

Social Impact Measurement

NPLD 583

March 29 – April 30, 2021

Synchronous Lectures Mondays, 6 - 7:30 pm

<https://upenn.zoom.us/j/95135734809?pwd=bnJKZ3NvZTBIN3hYbzQ0Q3ZuTjU2QT09>

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

Instructor: Sidney Hargro, MDiv, MSME

Email: shargro@upenn.edu

Office Hours: By appointment

Phone: 856-375-4297

Instructor: Stephanie Fenniri, MS, MPA

Email: sfenniri@upenn.edu

Office Hours: By appointment

Phone: 214-794-4866

NOTE: *Please include both Instructors in each correspondence.*

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND FORMAT

The twofold purpose of social impact measurement is to assess and improve the impact of nonprofit programs and to offer actionable information for ongoing improvement. Social impact measurement is an essential learning opportunity for grantmaker and nonprofit partners. Developing an evaluation plan, instruments, and processes that are culturally responsive and equity informed will lead to actionable results and learning that will drive continuous improvement.

This course offers an overview of leading social impact measurement methodologies and tools in a format that includes asynchronous recorded video lectures, synchronous discussion lectures, readings, and practical assignments designed to teach the design and implementation of a social impact measurement plan.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

- Demonstrate an understanding of social impact measurement terminology and concepts;
- Demonstrate an understanding of logic models;
- Demonstrate understanding of major social impact measurement methods;
- Demonstrate understanding of how issues of social, cultural, and racial equity impact approaches to social impact measurement; and
- Demonstrate understanding regarding the implementation of social impact measurement plans.

ASSIGNMENT AND COURSE EVALUATION

Course grades are based on demonstrated knowledge about social impact measurement methodology, instruments, tools, and key concepts. Grades are calculated using the following grade scale and course component weighting.

Grade Scale

Letter	Range
A+	97-100
A	94-96.99
A-	90 - 93.99
B+	87 - 89.99
B	84 - 86.99
B-	80 - 83.99
C+	77 - 79.99
C	74 - 76.99
C-	70 - 73.99

Course Component Weighting

Assignments #1	10%
Assignments #2	10%
Assignment #3	25%
Discussion Board Posts (9)	45%
Student Engagement**	10%
Total	100%

**Student Engagement: All students are expected to attend all synchronous lectures and arrive in the session on time unless excused prior to class. Students are also expected to actively

participate in discussion during the lecture. A student engagement grade from 0 to 10 points will be given for each student.

STATEMENT ON 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 <https://catalog.upenn.edu/pennbook/code-of-academic-integrity/>

READINGS, VIDEOS, and RECORDED VIDEO LECTURES

All readings, recorded video lectures, and other videos are to be **completed by 6 pm at the start of the weekly synchronous lecture**. All required course readings will be available electronically on Canvas.

MAJOR ASSIGNMENTS AND DISCUSSION BOARDS BY DUE DATE

Week of March 29:

- Discussion Board Post#1: Review prompt provided in the syllabus under Module 1. Create one 250-word post reacting to the prompt. Post is **due on Friday, April 2, 2021 at 11:59 pm**.

Week of April 5:

- Assignment 1: Information Interview Questions **due on Monday, April 5, 2021 at 6:00 pm**.
- Discussion Board Post #2 and #3: Two 250-word peer review posts, one for a classmate submission from your group (same sample proposal) and one for a classmate submission from another group (different sample proposal) reacting to Assignment 1: Information Interview questions. Follow the prompt in Module 2. The two posts are **due on Friday, April 9, 2021 at 11:59 pm**.

Week of April 12

- Discussion Board Post #4 and #5 (see prompt below): Two 250-word post regarding bias and equity in philanthropy that affect social impact measurement following the prompt found in Module 3. The two posts are **due on Friday, April 16, 2021 at 11:59 pm**.

Week of April 19

- Assignment 2: Logic Model for Sample Program **due on Monday, April 19, 2021 at 6:00 pm**.
- Discussion Board Post #6 and #7: **Discussion Board Post #6 and #7: Two 250-word peer review posts, one for a classmate submission from your group (same sample proposal)**

and one for a classmate submission from another group (different sample proposal) reacting to Assignment 2: Logic Model for Sample Program. Follow the prompt in Module 4. The two posts are **due on Friday, April 23, 2021 at 11:59 pm.**

Week of April 26

- Assignment 3: Evaluation Critique **due on Monday, April 26, 2021 at 6:00 pm.**
- Discussion Board Post #8 and #9: Two 250-word peer review posts (one for any two peer submissions for Assignment 3: Evaluation Critique) following the prompt found in Module 5. The two posts are **due on Friday, April 30, 2021 at 11:59 pm.**

Module 1 (Week of 3/29): Introduction to Social Impact Measurement I

(Module 1 readings, recorded video lectures, and other videos are to be completed by 6 pm, March 29, 2021.)

Synchronous Lecture:

- Course Overview, Syllabus, [Assign groups and sample proposals](#)

Recorded Video Lectures and Other Videos:

- Social Impact Measurement: What is it?
- Visualizing the Path to Change (Theory of Change and Logic Model)
- Methodology at a Glance (Developmental, Formative, Summative)
- Key Questions: Preparing for the introductory information interview

Readings:

- Sample Proposals 1, 2, 3, and 4
- Theory of Change - Guided Example: Project Superwomen
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2012, January). Designing Evaluations (Publication No. GAO-12-208G) - Chapters 1- 2 Only
- Hogan, R. L. (2007). The historical development of program evaluation: Exploring past and present. *Online Journal for Workforce Education and Development*, 2(4), 5.

Major Assignments:

- None

Discussions Boards:

- Discussion Board Post #1: Read prompt below. Create one 250-word post regarding introductory concepts in social impact measurement **due on Friday, April 2 at 11:59 pm.**
- **Prompt:** After completing the readings, lectures, and synchronous class session, write a discussion post on Canvas that will spark further conversations about the course and its topics. The discussion post could focus on a) your overall impression of the information

presented this week and why they stood out; b) provide an example/quote(s) from the readings or lectures that you would like to further explore and why; c) list any comments or questions that you may have along with some context to help guide the discussion.

Module 2 (Week of 4/5): Introduction to Social Impact Measurement II

(Module 2 readings, recorded video lectures, and other videos are to be completed by 6 pm, April 5, 2021.)

Synchronous Lecture:

- Discussion: Information Interview Questions for 4 Sample Programs, Key Challenges and Appropriate Methodology, Zoom Group Discussion

Recorded Video Lectures and Other Videos:

- Developmental Evaluation
- Formative/Process Evaluation
- Summative/Outcome and Impact Evaluation
- [Evaluating Social Innovation \(Video\) – LINK](#)
- [Developmental evaluation as Alternative to Formative Assessment \(Video\) – LINK](#)

Readings:

- “Summative, Formative, Developmental” - a blog post by Molly Engle
- Types of Evaluation from CDC
- Introduction to Evaluation - Training Presentation - Part I: Ruth Mott Foundation Training Presentation
- Patton, M Q. “A World Larger Than Formative and Summative.” *The American journal of evaluation*. 17.2 (1996): 131–144.

Major Assignments:

- Assignment 1: Information Interview Questions **due on Monday, April 5, 2021 at 6:00 pm**. See Assignment Guides at the end of the syllabus.

Discussions Boards:

- Discussion Board Post #2 and #3 (see prompt below): Read and react to two peer submissions for Assignment 1, thereby producing two separate 250-word posts. Both posts are **due on Friday, April 9, 2021 at 11:59 pm**.
- **Prompt:** After posting your own Assignment 1, react to two classmates’ Assignment 1 submission. [One post for a classmate submission from your group \(same sample proposal\)](#) and [one for a classmate submission from another group \(different sample proposal\)](#). Try to select classmates who have not yet been discussed or who have few

respondents, as we want to expand our discussions as broadly as we can. In your discussion response, write about:

- A. Your overall reaction to their assignment response;
 - B. Any ideas or concepts that you would add or think about differently; and/or
 - C. Note any questions that the person's assignment brought up that you'd like the instructors to further address.
- This assignment is a way to learn from each other and get as many touches with the information as possible. Be sure to complete the prompt above with two different classmates' Assignment 1.

Module 3 (Week of 4/12): Equity Considerations in Social Impact Measurement

(Module 3 readings, recorded video lectures, and other videos are to be completed by 6 pm, Monday, April 12, 2021.)

Synchronous Lecture:

- Discussion: Equity issues in Social Impact Measurements, Zoom Group Discussion

Recorded Video Lectures and Other Videos:

- Bias and Equity in Philanthropy
- What is Equity-informed Social Impact Measurement?
- Equity-informed Logic Model
- [Ted Talk: The Urgency of Intersectionality | Kimberlé Crenshaw - LINK](#)
- [TED Talk: The Consciousness Gap in Education – LINK](#)
- [TED Talk: How America's Public Schools Keep Kids in Poverty - LINK](#)
- [TED Talk: The Problem with "Trickle-down Techonomics" - LINK](#)
- [The 1619 Project": Nikole Hannah-Jones on confronting the truth about slavery - LINK](#)

Readings:

- Zander, L. (2018). Desilencing Complexities: Addressing Categorization in Cross-Cultural Management with Intersectionality and Relationality. *International Studies of Management & Organization.*, 48(3), 294–313.
- Costa, E., & Pesci, C. (2016). Social impact measurement: Why do stakeholders matter? *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 7(1), 99-124.
- Dean-Coffey, J., & Casey, J. (2014). Raising the Bar-Integrating Cultural Competence and Equity: Equitable Evaluation. *The Foundation Review*, 6(2), pp. 81-94.
- "Why Am I Always Being Researched?" - A Guidebook for Community Organizations, Researchers, and Funders
- Equitable Evaluation Framing Paper - Luminare Group, Center for Evaluation Innovation, and Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy

- Potapchuk, M., Leiderman, S., Bivens, D., & Major, B. (2005). Flipping the script: White privilege and community building. Silver Springs, Md.: MP Associates, Inc., and the Center for Assessment and Policy Development (CAPD), Chapter 9: Doing Evaluation Differently (only)
- Sayer, K. (2002). Guidelines for Culturally Competent Evaluations prepared for Colorado Trust.
- “How can we avoid blaming the victim when we present information on poor outcomes for different racial, ethnic, language, or immigrant groups in our community?” - Racial Equity Tools Tip Sheets.

Major Assignments:

- None

Discussions Boards:

- Discussion Board Post #4 and #5 (see prompt below): Two-250-word post regarding bias and equity in philanthropy that affect social impact measurement **due on Friday, April 16, 2021 at 11:59 pm.**
- **Prompt:** After completing the readings, watching the videos, and this week’s class session, write two separate posts on bias and equity in philanthropy. The topic can be as broad or as narrow as your interests. Use these options to get you started: a) discuss a specific issue or concept of bias and/or equity (if you select bias only, then be sure to talk about equity in the next); b) highlight an example that exposes a specific issue of bias and/or equity in a philanthropy context and provide a response that helps to solve or prevent the issue; and/or c) pose questions, comments, or concerns about specific issues on bias or equity in philanthropy.

Module 4 (Week of 4/19): Evaluation Preparation, Planning, & Design

(Module 4 readings, recorded video lectures, and other videos are to be completed by 6 pm, Monday, April 19, 2021)

Synchronous Lecture:

- Discussion: Logic Models for 3 Sample Programs, Zoom Group Discussion

Recorded Video Lectures and Other Videos:

- Evaluation Components Matrix

Readings:

- Moura, L. F., Edson Pinheiro, d. L., Deschamps, F., Eileen, V. A., Sergio E Gouvea, d. C., Fernanda, T. T., & José Marcelo Almeida, P. C. (2019). Designing performance measurement systems in nonprofit and public administration

organizations. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 68(8), 1373-1410.

- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2012, January). Designing Evaluations (Publication No. GAO-12-208G) - Chapter 3 only
- Formative Case Study: Ragan, S. J. (2005). Conducting A Formative Evaluation Of A Materials Development Project. Case Examples of Project Evaluations
- Summative Case Study: Germuth, A. A. (2005). Evaluation Of An ATE Center: Assessing Components Of Student Impact of a Community College Adult Technical Education Program. Case Examples of Project Evaluations
- Developmental Case Study: Three Examples of Using Developmental Evaluation to Address Uncertainty from a Systems Perspective - American Evaluation Association
- *Optional*: NOAA Program Evaluation Guide (pp. 1-15)

Major Assignments:

- Assignment 2: Logic Model for Sample Program **due on Monday, April 19 at 6:00 pm.**

Discussions Boards:

- Discussion Board Post #6 and #7 (see prompt below): Two 250-word peer review posts (one for any two peer submissions for Assignment 2: Logic Model for Sample Program) **due on Friday, April 23, 2021 at 11:59 pm.**
- **Prompt:** After posting your own Assignment 2, select two classmates' assignments to react to. [One post for a classmate submission from your group \(same sample proposal\)](#) and [one for a classmate submission from another group \(different sample proposal\)](#) Try to select classmates who have not yet been discussed or who have few respondents, as we want to expand our discussions as broadly as we can. In your discussion response, write about:
 - A. Your overall reaction to their logic model strategy;
 - B. Any ideas or concepts that you would add or think about differently; and/or
 - C. Note any questions that the person's assignment brought up that you'd like the instructor or TA to further address.
- This assignment is a way to learn from each other and get as many touches with the information as possible. Be sure to complete the prompt above with two different classmates' Assignment 2.

Module 5 (Week of 4/26): Instrument Development

(Module 5 readings and recorded video lectures due by 6 pm, Monday, April 26, 2021.)

Synchronous Lecture:

- Discussion: Review of Case Studies, Zoom Group Discussion

Recorded Video Lectures and Other Videos:

- Developing Social Impact Measurement Tools and Indicators
- Evaluating Collective Approaches to Impact
- [Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness \(Video\) - LINK](#)

Readings:

- Barkman, S. "A Field Guide to Designing Quantitative Instruments to Measure Program Impact." *West Lafayette, IN: Purdue Extension* (2002).
- Introduction to Evaluation - Training Presentation - Part II: Ruth Mott Foundation Training Presentation
- Indicators of Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts in Security and Justice Programming (Section 3 and 4 Only)
- *Optional:* Preskill, H., Parkhurst, M., & Juster, J. (2014). Guide to evaluating collective impact, C1 01. FSG.

Major Assignments:

- Assignment 3: Evaluation Critique **due on Monday, April 26, 2021 at 6:00 pm.**

Discussions Boards:

- Discussion Board Post #8 and #9 (see prompt below): Two 250-word peer review posts (one for any two peer submissions for Assignment 3: Evaluation Critique) **due on Friday, April 30, 2021 at 11:59 pm.**
- Prompt: After posting your own Evaluation Critique, select two classmates' critiques to react to. Select two classmates, who you have not reacted to in previous discussions. Also, try to select classmates who have not yet been discussed or who have few respondents, as we want to expand our discussions as broadly as we can. In your discussion response, write about a) your overall reaction to their Evaluation Critique; b) any ideas or concepts that you would add or think about differently; and/or c) note any questions that your classmate's critique brought up that you'd like the instructor or TA to further address.
- Be sure to complete the prompt above with two different classmates' Evaluation Critique.

ASSIGNMENT GUIDES

Assignment 1: Information Interview Questions

Using the sample proposal that you were assigned, pretend you have set up an information interview for the program. Use the following guide to develop a set of specific questions you would want to ask at the initial information meeting.

Sample Proposals:

- Proposal 1
- Proposal 2
- Proposal 3
- Proposal 4

Generate a set of questions for each category using the questions to help you think about what you want to ask.

- I. Background
 - A. Is clarity needed regarding program purpose?
 - B. What do you need to know about staff, stakeholders, and/or partners?
 - C. What do you want to know about the approach, methods, and location of the program?
- II. Program
 - A. What do you need to know about program logistics?
 - B. What do you need to know about the target audience?
 - C. What do you need to know about the community?
 - D. Are there aspects of the program that are unclear in the sample proposal?
 - E. What do you need to know about the funders?
 - F. What do you need to know about how the program is funded?
- III. Current Evaluation Methods
 - A. What do you want to know about current practices?
 - B. Are there terms that need to be defined?
 - C. What do you need to know about the success of the program?

Assignment 2: Logic Model

This assignment will provide the opportunity for students to practice developing a logic model. Using the same sample proposal that your group was given for Assignment 1, develop a logic model. Be sure to review the difference between outputs and outcomes, and make sure that your outcomes depict an expected change. Use the following format:

Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impact

Assignment 3: Evaluation Critique

The objective of this assignment is to critique a social impact measurement plan. As you read the plan, think about its strengths and weaknesses. Evaluation plans inherently have flaws. Therefore, it helps to think critically when reviewing the approach, design, methodology, and instruments of evaluation plans. It is also important to recognize that while the plan may have flaws, sometimes it produces the best information available to determine how well the program is working. Prepare a concise 5- to 7-page critique of the evaluation report, *Changing Lives of Girls: Evaluation of The African Girls' Education Initiative*. The assignment should be typed with a 11-pt. font and double spaced.

The critique should include:

- I. **Evaluation and Program Overview** - Summarize the program in a few sentences including but not exclusive to program offerings, target audience, frequency and of offerings, length of time for each segment, and total number of weeks (ex. The program is offered at four locations and consists of a total of 8 weekly classes, each 45 minutes in length and serving 100 students.)
- II. **Methodology** - Summarize the methodology used in the report and why you think it was chosen. Was it formative or summative (or both)? What were the goals of the evaluation report?
- III. **Strengths** - What were the strengths of the evaluation plan design? Some of the following areas may be strengths of the report:
 - A. Format/Organization/Readability
 - B. Size/Scope
 - C. Methodology
 - D. Voice - Is the language accessible to a wide audience of stakeholders?
 - E. Recommendations
 - F. Clarity
 - G. Instruments
- IV. **Weaknesses** - What were the weaknesses of the evaluation plan design? Some of the following areas may be weaknesses of the report:
 - A. Format/Organization/Readability
 - B. Size/Scope
 - C. Methodology
 - D. Voice - Is the language accessible to a wide audience of stakeholders?
 - E. Recommendations
 - F. Clarity
 - G. Instruments
- V. **Equity** - How well were issues of equity addressed in the design, approach, or implementation of the evaluation?
- VI. **Questions** - Discuss any lingering questions that you feel were not addressed or answered (if any).