

# Course Syllabus

University of Pennsylvania | School of Social Policy & Practice | Masters in Social Policy

**MSSP 629-001: Research and Evaluation Design**

**Wednesdays, 7:00-8:30 PM EST | Course Syllabus – Fall 2021**

**Course Instructor:** Alisha K. Martinez, Ph.D.

**Email:** [alishak@upenn.edu](mailto:alishak@upenn.edu) | **Phone:** 571.205.9239 | **Office hours:** Thursdays, 6:45-7:45pm EST

- Zoom link: <https://upenn.zoom.us/j/98412266619>

**Synchronous Sessions:** Wednesday, 7:00-8:30pm EST (Via Zoom) [please join at 6:45pm EST for additional social time/interacting if you wish]

- Zoom link: <https://upenn.zoom.us/j/93759832524>

In addition to attending synchronous sessions, students are expected to participate in 1 hour of asynchronous learning each week. Lectures and readings will be posted in Canvas on a weekly basis.

**Course Assistant:** Lauren Colby ([lcolby@upenn.edu](mailto:lcolby@upenn.edu))

- Office hours: TBD
- Zoom link: TBD (Links to an external site.)

## Course Purpose

This course introduces social research methods in the context of social policy and program evaluation. Students will learn about the application of the research process and skills in all phases of assessing a social policy and developing a social program, including needs assessment, implementation analysis, and evaluation of policy or program effectiveness. Students will learn to be critical consumers of research and to apply guidelines of research ethics in social policy settings. Students will have multiple opportunities to engage with the content, build their own learning in a community of practice, and apply guidelines of evaluation in their own evaluation proposal.

## Educational Objectives

This course is an introduction to methods and practice of program evaluation and performance measurement. By the end of the course, students should be able to:

1. Describe the difference between research and program evaluation;

2. Identify the key concepts in program evaluation;
3. Discuss the component parts of program evaluation within a working framework;
4. Create a logic model linking program components;
5. Design a basic program evaluation that is practical and feasible;
6. Critique and recommend practical improvements to existing or proposed program evaluations;
7. Design a basic performance measurement system to assess program/organizational processes or outcomes; and
8. Develop critical thinking skills for reviewing and interpreting peer-reviewed publications.

## Course Specifics

**Prerequisites.** This course assumes prior coursework or basic knowledge of research methods.

**Expectations.** Classroom learning is a group activity that depends upon everyone's full participation in order to succeed. Students are expected to be prepared to begin class virtually on time; silence or turn off and put away cell phones and other electronic devices; complete assigned readings prior to class and be prepared to discuss content in class; submit assignments at the start of class; and assist classmates. In return, students can expect that the instructor will be on time; be prepared for every class; be available via email between classes; be available for office hours; make every class engaging and valuable; and respect student contributions.

**Course Format.** The course will incorporate diverse learning activities including pre-recorded lectures by the instructor, student presentations and discussion, and self-study. In addition to classroom attendance and participation, students are expected to complete readings, whole class and small group discussions, internet research, analyses of readings, and reflections on practice.

## Required Text and Readings

This course will use the following text: Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H. (2018). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (8<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

The course also requires students read the following articles. Two or three students will lead a facilitated discussion during one class period and all students are expected to read the article before class so they can actively participate in the facilitated discussion led by their peer(s).

**Reading 1:** Resnik, D. (2020). What is ethics in research and why is it important? National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.

**Reading 2:** Thomas, V. & McKie, B. (2006). Collecting and utilizing evaluation research for public good and on behalf of African American Children. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 75(3), 341-352.

**Reading 3:** W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2001). Logic model development guide. Battle Creek, MI. (Ch. 1-2)

**Reading 4:** W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2001). Logic model development guide. Battle Creek, MI. (Ch. 3-4)

**Reading 5:** Regional Community Health Needs Assessment – Executive Summary.

**Reading 6:** Rogers, P. (2008) Using program theory to evaluate complicated and complex aspects of evaluations. *Evaluation*, 14(1), 29-48.

**Reading 7:** Urban Institute (2002). Findings from a symposium: How and why non-profit use outcome information.

**Reading 8:** Martin, R. & Van Gunten, D. (2002). Reflected identifies. Applying positionality and multicultural social reconstructionism in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 44-54.

### **Attendance and Class Participation**

This class will meet synchronously on Wednesdays from 7-8:00 pm via Zoom. Please see p. 1 of the Syllabus for the Zoom meeting link. In addition to attending our synchronous, virtual session, students are also expected to participate in 1 hour of asynchronous learning by watching videos posted in Canvas, reviewing PowerPoint presentations posted in Canvas, and posting on the discussion board. Classroom learning is a fundamental component of your professional education and full and active participation in all classroom exercises and activities is required to pass the course. Attendance is, therefore, required at all classes and mandatory for a passing grade. If you cannot attend class, you are to notify your class instructor **prior** to the class session. Email is the desired form of communication. If an emergency arises and you must miss class, please contact the instructor as soon as reasonably possible. Two or more missed classes will require a make-up assignment to demonstrate the content was reviewed and learned and may impact a student's ability to receive a passing grade in the class.

### **Academic Integrity**

Students are expected to conduct themselves consistent with the University of Pennsylvania's Code of Academic Integrity, which presents standards regarding plagiarism, multiple submissions and other actions. Students are expected to be familiar with the Code, which can be found at <http://www.vpul.upenn.edu/osl/acadint.html>.

### **Grading policy**

Please see the instructor as soon as possible in the semester if you require formal accommodations through the Office of Students with Disabilities or informal accommodations that can be arranged on a situation-by-situation basis. Please also indicate if you anticipate having any problems completing assignments for any reasons. The late assignment policy is stated below. Exceptions to this late penalty are rare and up to the discretion of the course instructor. Plagiarism and other forms of student misconduct will automatically result in an "F" in the course.

### **Policy on Late Assignments**

All assignments will be penalized 10% of the possible points *for each day* of tardiness. Students should contact the instructor **at least three days prior** to the due date if there are extenuating circumstances. For such circumstances, new dates may be negotiated. Students who miss class when an assignment is due should e-mail the assignment prior to class by the due date.

### Final Grade

Points are given for all assignments completed outside of class. The following distribution will be used for grading:

A+ 98 -100	B 83 -86	C-70 -72
A 93 -97	B-80 -82	D 60 – 70
A-90 -92	C+ 77 -79	F under 60
B+ 87 -89	C 73 – 76	

**Course Assignments.** There are five assignments required in this course. This course is organized such that the completion of all assignments can be developed as the course progresses.

**Assignment #1: Facilitate a Discussion.** Student presenters will facilitate a 20-minute discussion on Reading 1-8 with the whole class during a synchronous class session. Facilitators are expected to incorporate 2 technology tools (e.g., Google Slides, Jamboard, Mentimeter, Padlet) to maximize student participation and receive full credit. Students are expected to work independently or with their fellow presenters ahead of time, test out technology tools, and share in the facilitation of the discussion. **This discussion will take place during the semester and accounts for 10% of your grade. (15 points possible)**

**Assignment #2: Description of Program & Logic Model.** Students should adequately describe the program they will be evaluating, present the program’s theory of action, and depict the program as a logic model. Students will learn about the format of logic models prior to the submission date of this assignment. Students should reach out to the program’s staff to see if an informational conversation can take place prior to the assignment due date to receive feedback on Assignment #2. While not required nor will points be deducted if this conversation does not take place, it is highly recommended to ensure clarity on the student’s part about the program’s theory of action. **Paper should follow APA format. This assignment is due October 13 and accounts for 10% of your grade. (15 points possible)**

**Assignment #3: Program Evaluation Article Critique.** Students should critique a program evaluation that is described in a peer-reviewed publication. Preferably this program evaluation is on the specific program selected in Assignment #2 or an equivalent/similar program. If students are unable to find a program evaluation on the program (or similar program) selected for Assignment #2, students may use a publication provided by the instructor or a peer-reviewed study that used an evaluation approach selected by the student. **Paper should follow APA format. This assignment is due November 3 and accounts for 20% of your grade.**

**Assignment #4: Program Evaluation Proposal.** Students will complete proposal for their proposed program evaluation of the program selected in Assignment #2. The contents of the proposal should be informed by the rubric for this assignment and were largely adapted by Chapter 11 in the course textbook. Students should reach out to the program’s staff to see if another informational conversation can take place prior to the assignment due date to receive feedback on Assignment #4. While not required nor will points be deducted if this conversation does not take place, it is highly recommended to ensure that the proposed evaluation would provide meaningful information to the program. **Paper should follow APA format.** **This assignment is due on December 1 and accounts for 30% of your grade.**

**Assignment #5: Presentation.** Students will complete a presentation on his/her evaluation proposal. The duration of the presentation will be determined by the class size, but class presentations are anticipated to take place on the final two classes. If the class is larger in size, the class presentations may be extended over three classes. This assignment is intended to simulate an evaluator pitching his/her evaluation proposal to an evaluation sponsor. The instructor will invite students to select the date in which they would like to present prior to December 1<sup>st</sup>. The PowerPoint presentation for this assignment should be posted in Canvas no later than 11:59pm on December 1<sup>st</sup> to receive full credit. **This assignment is due on December 8. Student presentations will take place on December 8 and December 14 or 15 (depending on which makeup day we select for the November 24th class when we will not meet) and accounts for 10% of your grade.**

**Class participation** accounts for **20% of your grade.** This grade is determined based on class attendance, engagement in class activities (such as student presentations, class activities facilitated by the instructor, and questions asked in class), and contributions on the discussion board.

**Class Schedule (Tentative)**

Class	Date	Topic	Textbook	Reading	Assignments Due
1	Sept 1	Course overview What is program evaluation? Community builder (Part 1) Presentation schedule			Post to discussion board Explore technology tools (Padlet, Jamboard, Google slides)
2	Sept 8	Ethics Community Builder (Part 2) Facilitated discussion	Ch. 1	Reading 1	

<b>3</b>	<b>Sept 15</b>	Deliverables & stakeholders	Ch. 12	Reading 2	
<b>4</b>	<b>Sept 22</b>	Planning an evaluation	Ch. 11	Reading 3 (Ch. 1 & 2)	
<b>5</b>	<b>Sept 29</b>	Logic models		Reading 4 (Ch. 3 & 4)	
<b>6</b>	<b>Oct 6</b>	Logic models (cont'd) Assignment #2 Rubric Peer consultations			Post to discussion board Draft Assignment #2 to present in peer consultation
<b>7</b>	<b>Oct 13</b>	Needs assessment	Ch. 2	Reading 5	<b>Assignment 2 Due</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Oct 20</b>	Program theory and design Assignment #3 Rubric	Ch. 3	Reading 6	
<b>9</b>	<b>Oct 27</b>	Program implementation	Ch. 4	Reading 7	
<b>10</b>	<b>Nov 3</b>	Program outcomes Positionality	Ch. 5	Reading 8	<b>Assignment 3 Due</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Nov 10</b>	Impact evaluation Assignment #4 Rubric	Read one of the following: Ch. 6, 7, or 8		Post to discussion board

<b>12</b>	<b>Nov 17</b>	Cost benefit analysis Assignment #5 Rubric Peer consultations	Ch. 10		Post to discussion board Draft Assignment #4 to present in peer consultation
<b>13</b>	<b>Dec 1</b>	Course synthesis Peer consultations			<b>Assignment 4 Due</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Dec 8</b>				<b>Assignment 5 Due</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>Dec 14 or Dec 15 (Make Up day from Nov 24 class)</b>	Student Presentations			Post to discussion board

**Please note:** Students may be enrolling in the class through September 15<sup>th</sup>. Depending on the class size, we may need to have student presentations over three course sessions. If that happens, Assignment #4 would be shifted to be due on **November 17<sup>th</sup>** and student presentations would take place on **Nov. 24, Dec. 1 and Dec. 8**. There would also be shifts to the content planned for Nov. 10 and 17. More information will be shared once the class list is finalized. Thank you!

### **Additional Resources**

American Psychological Association. (2009) *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (6th edition)*. Washington, DC.

Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research. (Ch. 5, pp. 109-138, in *The SAGE Handbook of qualitative research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Cunliffe, A. (2003). Reflexive inquiry in organizational research: Questions and possibilities. *Human Relations*. Vol. 56(8), pp. 983-1003.

Dimitrov, D.M. (2008). *Quantitative Research in Education*. Whittier Publications. New York.

- Duckworth, A. & Yeager, D. (2015). Measurement matters: Assessing Personal Qualities other than cognitive ability for educational purposes. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 237-251.
- Fitzpatrick, J.L., Sanders, J.R. & Worthen, B.R. (2003). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. 3rd edition. New York: Pearson.
- Foster, E.M., Dodge, K.A., & Jones, D., (2003). Issues in the economic evaluation of prevention programs. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7(2), 74-84.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C. and A. Leon-Guerrero. *Social Statistics for a Diverse Society*, 8th Edition. SAGE: Los Angeles, CA.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers (3rd edition)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gravetter, F. & Wallnau, L. (2000). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences (5th edition)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Grembowski, D. (2003). *The practice of health program evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Haddix, A. C., Teutsch, S. M., & Corso, P. S. (Eds.). (2003). *Prevention effectiveness: A guide to decision analysis and economic evaluation (2nd edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, M. (2005). *Diagnosing organizations: Methods, models, and processes*. Thousand Oaks, VA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Healy, J. (2005). *Statistics a tool for social research*. Belmont, CA. Wadsworth Publishers.
- Hodges, B., & Videto, D. (2005) *Assessment and planning in health programs*. Sudbury, MS: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Hoefler, R. (1994). A good story well told: Rules for evaluating human service programs, *Social Work*, 39(2), 233-236.
- Knopf, J. (2006). *Doing a literature review*. *Political Science and Politics*, 39 (01): 127-132. [doi: 10.1017/S1049096506060264](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506060264) (Links to an external site.)
- McKenzie, J., & Smelter, J. (2001) *Planning, implementing and evaluating health promotion programs (3rd Ed)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Morris, M., & Cohn, R. (1993). Program evaluators and ethical challenges. *Evaluation Review*, 17(6), 621-642.
- Posavec, E.J. & Carey, R.G. (2006). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies. (6th edition)*. New York: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Roberts-Gray, C., Gingiss, P., & Boerm, M. (2007). Evaluating school capacity to implement new programs. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 30(3), 247-257.

Savaya, R. & Waysman, M. (2005). The logic model: A tool for incorporating theory in development and evaluation of programs. *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 29(2), 85-103.

Stufflebeam, D.L., Madaus, G.F., and Kellaghan, T. (eds.). (2000). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. (2nd edition). Boston: Kluwer.

Swanson, R. & Holton, E. (2005) *Research in organizations: Foundations and methods of inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Thomas, V. & Madison, A. (2010). Integration of social justice into the teaching of evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(3), 570-583.

Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wholey, J.S., Hatry, H.P., & Newcomer, K.E. (2010). *Handbook of practical program evaluation (3rd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wuenschel, P. (2006). The diminishing role of social work administrators in social service agencies: Issues for consideration. *Administration in Social Work*, 30(4), 5-18.

### **Acknowledgement**

This syllabus was informed by the School of Social Policy & Practice MSSP 629 course syllabi and several graduate-level data analysis courses taught by the instructor at George Mason University.

### **Rubrics**

Please find the rubrics that will be used to evaluate assignments on the remaining pages. Questions? Just ask!

**Assignment #1: Facilitate a Discussion (15 points)**

	<b>Ratings</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exemplary (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Below expectations (1 point)</b>
<b>Command of content</b>	Facilitator(s) had thorough understanding of the content and was poised when students asked questions.	Facilitator(s) had adequate understanding of the content.	Facilitator(s) did not appear to have adequate understanding of the content
<b>Organization</b>	All content was presented in a clear manner (e.g., slides had a good balance of pictures, facilitator(s) drove conversation and limited the amount of text on slides) and facilitators equally shared in the delivery of the discussion.	Most content was presented in a clear manner. However, the facilitators may not have equally shared in the delivery of the discussion.	Most content was presented in an unclear manner. Facilitators may not have equally shared in the delivery of the discussion.
<b>Opportunities for students to discuss content</b>	There were several opportunities for students to participate in the conversation. Students were invited to participate in the discussion/participate in a	There were some opportunities for students to participate in the conversation. The facilitators may not have leveraged two technology tools. The opportunity for students to engage in the conversation may have	There were little to no opportunities for students to participate in the conversation and the facilitators did not leverage two technology tools.

	technology tool early on in the discussion.	not happened early enough in the discussion.	
<b>Preparedness</b>	Facilitator(s) was/were prepared at the start of the class. Facilitator(s) ended the discussion within 30 minutes. Students worked collaboratively prior to the presentation.	Facilitator(s) was/were prepared at the start of class. However, the discussion exceeded 30 minutes and the instructor had to end the presentation. Students may not have worked collaboratively prior to the presentation.	Facilitator(s) may not have been prepared at the start of class. However, the discussion exceeded 30 minutes and the instructor had to end the presentation. Students may not have worked collaboratively prior to the presentation.
<b>Utilization of technology tools</b>	The facilitator(s) leveraged two different technology tools to maximize student engagement.	The facilitator(s) may have leveraged two technology tools to maximize student engagement, however, the facilitator(s) may not have adequately practiced the tools ahead of the discussion (e.g., changed settings to edit mode, practiced the technology tool ahead of time to ensure seamless delivery, etc.).	The facilitator(s) did not leverage two technology tools to maximize student engagement.

**Assignment #2: Description of Program & Logic Model (15 points)**

	<b>Ratings</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exemplary (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Below expectations (1 point)</b>
<b>Description of the program to be evaluated this semester</b> <i>(see chapter 3)</i>	Student took great care to present the program. Student presented a description of the program model, program goals, and objectives. Student stated the program's mission, vision, targeted population/participants, location(s), and what problem the program is trying to solve.	Student described the program, but more detail in one or more of the following: program's mission, vision, targeted population/participants, location(s), and what problem the program is trying to solve.	The program is not adequately described. Most of the following was not described: program's mission, vision, targeted population/participants, location(s), and what problem the program is trying to solve.
<b>Description of the program's theory of action</b> <i>(see chapter 3)</i>	Student took care to assess the program's theory by presenting how the program is structured and operated. <u>Program documents</u> and the program's website was consulted and cited. This work on the student's part signaled to the instructor that program documents were vetted and reviewed.	Program theory is presented in terms of how the program is structured and operated, but more detail would have strengthened this section. There may or may not have been citations of the program's website or other materials.	Content is not presented clearly. It is difficult to ascertain how the program is structured and operated. No citations were provided.
<b>Literature Review</b>	Student has comprehensively reviewed previous program evaluations and studies conducted on the program selected for this	Student has reviewed previous program evaluations and studies conducted on the program	Student has not presented previous program evaluations or studies on the program selected.

	assignment or a similar program. Student has drawn connections between these previous evaluations and possible directions for his/her current program evaluation study.	selected for this assignment; however, more detail would have strengthened this section.	
<p><b>Logic model (Content and format will be evaluated)</b></p> <p><i>(see chapter 3; Exhibit 3-H)</i></p>	<p><b>Content:</b> Student has taken great care to organize content by presenting the most salient information. Student has presented quantifiable metrics (e.g., 15 workshops) and direction (increase satisfaction in...)/decrease recidivism) in outcomes. Short/abbreviated phrases are found throughout. <b>Format:</b> Logic model appears in <u>one page</u> in <u>landscape format</u>. There are six components found including (1) problem statement (2) inputs (3) outputs (4) short-term outcomes (5) long-term outcomes (6) goal. Font size is reasonable/legible. Shading of cells or use of arrows/dotted lines was included to ease review.</p>	<p><b>Content:</b> Student has presented content, but full sentences or paragraphs appear. The content is quite verbose and could have been shortened. <b>Format:</b> Logic model appears in one page but is in portrait format. There may or may not be all six components found including There are six components found including (1) problem statement (2) inputs (3) outputs (4) short-term outcomes (5) long-term outcomes (6) goal. Font size may not be reasonable/legible. Shading of cells or use of arrows may or may not be evident.</p>	<p><b>Content:</b> Content is very hard to follow. There is not a logical connection between the components. <b>Format:</b> Logic model is more than one page. There may or may not be all six components found including There are six components found including (1) problem statement (2) inputs (3) outputs (4) short-term outcomes (5) long-term outcomes (6) goal. Font size may not be reasonable/legible. Shading of cells or use of arrows may or may not be evident.</p>
<p><b>Use of APA format, grammar, and punctuation</b></p> <p><i>(See Purdue OWL)</i></p>	<p>Student adhered to APA format throughout the paper No grammar or punctuation errors are evident. Paper is nicely organized.</p>	<p>Student has adhered to APA format for most of the assignment, however, there are minor errors. Limited to no grammar or punctuation errors.</p>	<p>Student has not adhered to APA format. There are several errors. There are several grammar and punctuation errors. Paper isn't organized and hard to follow.</p>

**Assignment #3: Program Evaluation Article Critique (50 points)**

	<b>Ratings</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exemplary (7-10 points)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (4-6 points)</b>	<b>Below expectations (0-4 points)</b>
<b>Named the topic, article, journal, author(s) name, and program being evaluated</b>	Student has provided the topic, name of the article, the name of the program evaluated, and provided the author(s) name(s). Student has attached the article as a PDF in Canvas along with his/her submission of Assignment #3.	Student has provided the name of the article, the name of the program evaluated, and provided the author(s) name(s) but did not attach the article in Canvas.	Student has not provided adequate information in this section and may or may not have attached the article in Canvas.
<b>Background</b>	Student has provided a comprehensive description of the problem the program is aiming to solve. Student took great care to present how pervasive this issue is by using metrics.	Student has provided an adequate description of the problem the program is aiming to solve.	Student has not provided an adequate description of the problem the program is aiming to solve.
<b>Methods</b>	Student has provided a comprehensive description of the type of evaluation approach conducted, the research questions guiding the program evaluation, the goal of the program evaluation, participants, data collection strategies, instruments/measures used in	Student has provided an adequate description of the type of evaluation approach conducted, the research questions guiding the program evaluation, the goal of the program evaluation, participants, data collection strategies, instruments/measures	Student has not provided an adequate description of the type of evaluation approach conducted, the research questions guiding the program evaluation, the goal of the program evaluation, participants, data collection strategies, instruments/measures used in the

	the evaluation, and any limitations of the study.	used in the evaluation, and any limitations of the study.	evaluation, and any limitations of the study.
<b>Results and Conclusions</b>	<p><b>Results:</b> Student has provided a clear description of the results of the evaluation and implications of the study. Student has taken great care to present the findings in table(s) or other figure(s) to ease the review of this section.</p> <p><b>Conclusions:</b> Student has presented the conclusions of the study and the implications of the study on future evaluation studies and/or policies.</p>	<p>Student has provided an adequate description of the results of the evaluation and implications of the study. Student has taken great care to present the findings in table(s) or other figure(s) to ease the review of this section. Student may have presented the conclusions of the study and the implications of the study on future evaluation studies and/or policies.</p>	<p>Student has not provided an adequate description of the results of the evaluation and implications of the study. Student has taken great care to present the findings in table(s) or other figure(s) to ease the review of this section. Student may have presented the conclusions of the study and the implications of the study on future evaluation studies and/or policies.</p>
<b>Use of APA format, grammar, and punctuation</b> <i>(See Purdue OWL)</i>	<p>Student adhered to APA format throughout the paper (e.g., proper in-text citations, headers, sub-headers, margins, font size, font type, etc.). No grammar or punctuation errors are evident. Paper is nicely organized.</p>	<p>Student has adhered to APA format for most of the assignment, however, there are minor errors. Limited to no grammar or punctuation errors.</p>	<p>Student has not adhered to APA format. There are several errors. There are several grammar and punctuation errors. Paper isn't organized and hard to follow.</p>

**Assignment #4: Program Evaluation Proposal (100 points)**

	<b>Ratings</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exemplary (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Below expectations (1 point)</b>
<p><b>Description of the program to be evaluated this semester</b> <i>(see Assignment #2)</i></p>	<p>Student took great care to present the program. Student presented a description of the program model, program goals, and objectives. Student stated the program's mission, vision, targeted population/participants, location(s), and what problem the program is trying to solve.</p>	<p>Student described the program, but more detail in one or more of the following: program's mission, vision, targeted population/participants, location(s), and what problem the program is trying to solve.</p>	<p>The program is not adequately described. Most of the following was not described: program's mission, vision, targeted population/participants, location(s), and what problem the program is trying to solve.</p>
<p><b>Description of the program's theory of action</b> <i>(see Assignment #2)</i></p>	<p>Student took care to assess the program's theory by presenting how the program is structured and operated. <u>Program documents</u> and the program's website was consulted and cited to show exhaustive research was done.</p>	<p>Program theory is presented in terms of how the program is structured and operated, but more detail would have strengthened this section.</p>	<p>Content is not presented clearly. It is difficult to ascertain how the program is structured and operated. No citations were provided.</p>
<p><b>Literature Review</b> <i>(see Assignment #2)</i></p>	<p>Student has comprehensively reviewed previous program evaluations and studies conducted on</p>	<p>Student has reviewed previous program evaluations and studies conducted on the program selected for this assignment; however,</p>	<p>Student has not presented previous program evaluations or studies on the program selected.</p>

	the program selected for this assignment.	more detail would have strengthened this section.	
<p><b>Logic model (Content and format will be evaluated)</b> (see Assignment #2)</p> <p><i>The logic model can be described and referenced in the narrative/body of the paper but should be found in the Appendix.</i></p>	<p><b>Content:</b> Student has taken great care to organize content by presenting the most salient information. Student has presented quantifiable metrics (e.g., 15 workshops) and direction (increase satisfaction in...)/decrease recidivism) in outcomes. Short/abbreviated phrases are found throughout. <b>Format:</b> Logic model appears in <u>one page</u> in <u>landscape format</u>. There are six components found including (1) problem statement (2) inputs (3) outputs (4) short-term outcomes (5) long-term outcomes (6) goal. Font size is reasonable/legible. Shading of cells or use of arrows/dotted lines was included to ease review.</p>	<p><b>Content:</b> Student has presented content, but full sentences or paragraphs appear. The content is quite verbose and could have been shortened. <b>Format:</b> Logic model appears in one page but is in portrait format. There may or may not be all six components found including There are six components found including (1) problem statement (2) inputs (3) outputs (4) short-term outcomes (5) long-term outcomes (6) goal. Font size may not be reasonable/legible. Shading of cells or use of arrows may or may not be evident.</p>	<p><b>Content:</b> Content is very hard to follow. There is not a logical connection between the components. <b>Format:</b> Logic model is more than one page. There may or may not be all six components found including There are six components found including (1) problem statement (2) inputs (3) outputs (4) short-term outcomes (5) long-term outcomes (6) goal. Font size may not be reasonable/legible. Shading of cells or use of arrows may or may not be evident.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Evaluation Purpose and Scope</b> (see Ch. 11)</p>	<p>Student has comprehensively described the proposed evaluation purpose and scope by clearly articulating the research questions, and research design. Student has included a clear description of stakeholders involved in the proposed evaluation. Student has named the</p>	<p>Student has adequately described the proposed evaluation purpose and scope by clearly articulating the research questions, research design, sample, and measures or observations.</p>	<p>Student has not described the proposed evaluation purpose and scope by clearly articulating the research questions, research design, sample, and measures or observations.</p>

	evaluation sponsor, program staff, and participants of the proposed study.		
<b>Data Collection, Acquisition, and Management</b> <i>(see Ch. 11)</i>	<p>Student has comprehensively described how he/she will obtain primary and secondary data sources. The proposed sample that will be involved is comprehensively described. The measures/instruments that will be used in the study (e.g., survey instrument, observation protocol, focus group protocol, etc.) are described in this section and the actual measures/instruments are included in the appendix. If qualitative data collection strategies are included, the <u>consent form</u> is described in this section and the actual consent form that will be used is included in the appendix. If the student is proposed to collect/analyze administrative data, these data are comprehensively described in this section. If a student will use software programs/tools to analyze data (e.g., STATA, SPSS, R, NVIVO, Excel, etc.) those programs are described here.</p>	<p>Student has adequately described how he/she will obtain primary and secondary data sources. The proposed sample is described in some detail. The measures/instruments that will be used in the study (e.g., survey instrument, observation protocol, focus group protocol, etc.) were briefly described in this section and the actual measures/instruments are included in the appendix. If qualitative data collection strategies are included, the <u>consent form</u> is described in this section and the actual consent form that will be used is included in the appendix. If the student is proposed to collect/analyze administrative data, these data are comprehensively described in this section. If a student will use software programs/tools to analyze data (e.g., STATA, SPSS, R, NVIVO, Excel, etc.) those programs are described here.</p>	<p>There is limited description of how the student will obtain primary and secondary data in the proposed evaluation study.</p>

<p><b>Communication Plan</b></p>	<p>Student has taken great care to describe a variety of communication tools (e.g., Full report, executive summary, infographics, briefings, presentations, etc.) that he/she will use to convey the findings of the proposed evaluation. This section includes a narrative describing each of these communication tools and actual samples are provided for ALL proposed communication tools in the appendix.</p>	<p>Student adequately described the communication tools (e.g., Full report, executive summary, infographics, briefings, presentations, etc.) that he/she will use to convey the findings of the proposed evaluation. Samples are provided for some of the communication tools proposed in the study in the appendix.</p>	<p>There is limited description of the communication tools in the narrative. Samples may be provided in the appendix.</p>
<p><b>Project Management Plan</b></p>	<p>Student has included a project management plan that is described in the narrative and also as a <u>Gantt chart</u> (found in the Appendix) to convey: resources, equipment, facilities, and technical support that will be needed to implement the program evaluation. This plan should include the personnel involved (evaluator(s) and program staff), resources (equipment, facilities) that will support the completion of the evaluation, and the study timeline which is to include description of key milestones or major tasks to be completed during the evaluation. Please note that the proposed evaluation should be completed within 12 months, from start to finish, so the</p>	<p>Student has included a project management plan that is described in the narrative to convey: resources, equipment, facilities, and technical support that will be needed to implement the program evaluation. This plan should include the personnel involved (evaluator(s) and program staff), resources (equipment, facilities) that will support the completion of the evaluation, and the study timeline which is to include description of key milestones or major tasks to be completed during the evaluation. Please note that the proposed evaluation should be completed within 12 months, from start to finish, so the</p>	<p>There is limited description of the project management plan. The plan may exceed the 12-month project timeline.</p>

	plans that are found in the paper should align to a 12-month project timeline.	plans that are found in the paper should align to a 12-month project timeline.	
<b>Appendix</b>	<p>The appendix includes a cover page/table of contents that lists out all of the contents found in the appendix and corresponding page number. Logic model, sample measures/instruments, consent form (if applicable), observation protocol (if applicable), focus group protocol (if applicable), data analysis plan, Gantt chart displaying project management plan, and all proposed communication samples are evident.</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The appendix may include a cover page/table of contents that lists out all of the contents found in the appendix and corresponding page number, however, one or more of the following is missing or incomplete: Logic model, sample measures/instruments, consent form (if applicable to study), data analysis plan, Gantt chart, and all proposed communication samples.</p>	There is no appendix.
<b>Use of APA format, grammar, and punctuation</b> <i>(See Purdue OWL)</i>	Student adhered to APA format throughout the paper (e.g., proper in-text citations, headers, sub-headers, margins, font size, font type, etc.). No grammar or punctuation errors are evident. Paper is nicely organized.	Student has adhered to APA format for most of the assignment, however, there are minor errors. Limited to no grammar or punctuation errors.	Student has not adhered to APA format. There are several errors. There are several grammar and punctuation errors. Paper isn't organized and hard to follow.

**Assignment #5: Presentation (15 points)**

	<b>Ratings</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exemplary (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets expectations (2 points)</b>	<b>Below expectations (1 point)</b>
<b>Preparation</b>	Student was prepared with his/her presentation by displaying his/her screen at the start of his/her time and moving through the presentation in a steady manner.	Student was not prepared with his/her presentation by displaying his/her screen at the start of his/her time and may or may not have moved through the presentation in a steady manner.	Student was not prepared with his/her presentation by displaying his/her screen at the start of his/her time and did not move through the presentation in a steady manner.
<b>Content</b>	Student presented the most salient parts of his/her program evaluation proposal. The program was clearly described, the purpose of the study was described along with the type of evaluation, and research question(s) being explored. Some description of the data sources and analytic techniques were mentioned. Project timeline was presented along with one of the possible communication strategies.	Student presented the some of the salient parts of his/her program evaluation proposal. One of the following was missing: description of the program, the purpose of the study, type of evaluation, research question(s), data sources and analytic techniques, project timeline, and one possible communication strategies.	Several pieces of content were missing: description of the program, the purpose of the study, type of evaluation, research question(s), data sources and analytic techniques, project timeline, and one possible communication strategies.
<b>Command of content</b>	Student had thorough understanding of his/her proposed evaluation plan and clearly conveyed it to the class.	Student had conveyed his/her proposed evaluation, but parts of the	Student did not appear to have a thorough understanding of his/her proposed evaluation plan and most of

	Student was confident as he/she delivered the material.	presentation were slightly unclear or poorly presented.	the presentation was presented in an unclear manner making it difficult to follow/understand.
<b>Poise during presentation</b>	Student displayed poise throughout the entire presentation and masterfully fielded questions from peers and provided clear responses/answers.	Student displayed poise for most of the presentation and adequately answered questions from peers.	Student did not display poise during the presentation and stumbled in his/her responses from questions posed by peers.
<b>Timeliness</b>	Student completed the presentation in the allotted time.	Student did not begin the presentation on time but did end on time.	Student did not begin the presentation on time, nor did he/she end the presentation on time.

## Discussion Board Prompts

<b>Class</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Textbook</b>	<b>Discussion Board Topic</b> <i>Please post your discussion board response at least 24 hours in advance of class to receive full credit.</i>
<b>1</b>	<b>Sept 1</b>	Course overview, tech tools, and class community builder		Class 1: Introductions
<b>6</b>	<b>Oct 6</b>	Logic models (cont'd), Assignment #2 rubric review, and peer consultations		Class 6: Logic models
<b>11</b>	<b>Nov 10</b>	Impact evaluation	Read one of the following: Ch. 6, 7, or 8	Class 11: Impact evaluation
<b>12</b>	<b>Nov 17</b>	Cost benefit analysis & peer consultations	Ch. 10	Class 12: Cost benefit analysis
<b>15</b>	<b>Dec 8</b>	Class presentations		Class 15: Takeaways

Dear Students,

I hope this email finds you well. I want to welcome you to MSSP 629 Research and Evaluation Design. I am looking forward to getting to know all of you this semester!

This will be my second year teaching this course at the School of Social Policy and Practice at Penn. I am an alum from the MSSP program and have been in the field of education for nearly 20 years. I invite you to review the course in Canvas which is now published. If the course seems like a good fit, there are a few things I'd like for you to do before our first class.

1. Order the textbook and review the syllabus in its entirety to learn about the course assignments and my expectations. Please reach out to me if you have any questions.
2. Plan to join the class in Zoom a few minutes early to ensure an on-time start. The Zoom link for our synchronous session is listed in Canvas in the syllabus.
3. Please contribute to the discussion board. The questions are: How did you get your name? What is the best piece of advice you have ever received? Why are you interested in taking this course? What is your proudest accomplishment? Finish this sentence: I believe in...
4. Gather and have ready on your device (laptop, desktop, iPad) a few images, photos, GIFs, Bitmoji's, etc. that you'd like to add to the Google slide for class introductions. Each of you will have 5 minutes during our synchronous class session to prepare your slide and 2 minutes to present. Having images at the ready will ensure everyone has completed his/her slide and is ready to present in a timely manner. Thank you for your support!

I look forward to reading your posts in the discussion board and learning more about you at our first class. Questions? Just ask! I hope you have a wonderful rest of the summer. Take good care.

All my best,

Dr. Martinez

e: [alishak@upenn.edu](mailto:alishak@upenn.edu)

c: (571) 205-9239