

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DIVISION of EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY,
RESEARCH METHODS AND EDUCATION POLICY

EDRS 820 – 001- 20987
Evaluation Methods for Educational Program and Curricula
3 Credits, Spring 2015
Thursdays, 7:20-10:00 p.m.
Innovation Hall, 318

PROFESSOR(S): Lori C. Bland, Ph.D.

Office hours: Thursdays, 5:30-6:30

Office location: West Building, Room 2006, Fairfax Campus

Office phone: 703-993-5047

Email address: lbland2@gmu.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

- A. **Prerequisites/Corequisites:** Successful completion of EDRS 810, or permission of instructor. Prior completion of EDRS 811 and 812 helpful but not required.
- B. **Catalog Description:** Explores development and types of current systems and models for evaluating educational programs and curricula. Emphasizes evaluation needs and problems of public and private elementary and secondary schools, and colleges and universities. Also considers needs of government agencies, industry, and health-related organizations.
- C. **Course Description:** This course examines the theory, ethics, and practice of program evaluation. Areas of focus include understanding the nature of program evaluation and using program evaluation in applied settings, such as K-12 or higher education; local, state, or federal agencies; community health programs; nonprofits; or industry. This course is one of the requirements for the Ph.D. professional specialization in Research Methods. For students not specializing in Research Methods, it is one of the electives within the 15 credits required of research methods for Ph.D. students.

Nature of course delivery: A ‘big picture question,’ or a mini-lecture will generally open each instructional period to set the focus for the class session. While all class lectures are relevant to specific chapters in the required textbook, they are not taken exclusively from this source. Students are expected to complete readings in advance of the class. Quizzes or other assignments related to the weekly reading may be given at the beginning of class. Generally, the final segment of the class period will be devoted to small group discussions or in-class assignments. Students will be required to engage in field studies to gain practical experience with program evaluation methods. When available, guest speakers will

enrich the course by sharing their experiences in program evaluation and providing students with insight into the world of the professional evaluator. The Blackboard site for this course includes readings, assignments, and other related resources. A variety of learning approaches will be used such as, assigned readings, lecture, whole and small group discussion, individual or small group work for in-class assignments, individual or small group work for homework and projects, examining case studies of previously completed program evaluations, and project-based learning.

LEARNER OUTCOMES/OBJECTIVES:

This course is designed to enable students to:

- Understand the nature of program evaluation
- Compare and contrast program evaluation and social science research
- Apply the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2011) Program Evaluation Standards in planning and conducting program evaluations
- Distinguish among the major approaches and methods for conducting a program evaluation
- Apply evaluation models and methods appropriately within a given evaluation context, such as public and private elementary and secondary schools, and colleges and universities, government agencies, non-profits, industry, and health-related organizations
- Understand program evaluation questions, including but not limited to: program theory, stakeholder experiences and satisfaction, fidelity of implementation, randomized control trials, program impact and outcomes, cost analyses, etc.
- Develop a program evaluation plan (including appropriate quantitative and/or qualitative methods), implement the study, analyze the data, and report out the results using a variety of appropriate methods
- Understand the linkages between program evaluation, program design, and program implementation and program theory (theory of change, theory of action, logic models)
- Understand issues related to utilization of evaluation information and data-driven decision-making
- Understand the cultural, political, economic, and social justice implications of program evaluations

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

A. Competencies for the Doctoral Program

Students must demonstrate the following major competencies to be awarded a Ph.D. in Education degree:

1. Ability to communicate effectively in a variety of professional roles in both oral and written forms;

2. Knowledge of significant theory, developments and practices in one's professional specialization (e.g. teaching of mathematics, counseling, etc.), and one or more supporting areas of study;
3. Ability to understand, utilize and interpret basic principles and methodologies of educational research design and data analysis; and
4. Ability to organize efforts to solve problems, advance knowledge, test theories, and adapt information to meet professional goals.

Mastery of these competencies is demonstrated by successful coursework, successful completion of a comprehensive portfolio assessment preparation and acceptance of a dissertation, and successful completion of an oral defense of the dissertation.

B. Program Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2011)

Students examine and develop competencies to adhere to the Program Evaluation Standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2011) including:

1. **Utility Standards:** The utility standards are intended to increase the extent to which program stakeholders find evaluation processes and products valuable in meeting their needs.
2. **Feasibility Standards:** The feasibility standards are intended to increase evaluation effectiveness and efficiency.
3. **Proprietary Standards:** The proprietary standards support what is proper, fair, legal, right, and just in evaluations.
4. **Accuracy Standards:** The accuracy standards are intended to increase the dependability and truthfulness of evaluation representations, propositions, and findings, especially those that support interpretations and judgments about quality.
5. **Evaluation Accountability Standards:** The evaluation accountability standards encourage adequate documentation of evaluations and a metaevaluative perspective focused on improvement and accountability for evaluation processes and products.

C. Student Outcomes and Relationship to Professional Standards

The student outcomes are informed by the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles (AEA, 2004) for professionals conducting program evaluation:

1. **Systematic Inquiry:** Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries.
2. **Competence:** Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.
3. **Integrity/Honesty:** Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behavior, and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
4. **Respect for People:** Evaluators respect the security, dignity, and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders.
5. **Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare:** Evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of general and public interests and values that may be related to evaluation.

REQUIRED TEXTS:

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

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2011). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (4th Ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Frechtling, J. (2010, December). *The 2010 user-friendly handbook for project evaluation* (REC 99-12175). Arlington, VA: The National Science Foundation.
<https://www.westat.com/sites/westat.com/files/2010UFHB.pdf>

Yarborough, D. B., Shulha, L. M., Hopson, R. K., Caruthers, F. A. (2011). *The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

ADDITIONAL REQUIRED READINGS:

Additional readings can be found on the indicated website, Blackboard, or will be distributed by the instructor in class. The purposes for these readings are to augment the text with important concepts for the beginning evaluator. The instructor reserves the right to assign additional readings based on “teachable moments” or to no longer require a reading based on discussions. Changes will be invoked minimally and discussed with the class.

Altschuld, J. W., & Watkins, R. (2014). A primer on needs assessment: More than 40 years of research and practice. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2014(144), 5–18. doi: 10.1002/ev.20099

Annie E. Casey Foundation. Real life lessons learned and resources in building capacity for advocacy and policy evaluation among KIDS Count grantees. Retrieved from:
http://www.innonet.org/resources/files/AEA2008_AECF_and_ORIS_10_Lessons.pdf

Cellini, S. R., & Kee, J. E. (2010). Cost-effectiveness and Cost-benefit analysis. In: J. Wholey, H. Hatry, & K. Newcomer (Eds.). *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (3rd Ed.) (pp. 493-530). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCawley, P. F. The logic model for program planning and evaluation. (2009). Retrieved from:
<http://www.cals.uidaho.edu/edcomm/pdf/CIS/CIS1097.pdf>

Rallis, S. F., & Rossman, G. B. (2000). Dialogue for learning: Evaluator as critical friend. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2000(86), 81–92. doi:10.1002/ev.1174

Torgerson, C. J., Torgerson, D. J., & Taylor, C. A. (2010). Randomized control trials and nonrandomized designs. In: J. Wholey, H. Hatry, & K. Newcomer (Eds.). *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (3rd Ed.) (pp. 144-162). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

EVALUATION JOURNALS

For each journal, become acquainted with the information about the journal, the editorial board, how to publish in the journal. Review a few of the more recent volumes to become familiar with the types of articles in the journals and the writing style. How do authors write about evaluation?

American Journal of Evaluation

Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education

Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation

Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability

Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis

Evaluation

Evaluation and the Health Professions

Evaluation Review

Evaluation and Program Planning

Journal of Educational Evaluation for the Health Professions

Journal of Policy Analysis and Management

Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development

New Directions in Evaluation

Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation

Research Evaluation

SAMPLE PROGRAM EVALUATION DOCUMENTS AND CASE STUDIES

The evaluation documents and case studies are provided to you as samples of evaluation reporting, but are by no means exhaustive.

- Fertman, C. I., Tarasevich, S. L., & Hepler, N. A. (November 2003). *Retrospective Analysis of the Pennsylvania Student Assistance Program Outcome Data: Implications for Practice and Research*. Bethesda, MD: CDM Group, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/prevention/dropout_truancy/resources/retrospective_analysis.pdf
- Norris, J. (2009). Foreign Language Program Evaluation Case Studies. Foreign Language Program Evaluation Project. National Foreign Language Resource Center. University of Hawaii at Manoa. Retrieved from: http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/evaluation/E_casestudy.htm#1
- Virginia Department of Education (2005). *Creating Community Service Opportunities for Suspended and Expelled Youth*. Richmond, VA: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/federal_programs/safe_drug-free/publications/community_service_suspended_expelled.pdf
- Virginia Department of Education (December 2011). *Migrant Education Program Evaluation Report*. Richmond, VA: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/federal_programs/esea/title1/part_c/migrants/vdoemep_evaluation_report.pdf

WEBSITE RESOURCES

For each website, become acquainted with the nature of the information on the website, the organization sponsoring the website, key personnel, key focus areas, key publications. Review a few of the more recent publications to become familiar with some of the “hot topics” in evaluation. How can this website help an evaluator or a program manager?

- Multimedia Educational Resources for Learning and Online Teaching (MERLOT)
<http://www.merlot.org/merlot/materials.htm;jsessionid=002A8DD7F8B7CEFD857F34D455374C14?sort.property=relevance&materialType=&keywords=Program+Evaluation&category=&newsearchbutton0.x=25&newsearchbutton0.y=21>
- National Center for Education Statistics, <http://nces.ed.gov>
- National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/>
- National Research Center on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST),
<http://www.cse.ucla.edu/>
- Wisconsin Center for Education Research, <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/>

OPTIONAL READINGS:

Frechtling, J., & Sharp, L. (1997, August). The user-friendly handbook for mixed methods evaluations. (RED 94-52965). Arlington, VA: The National Science Foundation.
<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1997/nsf97153/start.htm>

Funnell, S. C., & Rogers, P. J. (2011). Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models.

Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. New York: Guilford.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS AND EXAMINATIONS:

- A. **Assignment descriptions:** An overview of student projects and products are described below. **See the assignments folder in the course blackboard (BB) for detailed assignment requirements. Students must consult and follow these requirements.**
1. **Class participation (20 points).** See other expectations; participation rubric.
 2. **Quizzes (10 points).** Read. You will have unannounced quizzes on readings, selected- and/or constructed-response. There are no make-ups for quizzes.
 3. **Evaluation Article Summary, Analysis, & Critique (10 points).** Students will locate, read, summarize, analyze, & critique an article of interest from one of the identified evaluation journals.
 4. **Presentations about an Evaluation Approach or Topic (30 points).** In pairs, students will prepare a presentation, handouts, and an activity related to an evaluation approach or topic.
 5. **Evaluation Project: (130 points).** In groups, students will evaluate a program.
 - a. **Program Reflection (10 points).** Groups will prepare an initial discussion on their program, reflecting on the issues that the program faces.
 - b. **Evaluation Plan (10 points).** Groups will develop a plan outlining the evaluation questions, methods, work proposal, and timeline.
 - c. **Literature Review (10 points).** Groups will write a literature review related to the program and evaluation issues under examination.
 - d. **Methods Section (10 points).** Groups will write a detailed methods section following the article format in the APA appendix.
 - e. **Program Description, Theory, & Logic Model (20 points).** Groups will write a description of the program, develop a logic model, and explain the theory of action and theory of change underlying the program.
 - f. **Final Evaluation Report (50 points).** Groups will analyze their data and write a final comprehensive evaluation report.
 - g. **Oral Presentation & Executive Summary of Evaluation (20 points).** Groups will present their findings to the class and provide an executive summary.

B. Assignment and Examination Weighting (Points, Percentages, Letter Grades): There are 200 total points for the course, distributed across the assignments and classroom attendance and discussion expectations.

C.

Assignment and Examination Weighting			
Assignment	Total Points	Partial Points	Percent of Grade
1. Class Participation	20		10%
2. Quizzes	10		5%
3. Evaluation Article Critique	10		5%
4. Presentations about Evaluation Approach	30		15%
5. Evaluation Project	130		65%
a. Program Reflection		10	5%
b. Evaluation Plan		10	5%
c. Literature Review		10	5%
d. Methods		10	5%
e. Program Desc., Theory, Logic Model		20	10%
f. Evaluation Report		50	25%
g. Oral Presentation & Exec. Summary		20	10%
Total	200		100%

D. Grading Policies

1. E-mail an electronic copy of all assignments using your GMU e-mail account before class begins on the due date.
2. One point will be deducted for every day the assignment is late without appropriate documentation, such as medical documentation.
3. Students will receive feedback on all assignments within two weeks of when the assignment was submitted. Feedback will be returned electronically.
4. Students will have the opportunity to correct all assignments and submit them **once** for additional review.
5. All changes must be made using track changes. Assignments that are resubmitted without use of track changes will not be reviewed. Students must respond to instructor comments within the comment explaining how the change was made.
6. The oral report, quizzes and class participation are not eligible for resubmission.
7. The written syllabus and written assignment directions supercedes any perceived verbal statements. If there is a question, refer to written statements.

E. Grading Scale:

At George Mason University, course work is measured in terms of quantity and quality. One credit normally represents one hour per week of lecture or recitation and not fewer than two hours per week of homework or laboratory work throughout a semester. The

number of credits is a measure of quantity. The grade is a measure of quality. The system for grading graduate courses is as follows:

Points	Percent	Grade	Graduate Courses
200	100	A+	Satisfactory / Passing
188-199	94-99	A	Satisfactory / Passing
180-187	90-93	A-	Satisfactory / Passing
170-179	85-89	B+	Satisfactory / Passing
160-169	80-84	B	Satisfactory / Passing
140-159	70-79	C	Does not meet CEHD requirements
0-139	<69	F	Does not meet CEHD requirements

F. Other Expectations (Attendance, Writing Requirements, etc.)

1. **Class participation (20 points).** The elements listed reflect the professional attitudes implied in the course goals and professional dispositions expected of a doctoral student at Mason and a program evaluator.
 - a. Attend class on time and for the duration.
 - b. Read **before** class, and bring texts/readings.
 - c. Participate fully, be polite, and eliminate distractions.
 - d. Submit work on time: for assignments by beginning of class on due date and for classwork or homework by next class.
 - e. Inform instructor via e-mail about missing class or a due date. You are responsible for making up the missed work, submitting assignments on time, and understanding assignments based on class discussions.
 - f. Bring a means for saving electronic work done class (such as a flash drive), as well as, paper and writing implements for in-class work.
2. **General Guidelines for Written Assignments**
 - a. Follow guidelines on BB! Ask if you have questions.
 - b. All course projects must include a cover page. The *cover page* should include the title of the assignment, course number and title, instructor, your name, date, and institutional affiliation information. Points will be deducted if a cover page is not included following these minimal specifications. Points deducted for lack of a cover page are **NOT** eligible for regaining points through a resubmit, though the work **MUST** be fixed else points will be deducted again.
 - c. All course projects need to follow APA guidelines. It is your responsibility to know those guidelines. Points will be deducted for not following APA. **NOT** eligible for resubmit.

- d. All course projects **MUST** include sections with the headings/subheadings as stated in the assignment instructions posted on BB. I will assume that the section is missing if it is **NOT** appropriately labeled, and the corresponding points will be deducted. Ensure that you include these minimal Headings/Subheadings. A general rule is to err on the side of including **MORE** headings than the minimal required. **NOT** eligible for resubmit. Follow the article format in the APA appendix, unless.
- e. Citations are required in text and on the reference page, just as in a research proposal, paper, article, or grant. Points will be deducted for missing citations in text or on the reference page, citations not matching the reference page, and/or incorrect citations in text or on the reference page.
- f. You **MUST** use track changes for all resubmissions. The instructor will not re-review any documents that do not follow these guidelines and you will not be eligible to earn points for a re-submit. You will **NOT** be eligible to earn points on a resubmit because you did not follow assignment instructions from BB or instructions on the syllabus.
- g. Ensure that you keep both an electronic and paper copy of your projects before submitting them to the instructor. When asking questions about your project, you must have a paper copy of your project available for the instructor.

G. Selected Performance-Based Assessment

There is **NO** selected performance-based assessment for EDRS 820 that needs to be entered into TaskStream.

TASKSTREAM REQUIREMENTS

Every student registered for any Research Methods course with a required performance-based assessment is required to submit the assessment TaskStream (regardless of whether the course is an elective, a onetime course or part of an undergraduate minor). Evaluation of the performance-based assessment by the course instructor will also be completed in TaskStream. Failure to submit the assessment to TaskStream will result in the course instructor reporting the course grade as Incomplete (IN). Unless the IN grade is changed upon completion of the required TaskStream submission, the IN will convert to an F nine weeks into the following semester.

GMU POLICIES AND RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS

- a. Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [See <http://oai.gmu.edu/honor-code/>].

- b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>].
- c. Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students solely through their Mason email account.
- d. The George Mason University Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) staff consists of professional counseling and clinical psychologists, social workers, and counselors who offer a wide range of services (e.g., individual and group counseling, workshops and outreach programs) to enhance students' personal experience and academic performance [See <http://caps.gmu.edu/>].
- e. Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the George Mason University Office of Disability Services (ODS) and inform their instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester [See <http://ods.gmu.edu/>].
- f. Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
- g. The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (e.g., tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing [See <http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/>].

PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

CORE VALUES COMMITMENT

The College of Education and Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles: <http://cehd.gmu.edu/values/>

For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, Graduate School of Education, please visit our website <http://gse.gmu.edu>

PROVISIONAL CLASS SCHEDULE

The instructor reserves the right to alter the class schedule and assignment due dates based on class progress, inclement weather, or other unforeseen circumstances.

Class	Date	Topic/Learning Experiences	Readings and Assignments
1	1/22/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of Course, Syllabus • Introduction to Evaluation • Evaluation vs. Research • Evaluation Types 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 1 • Frechtling: Ch. 1, 2 • Article: Rallis • Standards: pp. xii-xlvi
2	1/29/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political, Interpersonal, Ethical, and Propriety Issues in Evaluation • Human Subjects and Evaluation • Needs Assessment • Alternative Views of Evaluation 	EVALUATION ARTICLE DUE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 3, 4; Frechtling: Ch. 3 • Standards: Deciding Whether and Who will Evaluate, Negotiating Agreements • Article: Altshuld
3	2/5/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation Planning & Context • Evaluation Questions 	REFLECTION DUE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 11, 12, 13, 14; Frechtling: Ch. 4 • Standards: Evaluation Questions, Design
4	2/12/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collecting Evaluation Information: Design, Sampling, & Cost • Evaluation Use 	EVALUATION PLAN DUE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch.15, 17; Frechtling: Ch. 5, 6 • Standards: Managing the Evaluation
5	2/19/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Sources and Methods • Document Analysis, Pre-Existing Data, Getting Information from Stakeholders 	LITERATURE REVIEW DUE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 16; Frechtling: Ch. 8, 9 • Standards: Collecting & Analyzing
6	2/26/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation Fidelity • Observations 	METHODS SECTION DUE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article: O'Donnell
7	3/5/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Description • Program Theory: Logic Models, Theory of Action, Theory of Change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: pp. 159-164 • Standards: Describing the Program • Article: McCawley
	3/12/15	Spring Break	NO CLASS
8	3/19/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact/Outcomes Evaluation 	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION/THEORY DUE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article: Torgeson • Standards: Communicating and Reporting
9	3/26/15	Expertise & Consumer Approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 5 PRESENTATIONS
10	4/2/15	Program & Decision Approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 6, 7 PRESENTATIONS
11	4/9/15	Participant-Oriented Approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 8 PRESENTATIONS
12	4/16/15	Cultural Competence Capacity Building Comparative Evaluation Approaches	DRAFT REPORT DUE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 9, 10, PRESENTATIONS • Frechtling: Ch. 7 • Article: Annie E. Casey Foundation
13	4/23/15	Cost Analyses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSW: Ch. 15, cost analysis • Article: Cellini
14	4/30/15	PRESENTATIONS	PPT & EXECUTIVE SUMMARY DUE
15	5/4/15	Writing	FINAL REPORT DUE by 10:00

Scoring Criteria: Attendance & Participation

Student participation is imperative to student learning and a successful class. The following rubric outlines how student participation scores will be determined in this course. All students are expected to demonstrate specific characteristics and actions throughout the semester. The quality and quantity of these actions will determine the points assigned for participation.

Students are expected to:

- a) Be punctual, present (in mind and body), and well prepared for class.
- b) Participate fully in class activities and assignments – take an active part in small and large group discussions (without dominating the conversations) and pay attention to class lectures.
- c) Make insightful comments, which are informed by required readings and demonstrate reflection on those readings. Specifically, students should come to class with questions, comments, and thoughts on the current readings.
- d) Treat class activities, group discussions, and class discussions as important components of the course, showing respect for fellow classmates and the course material.
- e) Complete individual and group class activities within the time allotted, ensuring full participation of all group members. Submit class activities to the instructor at the end of class, or by the beginning of the next class.

Each of the 5 criteria will be assessed on a 4-point scale.

- 4 = Student *consistently* demonstrated the criterion throughout the semester.
- 3 = Student *frequently* demonstrated the criterion throughout the semester.
- 2 = Student *intermittently* demonstrated the criterion throughout the semester.
- 1 = Student *rarely* demonstrated the criterion throughout the semester.
- 0 = Student *did not* demonstrate the criterion throughout the semester.

The participation grade will be calculated as the sum of points for each criterion.

Evaluation Plan Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding (4)	Competent (3)	Minimal (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Introduction <i>Include a synthesis of the most important elements describing the program and justification for the evaluation</i>	The introduction provides a clear and complete synthesis of the information about the program and justification for the evaluation. No extraneous text is included.	The introduction may have minor issues with clarity or extraneous text. The introduction is mostly complete, but may lack a piece of key information related to the program or the justification.	The introduction has several issues with clarity and/or extraneous text. The introduction is incomplete, lacking more than one piece of key information about the program or the justification.	The introduction is unclear and/or too brief to completely communicate information about the program or the justification.
Proposed Methods and Procedures				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Collection and Instrument Development 	The description of the steps to collect the data and construct the instruments is clear and complete and includes relevant resources and follows APA article format.	The description of most of the steps is clear. There may be minor issues details or a step missing within the description. Relevant resources may be incomplete. There may be minor problems with APA article format.	The description has a major issue related to clarity or missing steps. One or two resources may not be relevant or may be incomplete. There may be a major problem with APA article format.	The description has multiple issues with clarity and/or many steps are missing. Most of the resources are not relevant, or resources are missing. There are multiple problems with APA article format.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Analysis 	The proposed plan for data analysis is easily executable, clear, complete, and	The proposed plan for has minor issues related to execution, clarity, missing details, or	The proposed plan appears to be executable, however more than one step is missing, steps are	The proposed plan does not appear to be executable. Multiple steps are missing,

Criteria	Outstanding (4)	Competent (3)	Minimal (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
	appropriate.	appropriateness.	unclear, and details are missing. One or more components of the plan may not be implemented appropriately, or the data analysis for one of the instruments may not be appropriate.	unclear, or lacking details. More than one steps in the data capture or analysis plan is incorrect or inappropriate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Applications for Data Use 	The proposed plan for data use is easily executable, clear, and complete.	The proposed plan for has minor issues related to execution, clarity, or missing details.	The proposed plan appears to be executable, however more than one step is missing, steps are unclear, and details are missing.	The proposed plan does not appear to be executable. Multiple steps are missing, unclear, lacking details.
<p>APA Style</p> <p><i>Use APA writing style, formatting, including citations within text and references.</i></p>	Writing is concise, coherent, well-organized, and with correct APA style. Citations and references are correct and complete.	Writing lacks some clarity or has minor organizational problems affecting the overall coherence, and/or there are some errors in APA style, citations, or references. There may also be a small number of missing citations or references.	Writing has multiple problems with clarity, coherence, and organization. There are many errors in APA style, citations, and/or references. Multiple references are missing or incomplete.	Writing lacks clarity, coherence, many errors, and/or no use of APA style. Citations and references are minimal or absent.

Additional Scoring Scales

Article Critique

Adequate evaluation (10 points): Evaluation includes a summary, analysis of the article, and critique of the article. Each section is thorough and thoughtful, provides support from the article and other sources as appropriate. Critique is submitted on time. Critique follows APA format.

Marginal evaluation (8 points): Evaluation is not thoughtful, minor parts may be incomplete, or minor mistakes with APA format or other careless errors.

Inadequate evaluation (6 points): Evaluation is simply restates the article, a part is missing, is carelessly completed, or APA format has many errors.

Unacceptable evaluation: (0-5 points): Major sections are missing, incomplete, incorrect, or APA is not followed.

Evaluation Project Sections: This scoring scale is presented in percentages, rather than points, as it applies to all sections of the written reporting for the evaluation project.

Exemplary paper (94-100%): Thoroughly and thoughtfully written. Fully addresses purpose and guidelines for assignment. Excellent writing style. Free of free of errors. Appropriate use of APA format. Has significant potential to contribute useful information for the program.

Adequate paper (90-93%): Good overall paper, but has minor issues with the paper, such as it is not comprehensively reflective or thoughtful; there may be errors or gaps in logic or explanation. Does not fully address purpose or guidelines for assignment. Minor writing style or APA format errors may be present. Has potential to contribute useful information for the program.

Marginal paper (80-89%): Overall, acceptable but with a significant problem in one area or many issues across the paper. Contains some useful information, but may have substantial problems with purpose and guidelines for assignment, writing style or APA format, or unclear or inappropriate description of the project. Might have some potential to contribute useful information for the program

Inadequate paper (0-79%): Paper has substantial problems in more than one area such as writing, assignment purpose or guidelines, overall thoughtfulness, APA format. Does not have the potential to contribute useful information for the program.

Presentations: This scoring scale is presented in percentages, rather than points, as it applies to all sections of the written reporting for the evaluation project.

Exemplary presentation (94-100%): Keeps within the time limits; reflects poise, clarity, knowledge and interest in the content being presented; reflects a high level of preparation; makes effective use of overheads, handouts, demonstrations, or activities; content is very clearly described and explained for faculty and peers; keeps the audience engaged; provides information of interest and value to audience.

Adequate presentation (90-93%): Good overall presentation, but may be lacking in one or two of the criteria specified in exemplary response. Some minor parts lack clarity or are missing. May seem a little less poised, polished or prepared, may be vague in some place, or may fail to maintain audience engagement.

Marginal presentation (80-89%): Presentation provides relevant information, but demonstrates only a limited understanding of the topic or project. Style, handouts, or visual aids are inadequate in more than one manner. Preparation was inadequate, and fails to maintain audience attention.

Inadequate presentation (0-79%): Weak overall presentation that reflects very little knowledge of topic or project. May appear very poorly prepared, or may not have followed directions. Handouts or visual aids may be inadequate or lacking.