



University of Arkansas at Little Rock

PADM 7380

Public Program Evaluation (Elective)

Spring 2018

Instructor: Dr. Derek Slagle

Class meets: Thursday 6:00pm - 8:40pm

Class location: Ross Hall 313 (Lecture)

Office hours: Thursday 5:00-6:00pm or by appointment

Office: Ross Hall #631

Email: drslagle@ualr.edu

Course Description:

Techniques for evaluating how well public programs work and what sort of research is most helpful to managers who want to improve them; formal research design, process evaluations, and impact evaluations; final project requires the evaluation of public or non-profit program.

Course Objectives:

Program evaluation is a critical component in designing and operating effective programs. Evaluations supply information to program managers and policymakers that can assist them in making decisions about which programs to fund, modify, expand, or eliminate. This course provides an overview of the “nuts and bolts” of evaluation methodology and evaluation tools commonly used to assess publicly funded programs.

Learning Outcomes:

At the end of this course, students will know how to:

- Articulate the concepts, methods, and applications of evaluation research
- Read evaluation research critically
- Use evaluation results to anticipate or improve program performance
- Propose an appropriate evaluation plan to assess the implementation and effectiveness of a program.

Required Text:

Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, 8th Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

In addition to the required text, you will have additional weekly readings (mainly articles/case studies). These will be uploaded to Blackboard.

Course Requirements:

All assignments should be submitted via Blackboard by 6pm on the due date. Late assignments will only be accepted under extreme circumstances and, dependent upon how late, will be given partial credit or no credit.

Class Attendance & Participation:

Please come prepared to contribute to class discussion by synthesizing the readings, integrating discussion about your course project or other work, and providing thoughtful feedback on the work of other students. You should be prepared to answer discussion questions about the assigned readings. Be ready to learn from others by holding yourself and others to high standards for analysis while honoring differences in experiences and values. Every effort should be made to attend all sessions. Attendance will be considered in your grade.

Weekly Reflections & Discussion Questions:

Each week, students are responsible for reflecting about the assigned readings on Blackboard and bringing 5 discussion questions about the assigned readings.

This is due each Thursday by 6pm and should consist of a few paragraphs. These discussions are visible to your peers. Your responses should demonstrate that you understand the material from the textbook/ class and can critically apply material to example evaluations you have read. *Do Not Simply Summarize the Reading*. Include the 5 questions you have about the material in the weekly journal post.

Assignment 1: Evaluating the Evaluation:

This assignment is designed to jump start us into thinking about the logic of evaluation and the totality of an evaluation project. Find a completed evaluation via a web search, UALR online library, or from your workplace. (If you have questions about whether the evaluation is appropriate for the assignment, let me know.) Write a 2-3-page memo to describe and assess the program evaluation. Use the Evaluation Assessment Tool as a framework for the memo. Please also provide me with the link to the evaluation or an electronic copy.

Assignment 2: Evaluation Questions & Program Theory:

This is the first assignment that will lead to your final project. We don't have time to do an entire evaluation, but you will complete an evaluation proposal. Carefully choose a project that will work well for the final goal of completing an evaluation design.

- Choose a program for which you can get good information on the program model, implementation, clients, and stakeholders.

- Consider a program from you job or volunteer work. (These work well because you have access to clients and information).
- Choose a program that is interesting, but not so complex that you will not be able to understand how it works within a week or two of work.

For this assignment, write a 4 to 5-page memo describing the program, the program theory, and the goals of the evaluation. About half of this first memo should describe the purpose of the program, its importance, the targeted clients, and the framework describing how the program works (a logic model), and recent literature that supports this theory. The other half of the memo should lay out the purposes of the proposed evaluation of the project and the key research questions that the evaluation will address. These evaluation questions should be clearly stated. [You don't need to provide information on your evaluation methods, outcomes, or indicators – that will come later.]

Assignment 3: Data Collection Plan & Instrument

For this assignment, you will continue with your evaluation project from Assignment 2. Here you will write a 4 to 5-page memo describing a plan for collecting and analyzing empirical evidence to answer your evaluation questions. You will want to revise and improve your evaluation questions from Assignment 2 as you will have learned more about the program and can briefly update those here. You should describe the research design and identify outcomes and indicators for your evaluation. Include a chart showing which data will address each of your evaluation questions.

You should also include the specific details on your instruments for data collection: target participants, questions for a focus group, short survey, interview protocol, and/or data extraction and manipulation plan for administrative data. In other words, how will you collect all of the data you need to answer your evaluation questions?

Final Evaluation Plan:

Your final project will be a 10 to 15-page complete evaluation plan which includes the following sections. Any feedback given on the previous assignments should be incorporated into your final submission.

1. Introduction
2. Program Theory & literature review
3. Evaluation goals & research questions
4. Detailed data collection plan
5. Plan for data analysis
6. Plan for working/communicating with stakeholders
7. Limitations
8. Any instruments for data collection (Appendices)

Week	Class Date	Topic	Required Readings	Assignment (Due Date)
1	1/24	Course Introduction Syllabus Review Intro. To Program Evaluation		
2	1/31	Evaluation Overview	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapter 1</p> <p>Journal Article 1.1: Page, T. F., Batra, A., Ghouse, M. M., & Palmer, R. C. (2014). Implementation Cost Analysis of a Community-Based Exercise Program for Seniors in South Florida. <i>Health Promotion Practice</i>, 15(4), 585-591. DOI: 10.1177/1524839913518221</p> <p>Journal Article 1.2: Sturges, K. M. (2015). Complicity Revisited: Balancing Stakeholder Input and Roles in Evaluation Use. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 36(4), 461-469. DOI: 10.1177/1098214015583329</p> <p>Journal Article 1.3: Yampolskaya, S., Nesman, T. M., Hernandez, M. & Koch, D. (2004). Using Concept Mapping to Develop a Logic Model and Articulate a Program Theory: A Case Example. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 25(2), 191-207. DOI: 10.1177/109821400402500204</p>	Weekly reflection
3	2/7	Social Problems & Assessing Need for a Program Types of evaluations, tailoring evaluations, & ethical considerations	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapter 2</p> <p>American Evaluation Association (2004) Guiding Principles for Evaluators</p> <p>Journal Article 2.1: Dierst-Davies, R., Rock Wohl, A., Pinney, G., Johnson, C. H., Vincent-Jones, C., & Pérez, M. J. (2017). Methods to Obtain a Representative Sample of Ryan White-Funded Patients for a Needs Assessment in Los Angeles County: Results from a Replicable Approach. <i>Journal of the International Association of Providers of AIDS Care</i>, 16(4), 383-395. DOI: 10.1177/2325957415592476</p> <p>Journal Article 2.2: Karlsson, M. E. & Zielinski, M. J. (2018). Sexual Victimization and Mental Illness Prevalence Rates Among Incarcerated Women: A Literature Review. <i>Trauma, Violence, & Abuse</i>. DOI: 10.1177/1524838018767933</p>	Weekly reflection

			<p>Journal Article 2.3: Karras-Jean Gilles, J., Astuto, J., Gjicali, K., & Allen, L. (2018). Sample Retention in an Urban Context: Exploring Influential Factors Within a Longitudinal Randomized Evaluation. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>. DOI: 10.1177/1098214017742719</p>	
4	2/14	<p>Assessing Program Theory & Design</p> <p>Measuring & Monitoring Program Outcomes</p> <p>Introduction to Logic Models</p>	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapters 3 & 5</p> <p>Your chosen article for assignment 1.</p> <p>Journal Article 3.1: Rosas, S. R. (2005). Concept Mapping as a Technique for Program Theory Development: An Illustration Using Family Support Programs. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 26(3), 389-401. DOI: 10.1177/1098214005278760</p> <p>Journal Article 3.2: Munter, C. Cobb, P. & Shekell, C. (2015). The Role of Program Theory in Evaluation Research: A Consideration of the What Works Clearinghouse Standards in the Case of Mathematics Education. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 37(1), 7-26. DOI: 10.1177/1098214015571122</p> <p>Journal Article 3.3: Chandler, K. M. M. & Williamson, D. L. (2013) Explicating Practicum Program Theory: A Case Example in Human Ecology. <i>Journal of Experiential Education</i>, 36(3), 188-202. DOI: 10.1177/1053825913489101</p> <p>Journal Article 5.1: Álvarez, M., Rodrigo, M. J. & Byrne, S. (2016). What Implementation Components Predict Positive Outcomes in a Parenting Program? Research on Social Work Practice, 28(2), 173-187. DOI: 10.1177/1049731516640903</p> <p>Journal Article 5.2: Anderson, K. A., Geboy, L., Jarrott, S. E., Missaelides, L., Ogletree, A. M., Peters-Beumer, L. & Zarit, S. H. (2018). Developing a Set of Uniform Outcome Measures for Adult Day Services. <i>Journal of Applied Gerontology</i>. DOI: 10.1177/0733464818782130</p> <p>Journal Article 5.3: Jackson, J. L., Kay, C., & Frank, M. (2015). The validity and reliability of attending evaluations of medicine residents. <i>SAGE Open Medicine</i>, 3. DOI: 10.1177/2050312115589648</p>	<p>1. Weekly reflection 2. Assignment 1 due</p>

5	2/21	Using logic models and assessing program theory	<p>McLaughlin, J. A., & Jordan, G. B. (2015). Using Logic Models. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P. Hatry, & J. S. Wholey, <i>Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation: Essential Texts for Nonprofit and Public Leadership and Management</i> (pp. 62-87). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.</p> <p>Benstein et al. (2009). Impact evaluation of the U.S. Department of Education’s Student Mentoring Program. Washington DC: US Department of Education. (Executive Summary & Chapter 1)</p>	Weekly reflection
6	2/28	<p>Assessing processes and Implementation</p> <p>Impact Evaluation: Isolating Effects of Social Program in the Real World</p>	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapters 4 & 6</p> <p>Journal Article 4.1: Roe, K. & Roe, K. (2004). Dialogue Boxes: A Tool for Collaborative Process Evaluation. <i>Health Promotion Practice, 5</i>(2), 138-150. DOI: 10.1177/1524839903260141</p> <p>Journal Article 4.2: Bridges, A. J., Andrews III, A. R. & Deen, T. L. (2012). Mental Health Needs and Service Utilization by Hispanic Immigrants Residing in Mid-Southern United States. <i>Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 23</i>(4), 359-368. DOI: 10.1177/1043659612451259</p> <p>Journal Article 4.3: Lachman, J. M., Kelly, J., Cluver, L., Ward, C. L., Hutchings, J., & Gardner, F. (2016). Process Evaluation of a Parenting Program for Low-Income Families in South Africa. <i>Research on Social Work Practice, 28</i>(2), 188-202. DOI: 10.1177/1049731516645665</p> <p>Journal Article 6.1: Arseneault, C., Alain, M., Plourde, C., Ferland, F., Blanchette-Martin, N., & Rousseau, M. (2015). Impact Evaluation of an Addiction Intervention Program in a Quebec Prison. <i>Substance Abuse: Research and Treatment, 9</i>. DOI: 10.4137/SART.S22464</p> <p>Journal Article 6.2: Wimbush, E., Montague, S., & Mulherin, T. (2012). Applications of contribution analysis to outcome planning and impact evaluation. <i>Evaluation, 18</i>(3), 310-329. DOI: 10.1177/1356389012452052</p>	Weekly reflection

			<p>Journal Article 6.3: Sayago-Gomez, J., Piras, G., Jackson, R., & Lacombe, D. (2017). Impact evaluation of investments in the Appalachian Region: A reappraisal. <i>International Regional Science Review</i>, 41(6), 601-629. DOI: 10.1177/0160017617713822</p>	
7	3/7	<p>Impact Evaluation: Comparison Group Designs</p> <p>Outcomes and Indicators</p>	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapter 7</p> <p>Journal Article 7.1: Newcomb, T. M. (1984). Conservation Program Evaluations: The Control of Self-Selection Bias. <i>Evaluation Review</i>, 8(3), 425-440. DOI: 10.1177/0193841X8400800308</p> <p>Journal Article 7.2: Bell, S. H., Olsen, R. B., Orr, L. L., & Stuart, E. A. (2016). Estimates of External Validity Bias When Impact Evaluations Select Sites Nonrandomly. <i>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</i>, 38(2), 318-335. DOI: 10.3102/0162373715617549</p> <p>Journal Article 7.3: Grady, M. D., Edwards, Jr., D., & Pettus-Davis, C. (2017). A Longitudinal Outcome Evaluation of a Prison-Based Sex Offender Treatment Program. <i>Sexual Abuse</i>, 29(3), 239-266. DOI: 10.1177/1079063215585731</p>	Weekly reflection
8	3/14	Online peer evaluations		<p>Online Peer evaluations</p> <p>Post assignment 2 draft to share with class by 6pm</p>
Spring Break – No Class 3/21				
9	3/28	Impact evaluation: Designs w/ Strict Controls on Program Access	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapter 8</p> <p>Journal Article 8.1: Hind, J. (2010). Additionality: A Useful Way to Construct the Counterfactual Qualitatively? <i>Evaluation Journal of Australasia</i>, 10(1), 28-35. DOI: 10.1177/1035719X1001000105</p> <p>Journal Article 8.2: Minzner, A., Klerman, J. A., Markovitz, C. E., & Fink, B. (2014). The Impact of Capacity-Building Programs on Nonprofits: A Random Assignment Evaluation. <i>Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly</i>, 43(3), 547-569. DOI: 10.1177/0899764013491013</p> <p>Journal Article 8.3: White, H. (2010). A</p>	<p>1. Weekly reflection</p> <p>2. Assignment 2 due</p>

			<p>Contribution to Current Debates in Impact Evaluation. <i>Evaluation</i>, 16(2), 153-164. DOI: 10.1177/1356389010361562</p> <p>Comparing experimental, quasi-experimental, and non-experimental designs</p>	
10	4/4	Detecting, Interpreting, & Exploring Program Effects	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapter 9</p> <p>Journal Article 9.1: Kulik, J. A. & Fletcher, J. D. (2016). Effectiveness of Intelligent Tutoring Systems: A Meta-Analytic Review. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 86(1), 42-78. DOI: 10.3102/0034654315581420</p> <p>Journal Article 9.2: Reichardt, C. S. (2011). Evaluating Methods for Estimating Program Effects. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 32 (2), 246-272. DOI: 10.1177/1098214011398954</p> <p>Journal Article 9.3: Mukherjee, D. & Kable, J. W. (2014). Value-Based Decision Making in Mental Illness: A Meta-Analysis. <i>Clinical Psychological Science</i>, 2(6), 767-782. DOI: 10.1177/2167702614531580</p>	<p>1. Weekly reflection 2. Bring draft of outcomes and indicators to share with class</p>
11	4/11	Collecting data: Qualitative	<p>Westat, J. (2002) An Overview of Quantitative and Qualitative Data Collection Methods. In <i>The 2002 User Friendly Handbook for Program Evaluation</i>. Arlington, VA: NSF</p> <p>Sewell, M. The Use of Qualitative Interviews in Evaluation</p> <p>Other assigned readings</p>	Weekly reflection
12	4/18	Collecting data: Quantitative	<p>Hatry, H.P. (2015). Using Agency Records. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P. Hatry, & J. S. Wholey, <i>Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation: Essential Texts for Nonprofit and Public Leadership and Management</i> (pp. 325-343). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.</p> <p>Newcomer, K.E. & Triplett, T. (2015) Using Surveys. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P. Hatry, & J. S. Wholey, <i>Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation: Essential Texts for Nonprofit and Public Leadership and Management</i> (pp. 62-87). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.</p> <p>Fanning, E. (2005) Formatting a paper-based</p>	<p>1. Weekly reflection 2. Bring draft data collection instrument for project by 6pm</p>

			<p>survey questionnaire: Best Practices. Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation. 10(12).</p> <p>Optional readings from other data collection methods you may use in your proposal.</p>	
13	4/25	<p>Assessing Economic Efficiency of Programs</p> <p>Planning an Evaluation</p>	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapter 10 & 11</p> <p>Journal Article 10.1: Dalziel, K. M., Halliday, D., & Segal, L. (2015). Assessment of the Cost-Benefit Literature on Early Childhood Education for Vulnerable Children: What the Findings Mean for Policy. <i>SAGE Open</i>, 5(1). DOI: 10.1177/2158244015571637</p> <p>Journal Article 10.2: Willis, E., Semple, A. C., & de Waal, H. (2016). Quantifying the benefits of peer support for people with dementia: A Social Return on Investment (SROI) study. <i>Dementia</i>, 17(3), 266-278. DOI: 10.1177/1471301216640184</p> <p>Journal Article 10.3: Lee, S. & Aos, S. (2011). Using cost-benefit analysis to understand the value of social interventions. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 21(6), 682-688. DOI: 10.1177/1049731511410551</p> <p>Journal Article 11.1: Orr, L. L. (2018). The Role of Evaluation in Building Evidence-Based Policy. <i>The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i>, 678(1), 51-59. DOI: 10.1177/0002716218764299</p> <p>Journal Article 11.2: Francis, L. J. & Smith, B. J. (2015). Toward Best Practice in Evaluation: A Study of Australian Health Promotion Agencies. <i>Health Promotion Practice</i>, 16(5), 715-723. DOI: 10.1177/1524839915572574</p> <p>Journal Article 11.3: House, E. R. (2017). Evaluation and the Framing of Race. <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i>, 38(2), 167-189. DOI: 10.1177/1098214017694963</p>	Weekly reflection
14	5/2	<p>Social & Context of Evaluation</p> <p>In-class peer assessment</p>	<p>Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman – Chapter 12</p> <p>Journal Article 12.1: Tossavainen, P. J. (2017). Co-create with stakeholders: Action research approach in service development. <i>Action Research</i>, 15(3), 276-293. DOI: 10.1177/1476750316641995</p> <p>Journal Article 12.2: Steve Jacob, Yves</p>	<p>1. Weekly reflection</p> <p>2. Assignment 3 Due</p>

			<p>Boisvert. (2010). To Be or Not to Be a Profession: Pros, Cons and Challenges for Evaluation. <i>Evaluation</i>, 16(4), 349-369. DOI: 10.1177/135638901038000</p> <p>Journal Article 12.3: Haviland, M. & Pillsbury, J. (2012). Challenges Faced when Evaluating the Jalaris Kids Future Club. <i>Evaluation Journal of Australasia</i>, 12(1), 26-31. DOI: 10.1177/1035719X1201200104</p>	
Finals	5/9			Final Evaluation Plan/ Paper due

Point Distribution:

- Weekly Reflection (24% - 12 x 2 pts)
- Attendance & Participation (15%)
- Assignment 1 (10)
- Assignment 2 (15)
- Peer evaluations (6)
- Assignment 3 (10)
- Final Evaluation Plan (20%)

Grade Scale	
Range	Grade
90% - 100%	A
80% - 89%	B
70% - 79%	C
60% - 69%	D
0% - 59%	F

University Grading Policies:
<http://ualr.edu/policy/home/student/grades-and-grading-grad/>

General Policies:

- **Skills:** Students are expected to possess basic computer skills. If you are not comfortable in a technology environment, you must meet with me ASAP.
- **Assignment Submission:** Assignments MUST be submitted by the assigned time.
- **Late Work:** I expect assignments to be handed in on time. When this is not possible, you must make arrangements with me **prior to the due date**. Make Up work will only be given in the case of a legitimate, documented emergency.
- **Academic Integrity:** The university has developed certain regulations to make possible an orderly academic environment where all members of the community have the freedom to develop to the fullest extent.
Academic dishonesty cannot be condoned or tolerated in the university community. Such behavior is considered a student conduct violation and students found responsible of committing an academic offense on the campus, or in connection with an institution-related or sponsored activity, or while representing the university or academic department, will be disciplined by the university.
- **Classroom Etiquette:** I ask that you attend class on time and ready to participate. Entering the class more than a few minutes late can be very distracting and should be avoided whenever possible. Late arrivals to class and/or leaving class before dismissal can impact attendance and participation grades. Please refrain from talking, reading outside materials, and eating meals in class. You are not available to take phone calls or text messages during this class. There will usually be an intermission where phone usage is permitted.
- **Plagiarism Policy** Anyone caught plagiarizing will be disciplined according the UALR Student Handbook regulations. A slideshow on academic integrity (of which plagiarism is a part) is available at <http://www.ualr.edu/copyright/articles/?ID=4>

See also the University Policies for [Academic Offenses](#)

Students with Disabilities:

- Your success in this class is important to me, and it is the policy and practice of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock to create inclusive learning environments consistent with federal and state law. If you have a documented disability (or need to have a disability documented), and need an accommodation, please contact me privately as soon as possible, so that we can discuss with the Disability Resource Center (DRC) how to meet your specific needs and the requirements of the course. The DRC offers resources and coordinates reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities. Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process among you, your instructor(s) and the DRC. Thus, if you have a disability, please contact me and/or the DRC, at 501-569-3143 (V/TTY) or 501-683-7629 (VP). For more information, please visit the DRC website at <http://ualr.edu/disability/>.

UALR Non-Discrimination Policy:

- UALR adheres to a policy that enables all individuals, regardless of race, color, gender, national origin, age, sexual orientation, veteran's status, or disability to work and study in an environment unfettered by discriminatory behavior or acts. Harassment of an individual or group will not be condoned and any person – student, faculty, or staff member – who violates this policy will be subject to disciplinary action.
Any person who believes they have been discriminated against should contact the Human Resources Office to obtain assistance and information concerning the filing of complaints, (501) 569-3180.
Harassment which is considered discriminatory includes actions or conduct (verbal, graphic, gestural, or written) directed against any person or group with the intent to demean or create a hostile or threatening environment.
It is not the intent of this policy to infringe upon or limit educational, scholarly, or artistic expression. At the same time the University prohibits discriminatory practices, it promotes equal opportunity through affirmative action. Nondiscriminatory affirmative action equal opportunity policies apply to: recruitment, hiring, job classification and placement, work conditions, promotional opportunities, demotions/transfers, terminations, training, compensation, choice of contractors and suppliers of goods and services, educational opportunities, disciplinary action, recreational and social activities, use of facilities, housing, and University sponsored programs.

A Note on Incompletes:

- Be aware that I will only grant Incompletes to students who a) have completed (and passed!) a majority of the required work b) have legitimate reasons for requesting an extension, and c) have arranged a reasonable plan for completion of the required work

Syllabus Changes:

- Although every effort has been made to present accurate, complete information, this syllabus is subject to change. If a change is necessary, the instructor will notify the class in advance.