback by Sunday, August 8 by 11:59 pm; you should revise your memo using the Discussion Board feedback and submit by Tuesday, August 10 by 11:59 p.m. Pacific; please submit using the two step procedure for this class: (step 1) submit to TurnItIn link in week's Content folder, review text passages that are highlighted via the TurnItIn textual analysis, and add quotation marks around the highlighted text passage and complete citations including page number where the highlighted text passage appeared in the source; (step 2) submit your revised and corrected document via Assignments link in the week's Content folder).** In this individual memo, you will describe an appropriate evaluation design for evaluating the policy (including content, implementation, and impact components), expanding, improving, and revising the team's proposed plan developed in the slide deck. Format: 2 page maximum (including footnotes and embedded graphics, but not including appendices), single-spaced, memo format, 12 point font, 1 inch margins, with full and complete citations.
- **Step 1: review the feedback from the instructor on the team slide deck**
 - **Step 2: revise and deepen the policy description, content, and implementation, and impact components, with additional research evidence**

and any needed data collection/validation tools, templates for data collection/validation/reporting, timeline/Gantt chart for policy evaluation plan

- **Step 3:** put these sections (policy description, content, and implementation and impact evaluation design) into memo format; include data collection/validation tools, templates, and timeline/Gantt chart in the appendix; use descriptive subheadings for each section; make sure to include quotation marks for text that you have taken from existing sources and provide a complete citation as a footnote or endnote
- **Step 6:** write an Executive Summary that summarizes the most important “takeaways” of the memo (hint: the reader should be able to read the subject line and the Executive Summary and understand exactly what you are proposing without reading the rest of the memo)
- **Step 7:** check the draft memo for spelling and grammatical errors and read the memo aloud to yourself to make sure that the memo makes sense
- **Step 8:** Step 1: submit the memo to the TurnItIn link in the week’s Content folder, review the similarity index and highlighted text via the TurnItIn textual analysis, make sure that all highlighted text (except for the citations) have quotation marks and a full citation including page numbers where the highlighted text appeared in the source; please try to use a citation management platform to help you organize your citations, such as Endnote online, Zotero, etc.
- **Step 9:** Step 2: submit the corrected memo via the Assignment link in the week’s Content folder

Name

Memo #3: Policy Evaluation Plan

Description

Rubric Detail

Criteria	Levels of Achievement		
	Novice	Competent	Proficient
Policy Evaluation Plan Weight 60.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * missing content * missing implementation * missing impact	80.00 to 89.99 % * incomplete content * incomplete implementation * incomplete impact	90.00 to 100.00 % * complete and feasible content * complete and feasible implementation * complete and feasible impact
Memo Organization Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * not in memo format * missing or inconsistent citations	80.00 to 89.99 % * memo format but subheadings not optimal * inconsistent citations	90.00 to 100.00 % * memo format with strong Executive Summary and clear subheadings * consistent and complete citations
Spelling and Grammar Weight 20.00%	0.00 to 79.99 % * more than 1 spelling error * more than 1 grammatical error	80.00 to 89.99 % * 1 spelling error * 1 grammatical error	90.00 to 100.00 % * no spelling errors * no grammatical errors

Grading Scale

Course final grades will be determined using the following scale:

A	95-100
A-	90-94
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

Course Format, Policies, and Expectations

Weekly assignments are structured on a Wednesday to Tuesday format, as the summer session starts on Wednesday, May 19 and ends on Tuesday, August 10.

We will have “live” online sessions via Zoom on Saturdays starting at 9:00 am Pacific. You are not required to attend the Zoom sessions “live”; you may view the recordings once they are available (after Saturday) as many times as needed. If you are unable to attend “live” and you have questions, please contact the instructor (lmtakaha@usc.edu) and set up an appointment, or use the course Slack platform to ask the class.

Other guidelines include:

- Assignments are due no later than 11:59 p.m. in the Pacific Time zone on the day that is due, except where otherwise noted in the course schedule.
- Label all files: lastname_assignmentname.docx (e.g., takahashi_individualevaluationplanmemo.docx) or team_assignmentname.pptx (e.g., teamname_logicmodel.pptx)
- All submitted assignments should be in Microsoft Word or PowerPoint format, unless otherwise indicated.
- Memos must be single-spaced with 12 point font, with 1-inch margins, and must abide by the maximum page limits. If you are unfamiliar with memo format, please see this guidance from the USC Library: <https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/policymemo>.
- All written memos should include page numbers and proper labeling of all tables and figures.
- PowerPoint slide decks must not exceed 10 slides including title (the title page should include the name of the program or policy, the team members, date submitted, and the name of the class) and end slide (the end slide should include email contact information), and must use at least 20 point font. Citations may use 12 point font at the bottom of the slide where the text is quoted.
- Please use APA style for citations; the USC Library has a citation tool built into the article search engine; another useful tool is the Purdue OWL site, and its citation tool: https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/general_format.html.
 - Please consider using a citation management software platform such as Endnote online, Zotero, etc.
 - I have also included a tutorial on Endnote online on the Blackboard course page.
- Please avoid use of non-academic or non-governmental material found on the World Wide Web (e.g., Wikipedia, and sites that advocate for positions without evidence).
- Students who need help with grammar or style are encouraged to make use of a web-based grammar application such as Grammarly (<https://www.grammarly.com/>). If you use USC’s Microsoft Office suite, Grammarly should be available in your menu bar in Word.

There is a two-step submission process for all assignments in this course:

Step 1. Submit your individual or team assignment via the TurnItIn link on the Blackboard

Assignments tab:

- TurnItIn will highlight text that has been found to be drawn from another source. In words, please do not only review the similarity index, as even with a low similarity index score, there may still be text passages that are taken from existing sources without attribution. TurnItIn highlights these text passages in its text analysis.
- Please make sure that text highlighted by the TurnItIn tool has quotation marks at the beginning and end of the text passage and that you provide a full and complete citation (including page numbers; please use APA format).
- If there is text highlighted by TurnItIn for which you do not provide quotation marks (this includes lists that you have taken from existing sources), then the assignment will be considered to be a potential instance of plagiarism and will be reported to the main campus (see more on academic dishonesty at the end of the syllabus).

Step 2. Submit your corrected individual or team assignment via the Blackboard Assignments link for that specific assignment:

- Please make sure to allow sufficient time to submit in the event of any issues with the online platform (in other words, do not wait until 11:55 pm on the due date to submit!).
- Submitting early is recommended!

Grading Timeline

Assignments will be reviewed and graded by the Wednesday following the Sunday due date.

Grading Policies

Late Assignments

NO assignments are accepted after their due dates. If an assignment is not completed, the student receives zero points for it. There can be no exceptions to this policy except with written permission granted by the instructor PRIOR to the original due date. Please make sure to allocate sufficient time to complete all of your assignments in your schedule.

Individual Grading for Team Assignments

The assignment of grades for a team submission generally will be consistent among team members; however, the instructor reserves the right to grade team assignments with individual scores reflecting the timeliness, accuracy and relevance of individual contributions to each assignment or project component. Group grades for team assignments, projects and presentations should not be assumed to be universal, and may be individualized for the team member and/or assignment at the discretion of the instructor.

Feedback to Instructor

Students will have the opportunity to provide anonymous feedback to the instructor about the course mid-way through the term. A mid-term course evaluation will be made available to students via the Blackboard course platform (under the Assignments link).

Course Schedule: Weekly Breakdown

Week 01: May 19-25 Introductions and Overview Recognizing Key Differences and Similarities between Research and Evaluation		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<i>Reading:</i> Syllabus (available at Blackboard course page under Syllabus) Fink, Chapter 1	Tuesday, May 25	~
Week 01 Instructional Media: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watch How high-performing teams communicate -- https://www.linkedin.com/learning/communication-within-teams/how-high-performing-teams-communicate?u=76870426 • Watch Establish roles -- https://www.linkedin.com/learning/communication-within-teams/establish-roles?u=76870426 • Watch Delegate responsibilities -- https://www.linkedin.com/learning/communication-within-teams/delegate-responsibilities?u=76870426 • Watch Becoming an Active Listener -- https://www.linkedin.com/learning/coaching-and-developing-employees-4/becoming-an-active-listener?u=76870426 (e.g., think about “WAIT — Why Am I Talking?”) • Watch Managing Difficult Personalities -- https://www.linkedin.com/learning/managing-teams-3/managing-difficult-personalities-on-your-team?u=76870426 (e.g., “empathize” and “keeping your emotions in check”) 	Tuesday, May 25	~
Week 01 Zoom session (will be recorded): Overview on evaluation and syllabus	Saturday, May 22 starting at 9 am Pacific	~
Week 01 Individual Assignment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion Board: Self introductions and program/policy interests • Complete course baseline student survey • Select or initiate a team for the Program and Policy Evaluation Projects (maximum of 5 individuals per team) via Blackboard Groups 	Sunday, May 23 by 11:59 pm Sunday, May 23 by 11:59 pm Pacific Tuesday, May 25 by 11:59 pm	1 ~ ~

Week 02: May 26-June 1 Understanding and Developing Logic Models		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<i>Reading:</i> Fink, chapter 1 (focus on logic models) CDC brief on logic models: https://www.cdc.gov/eval/logicmodels/index.htm	Tuesday, June 1	~
Week 02 Instructional Media: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RAND tutorial on logic models: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w1AY30Jwr7Y CDC tutorial on logic models: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2HrG5ButP_g RAND toolkit for logic model on countering violent extremism: https://www.rand.org/pubs/tools/TL243.html 	Tuesday, June 1	~
Week 02 Zoom session (will be recorded): Explanation of logic models and overview of team work	Saturday, May 29 starting at 9 am Pacific	~
Week 02 Team task with instructor feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select a program to develop an evaluation plan, and email to instructor for approval (Imtakaha@usc.edu; instructor needs to approve selection before next step) 	Tuesday, June 1 by 11:59 pm	~

Week 03: June 2-8 Evaluation Design: Evaluation Questions and Process Evaluation		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<i>Reading:</i> Fink, chapters 2-3	Tuesday, June 8	~
<p>Week 03 Instructional Media:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC on indicators (focus on process): https://www.cdc.gov/eval/indicators/index.htm • SAMSHA on fidelity to implementation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DG8BeErPReg (start at 4:00 minutes) • Sharma, S., et al. (2017). A process evaluation plan for assessing a complex community-based maternal health intervention in Ogun State, Nigeria. <i>BMC health services research</i>, 17(1), 238. Available at: https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-017-2124-4 and in the Content folder on the Blackboard page. • Saunders, R. P., Evans, M. H., & Joshi, P. (2005). Developing a process-evaluation plan for assessing health promotion program implementation: a how-to guide. <i>Health promotion practice</i>, 6(2), 134-147. Available at: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1524839904273387 and in the Content folder on the Blackboard page. • CDC: https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/stateandcommunity/tobacco_control_programs/surveillance_evaluation/quitline-workbook/pdfs/conducting-quitline-evaluations-508tagged.pdf (Introduction and Part I, pp. 1-56) 	Tuesday, June 8	~
Week 03 Zoom session (will be recorded): Questions about logic models; overview on process evaluation and fidelity	Saturday, June 5 starting at 9 am Pacific	~

Week 04: June 9-15 Evaluation Design: Outcomes and Impact Evaluation		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<i>Reading:</i> Fink, chapters 4-6 CDC indicators (focus on outcome and impact indicators): https://www.cdc.gov/eval/indicators/index.htm	Tuesday, June 15	~
Week 04 Instructional Media: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> World Bank on impact evaluation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HEJIT8t5ezU SAMSHA on Native Connections: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7TtAarPtOVI 	Tuesday, June 15	~
Week 04 Zoom session (will be recorded): Overview on outcomes and impact evaluation	Saturday, June 12 starting at 9 am Pacific	~
Week 04 Team Assignment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Board: Develop each element of the logic model using evidence about the program available via public sources, and post draft PowerPoint slide deck to Blackboard Discussion Board Revise and submit PowerPoint slide deck given Discussion Board feedback using two step submission process 	Friday, June 11 by 11:59 pm Tuesday, June 15 by 11:59 pm Pacific	~ 5
Week 04 Individual Assignment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Board: Provide supportive feedback to at least one team PowerPoint slide deck on Discussion Board Journal Entry: Complete entry on reflections on team work and logic models 	Saturday, June 12 by 11:59 pm Pacific Sunday, June 13 by 11:59 pm	1 2

Week 05: June 16-22 Evaluation Design: Collecting Pilot Data to Test Instruments (Questionnaires, Interview Guides)/ Data Validation		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<i>Reading:</i> Fink, chapters 5-6 (review survey and interview methods)	Tuesday, June 22	~
Week 05 Instructional Media: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike Dronker on conducting interviews: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WDOQBPYEaNs Frances Chumney on survey instruments and questionnaires: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LhFLr9i2uw0 	Tuesday, June 22	~
Week 05 Zoom session (will be recorded): Testing my survey questions, interview questions, or archival data collection strategy	Saturday, June 19 starting at 9 am Pacific	~
Week 05 Individual Assignment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Board: post to Discussion Board on your preliminary process evaluation plan for your specific program, including the evaluation design, and data collection and analysis plan (initial post by you, post supportive feedback to another student's post that does not already have a comment) 	<u>Initial post</u> by: Friday, June 18 by 11:59 pm Pacific <u>Post supportive feedback to another draft without feedback</u> by: Saturday, June 19 by 11:59 pm Pacific	1

Week 07: June 30-July 8 Team Program Evaluation Plans		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<i>Reading:</i> None	~	~
Week 07 Zoom session (will be recorded): Q&A about pilot data and team evaluation plans	Saturday, July 3 starting at 9 am Pacific	~
Week 07 Individual Assignment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mid-term Anonymous Course Evaluation: Complete mid-term course evaluation (via Blackboard Assignments tab) 	Tuesday, July 8 by 11:59 pm	~

Week 08: July 7-13
Evaluation Design: Policy Evaluation Design Introduction

Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<p><i>Reading:</i> CDC: Overview of Policy Evaluation: https://www.cdc.gov/injury/pdfs/policy/Brief%201-a.pdf</p> <p>OECD definition: https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/oecd-framework-for-regulatory-policy-evaluation_9789264214453-en#page9 (ch 1-2, pp. 23-40)</p> <p>California legislative process: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/bil2lawx.html</p>	Tuesday, July 13	~
<p>Week 08 Instructional Media:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> California Department of Finance analyses of bills for fiscal impact and alignment with Governor priorities: http://www.dof.ca.gov/legislative_analyses/ Database for California legislative analyses of current bills: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billSearchClient.xhtml 	Tuesday, July 13	~
Week 08 Zoom session (will be recorded): Overview of policy evaluation	Saturday, July 10 starting at 9 am Pacific	~

Week 09: July 14-20 Evaluation Design: Policy Implementation Evaluation		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<i>Reading:</i> CDC report on using evaluation for policy process: https://www.cdc.gov/policy/analysis/process/docs/usingevaluationtoinformcdcspolicyprocess.pdf CDC brief on implementation evaluation: https://www.cdc.gov/injury/pdfs/policy/Brief%204-a.pdf	Tuesday, July 20	~
Week 09 Zoom session (will be recorded): Explanation of policy evaluation model and overview of team work	Saturday, July 24 starting at 9 am Pacific	~
Week 09 Individual Assignment: Pilot Data and Analysis Memo <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion Board: post draft pilot data and analysis memo • Discussion Board: post supportive feedback to at least one draft that does not already have feedback • Pilot data and analysis memo due via two step submission process • Journal: complete journal entry on reflections on pilot data, data validation 	Friday, July 16 by 11:59 pm Saturday, July 17 by 11:59 pm Tuesday, July 20 by 11:59 pm Tuesday, July 20 by 11:59 pm	~ 1 20 2

Week 10: July 21-27 Evaluation Design: Policy Impact and Outcome Evaluation Design		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
<p><i>Reading:</i> Legislative Analyst's Office analysis of California Air Resources Board cap and trade policy: https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2012/rsr/cap-and-trade/cap-and-trade-020912.pdf</p> <p>World Bank on impact evaluation: https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sief-trust-fund/publication/impact-evaluation-in-practice (please review Part 1, Chapter 1)</p>	Tuesday, July 27	~
<p>Week 10 Instructional Media:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> California State Library, California Research Bureau Reports: https://www.library.ca.gov/crb/reports/ 	Tuesday, July 27	~
Week 10 Zoom session (will be recorded): Overview of policy evaluation design	Saturday, July 24 starting at 9 am Pacific	~
<p>Week 10 Team proposal with instructor feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select a policy to develop an evaluation plan, and email to instructor (lmtakaha@usc.edu; instructor needs to approve selection of policy) 	Saturday, July 24 by 11:59 pm Pacific	~
Week 10 Team Assignment: Team Final Program Evaluation Plan memo due using two step submission process	Tuesday, July 27 by 11:59 pm Pacific	15

Week 11: July 28-August 3 Evaluation Design: Policy Evaluation Q&A		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
Week 11 Zoom session (will be recorded): questions on policy evaluation plan memo	Saturday, July 31 starting at 9 am Pacific	~
Week 11 Team Assignment: Policy Evaluation Plan slide deck <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop content, implementation, and preliminary impact elements of policy evaluation plan using publicly available evidence, and post PowerPoint slide deck to Blackboard Discussion Board Revise and submit PowerPoint slide deck given feedback from class using two step submission process 	Friday, July 30 by 11:59 pm Pacific Tuesday, August 3 by 11:59 pm Pacific	~ 5
Week 11 Individual Assignment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Board: Provide feedback to at least one team PowerPoint slide deck on Discussion Board Journal: complete journal entry on reflections on team work and policy content, implementation, and preliminary impact evaluation plan 	Saturday, July 31 by 11:59 pm Pacific Tuesday, August 3 by 11:59 pm Pacific	1 2

Week 12: August 4-10 Team Policy Evaluation		
Learning Activity	Due Date	Point Value
Week 12 Zoom session (will be recorded): Q&A on final team policy evaluation plan	Saturday, August 7, starting at 9 am Pacific	~
Week 12 Individual Assignment: Policy Evaluation Plan memo due <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion Board: Post draft of individual policy evaluation plan to Discussion Board • Discussion Board: Post supportive feedback to at least one draft that does not already have feedback on Discussion Board • Revised policy evaluation plan memo due via two step submission process 	Saturday, August 7 by 11:59 pm Pacific Sunday, August 8 by 11:59 pm Tuesday, August 10 by 11:59 pm	~ 1 20
Week 12 Other Individual Assignments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online course evaluation (link has been sent to you via email) • End of course survey • Journal entry: complete journal entry on reflections on class, go back through all journal entries and summarize important takeaways 	Complete all by Tuesday, August 10 by 11:59 pm	~ ~ 2

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, policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct.

Support Systems:

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

engemannshc.usc.edu/counseling

Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention.

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1 (800) 273-8255 – 24/7 on call

suicidepreventionlifeline.org

Free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

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

engemannshc.usc.edu/rsvp

Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm.

Office of Equity and Diversity (OED) | Title IX - (213) 740-5086

equity.usc.edu, titleix.usc.edu

Information about how to get help or help a survivor of harassment or discrimination, rights of protected classes, reporting options, and additional resources for students, faculty, staff, visitors, and applicants. The university prohibits discrimination or harassment based on the following protected characteristics: race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, age, physical disability, medical condition, mental disability, marital status, pregnancy, veteran status, genetic information, and any other characteristic which may be specified in applicable laws and governmental regulations.

Bias Assessment Response and Support - (213) 740-2421

studentaffairs.usc.edu/bias-assessment-response-support

Avenue to report incidents of bias, hate crimes, and microaggressions for appropriate investigation and response.

The Office of Disability Services and Programs - (213) 740-0776

dsp.usc.edu

Support and accommodations for students with disabilities. Services include assistance in providing readers/notetakers/interpreters, special accommodations for test taking needs, assistance with architectural barriers, assistive technology, and support for individual needs.

USC Support and Advocacy - (213) 821-4710

studentaffairs.usc.edu/ssu

Assists students and families in resolving complex personal, financial, and academic issues adversely affecting their success as a student.

Diversity at USC - (213) 740-2101

diversity.usc.edu

Information on events, programs and training, the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council, Diversity Liaisons for each academic school, chronology, participation, and various resources for students.

USC Emergency - UPC: (213) 740-4321, HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu, emergency.usc.edu

Emergency assistance and avenue to report a crime. Latest updates regarding safety, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible.

USC Department of Public Safety - UPC: (213) 740-6000, HSC: (323) 442-120 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu

Non-emergency assistance or information.

ASPA Code of Ethics

(<https://www.aspanet.org/ASPA/About-ASPA/Code-of-Ethics/ASPA/Code-of-Ethics/Code-of-Ethics.aspx?hkey=feba3e2-a9dc-4fc8-a686-3446513a4533>)

The American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) advances the science, art, and practice of public administration. The Society affirms its responsibility to develop the spirit of responsible professionalism within its membership and to increase awareness and commitment to ethical principles and standards among all those who work in public service in all sectors. To this end, we, the members of the Society, commit ourselves to uphold the following principles:

- 1. Advance the Public Interest.** Promote the interests of the public and put service to the public above service to oneself.
- 2. Uphold the Constitution and the Law.** Respect and support government constitutions and laws, while seeking to improve laws and policies to promote the public good.
- 3. Promote democratic participation.** Inform the public and encourage active engagement in governance. Be open, transparent and responsive, and respect and assist all persons in their dealings with public organizations.
- 4. Strengthen social equity.** Treat all persons with fairness, justice, and equality and respect individual differences, rights, and freedoms. Promote affirmative action and other initiatives to reduce unfairness, injustice, and inequality in society.
- 5. Fully Inform and Advise.** Provide accurate, honest, comprehensive, and timely information and advice to elected and appointed officials and governing board members, and to staff members in your organization.
- 6. Demonstrate personal integrity.** Adhere to the highest standards of conduct to inspire public confidence and trust in public service.
- 7. Promote Ethical Organizations:** Strive to attain the highest standards of ethics, stewardship, and public service in organizations that serve the public.
- 8. Advance Professional Excellence:** Strengthen personal capabilities to act competently and ethically and encourage the professional development of others.

USC Code of Ethics

(<https://policy.usc.edu/ethics/>)

At the University of Southern California, ethical behavior is predicated on two main pillars: a commitment to discharging our obligations to others in a fair and honest manner, and a commitment to respecting the rights and dignity of all persons. As faculty, staff, students, and trustees, we each bear responsibility not only for the ethics of our own behavior, but also for building USC's stature as an ethical institution.

We recognize that the fundamental relationships upon which our university is based are those between individual students and individual professors; thus, such relationships are especially sacred and deserve special care that they not be prostituted or exploited for base motives or personal gain.

When we make promises as an institution, or as individuals who are authorized to speak on behalf of USC, we keep those promises, including especially the promises expressed and implied in our Role and Mission Statement. We try to do what is right even if no one is watching us or compelling us to do the right thing.

We promptly and openly identify and disclose conflicts of interest on the part of faculty, staff, students, trustees, and the institution as a whole, and we take appropriate steps to either eliminate such conflicts or ensure that they do not compromise the integrity of the individuals involved or that of the university.

We nurture an environment of mutual respect and tolerance. As members of the USC community, we treat everyone with respect and dignity, even when the values, beliefs, behavior, or background of a person or group is repugnant to us. This last is one of the bedrocks of ethical behavior at USC and the basis of civil discourse within our academic community. Because we are responsible not only for ourselves but also for others, we speak out against hatred and bigotry whenever and wherever we find them.

We do not harass, mistreat, belittle, harm, or take unfair advantage of anyone. We do not tolerate plagiarism, lying, deliberate misrepresentation, theft, scientific fraud, cheating, invidious discrimination, or ill use of our fellow human beings — whether such persons be volunteer subjects of scientific research, peers, patients, superiors, subordinates, students, professors, trustees, parents, alumni, donors, or members of the public.

We do not misappropriate the university's resources, or resources belonging to others, which are entrusted to our care, nor do we permit any such misappropriation to go unchallenged.

We are careful to distinguish between legal behavior on the one hand and ethical behavior on the other, knowing that, while the two overlap in many areas, they are at bottom quite distinct from each other. While we follow legal requirements, we must never lose sight of ethical considerations. Because of the special bonds that bind us together as members of the Trojan Family, we have a familial duty as well as a fiduciary duty to one another. Our faculty and staff are attentive to the well-being of students and others who are entrusted to our care or who are especially vulnerable, including patients, volunteer subjects of research, and the children in our daycare and community outreach programs.

By respecting the rights and dignity of others, and by striving for fairness and honesty in our dealings with others, we create an ethical university of which we can all be proud, and which will serve as a bright beacon for all peoples in our day and in the centuries to come.

For USC Student Code of Conduct, please see <https://sjacs.usc.edu/students/scampus/>.