

Evans School of Public Policy & Governance
Pub Pol 526 C Program Evaluation
Spring 2018
Tuesday 5:30-8:20pm • PAR 108

Heather Hill, Associate Professor

hdhill@uw.edu

Office hours: Generally (but not always) Monday 2-4pm in PAR 323. Sign up on Canvas.¹ If no time slots work for you, email me with 3 options that will.

Matt Fowle, PhD Student, TA

mfowle@uw.edu

Sections: CA Th 4:30-5:20pm PAR 108
CB Th 10:30-11:20am PAR 308
Office hours: Tuesday 1:30-2:30pm and
Wednesday 10:00-11:00am in PAR
410

Once we create a program or policy, how do we know if it works, whom it works for, and whether it is worth the money it costs?

These are the questions of program evaluation, the field of applying social science techniques to studying the design, implementation, and impact of policies and programs. The contexts of program evaluation are diverse, ranging from large contract research firms serving as outside evaluators to individuals working in small non-profits tasked with evaluating the program they also staff, and everything in between. The goals of evaluation also vary widely, from program improvement to the quantification of program costs and benefits. No matter your position or area of focus, you will need to be well-informed consumers of evaluation research.

We will focus on developing the following competencies:

- Assessing the theory and objectives of a program or policy.
- Determining a set of research questions to guide an evaluation.
- Matching a research design and data collection techniques to the research questions.
- Evaluating the implementation of a program or policy
- Evaluating the impacts of a program or policy
- Critiquing evaluation design, data, measures.
- Considering issues of power, equity, and ethics in the design of evaluations

Assignments and Grading

Your grade in this course will consist of the following:

Participation	10%
Evaluating assessment	15%
Evaluation plan	
Memo 1: Evaluation theory and questions	17.5%
Memo 2: Data collection plan and instrument	17.5%
Final plan	40%

¹ Go to Calendar: Scheduler: Prof Hill Office Hours
Spring Qtr

Participation includes attendance at lectures and sections (sign-in each class), contributions (questions and comments) to full class and/or small group discussions. We will excuse 1 absence from lecture and 1 absence from section per quarter from participation grade calculations. Please attend the section for which you are registered.

We will provide the details of **written assignments** in separate documents and on Canvas. In general, assignments are due on Fridays at 8pm. We will grade assignments with points (0 to 10, for example) and then transform those scores into 4.0 grades using the following scale:

% of max. pts.	Grade point
100	4.0
>=97.5	3.9
>=95	3.8
>=92.5	3.7
>=90	3.6
>=87.5	3.5
>=85	3.4
>=82.5	3.3
>=80	3.2
>=77.5	3.1
>=75	3.0
>=72.5	2.9
>=70	2.8
And so on...	...

Late assignments will be deducted 5% of the points for each day they are late. In the case of illness or other unexpected circumstances, a reasonable extension of a due date can be requested via email up until the day before the due date.

All of your written work should cite outside sources using APA or Chicago Style. Text taken directly from an outside source must be in quotations with a citation that includes the page number. The restatement of a fact or idea from another source must cite the source, but no page number is needed.

In this course, evidence of **cheating or plagiarism** will result in a zero on the relevant assignment and a scheduled discussion between the student, the professor, and Evans Student Services. Cheating includes not doing your own work (when you are expected to), such as copying from another student's assignment

or exam, using notes when it is prohibited, using an electronic device when it is prohibited, and getting an advance copy of assignments. Plagiarism is using another's ideas or words without proper citation. The University has a license agreement with *VeriCite*, an educational tool that helps prevent or identify plagiarism from Internet resources. Your assignments will be automatically checked by VeriCite when you upload them to Canvas. *VeriCite* indicate the amount of original text in your work and whether all material that you quoted, paraphrased, summarized, or used from another source is appropriately referenced.

Please let me know immediately if you need accommodations for classes or assignments due to a documented disability.

Community Norms

These are the *Evans School Community Conversation Norms*:

At the Evans School, we value the richness of our differences and how they can greatly enhance our conversations and learning. As a professional school, we also have a responsibility to communicate with each other—inside and outside of the classroom—in a manner consistent with conduct in today's increasingly diverse places of work. We hold ourselves individually and collectively responsible for our communication by:

- Listening carefully and respectfully
- Sharing and teaching each other generously

- Clarifying the intent and impact of our comments
- Giving and receiving feedback in a “relationship-building” manner
- Working together to expand our knowledge by using high standards for evidence and analysis

In addition, I suggest the following as our community norms:

- Practicing step up, step back
- Being here for your own learning
- Being brave
- Critiquing ideas not people
- Attending to your own background, biases, and lenses

Outside of class, the instructor and the TA will endeavor to be accessible to you in person and by email. If you have concerns about interactions inside the classroom or in team projects, or if you have questions about the class content, please contact one of us to schedule an appointment. We ask only that you be courteous and professional in your email exchanges with us (no “hey” “sup” “lol” etc.), and that you set up an appointment if the topic warrants more than a few sentence reply.

Course Schedule & Readings

There is one required text for this course:

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*, 7th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

This text is available at the UW bookstore and online. It costs \$90 new and approximately \$30 used. All other readings are available on Canvas.

Week	Date	Deadlines	Topic	Required Readings
1	3/27	None	Introduction to evaluation	Rossi et al., Chapter 1, 2, & pp. 77-81 on research questions. American Evaluation Association Public Statement on Cultural Competence in Evaluation, Summary. MLE “Innovations in Evaluation” video (5 min) PE Concepts Table
2	4/3	None	Stakeholder engagement and theory assessment	Rossi et al., Chapters 3, 5, & pp. 118-124 on target populations. Bryson, J.M. & Patton, M.Q. (2015). Chapter 2: Analyzing and engaging stakeholders. In Newcomer, K.E. et al. (eds.) <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> , 4 th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

3	4/10	By Friday 4/13 8pm: Submit Evaluation Assessment to Canvas	Implementation and process evaluation	<p>Rossi et al., Chapter 6</p> <p>Council for International Development. (2014). <i>Fact Sheet 17: Monitoring Versus Evaluation</i>. Auckland, New Zealand: Council for International Development.</p> <p>Choose: Levy, D. & Ohls, J. (2007). Evaluation of Jamaica's PATH program: Final Report. Washington DC: Mathematica Policy Research. READ pp. 1-37.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Zaveri, H. et al. (2015) Parents and children Together: Design and Implementation of Responsible Fatherhood Programs. Washington DC: Mathematica Policy Research. READ Executive Summary pp. viii-xv</p>
4	4/17	None	<p>Research validity: Measurement, causality, and generalizability</p> <p>Guest Lecturer: Professor Mary Kay Gugerty</p>	<p>Rossi et al., Chapter 7</p> <p>Newcomer, K.E., Hatry, H.P., Wholey, J.S. (2015). Chapter 1: Planning and designing useful evaluations. In Newcomer, K.E. et al. (eds.) <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i>, 4th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. pp. 14-29 on Producing Methodological Rigor.</p> <p>Margoluis, R. Stem. C., Salafsky, N., & Brown, M. (2009). Design alternatives for evaluation the impact of conservation projects. In M. Birnbaum & P. Michwitz (eds.) <i>Environmental program and policy evaluation: Addressing methodological challenges</i>. <i>New Directions for Evaluation</i>, 122, 85-96.</p>
5	4/24	By Friday 4/27, 8pm: Submit Evaluation plan, memo 1, to Canvas	Impact evaluation: Experiments and quasi-experiments	<p>Rossi et al., Chapters 8 & 9</p> <p>Shadish, W.R. & Cook, T.D. (2009). The Renaissance of Field Experimentation in Evaluating Interventions. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i>, 60, 607-29.</p> <p>Esther Duflo TED talk</p>

				Forti, M. (2012). Seven Deadly Sins of Impact Evaluation. <i>Stanford Social Innovation Review</i> , February 22.
6	5/1	None	Extensions of impact evaluation	Rossi et al., Chapter 11 Cody, S. & Asher, A. (2014). <i>Proposal 14: Smarter, better, faster: The potential for predictive analytics and rapid-cycle evaluation to improve program development and outcomes</i> . The Hamilton Project, Improving Safety Net and Work Support. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. White, H. (2009). <i>Theory-based impact evaluation: Principles and practice</i> . New Dehli, India: International Initiative for Impact Evaluation,
7	5/8	None	Introduction to data collection Survey and administrative data	Frechtling, J. with Frierson, H., Hood, S., & Hughes, G. (2002). <i>The 2002 User Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation</i> . Washington DC: The National Science Foundation Directorate for Education & Human Resources Division of Research, Evaluation, and Communication. Read Chpts 5-6, pp. 43-62. Pew Research Center. (n.d.) “Collecting Survey Data.” Available at: www.pewresearch.org/methodology/u-s-survey-research/collecting-survey-data/ Center for Disease Control. (2011). <i>Program Evaluation Tip Sheet: Constructing Survey Questions</i> . Atlanta, GA: CDC. Finkelstein, A. (2016). <i>The Value of Administrative Data for Randomized Experiments</i> . Slide Deck.
8	5/15	By Friday 5/18 8pm: Submit Evaluation plan, memo 2, to Canvas	Qualitative and mixed method data	Adams, C. (2015). Chapter 19: Conducting Semi-Structured Interviews. In Newcomer, K.E. et al. (eds.) <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> , 4 th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Krueger, R.A., & Case, M.A. (2015). Chapter 20: Focus Group Interviewing. In Newcomer, K.E. et al. (eds.) <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> , 4 th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

				<p>USAID. (2013). <i>Technical Note: Conducting Mixed Method Evaluations</i>. Washington, DC: USAID.</p> <p>Seattle Minimum Wage Study Work Interviews, Wave 3 Interview Guide</p>
9	5/22	None	Ethics and equity in evaluation	<p>Bledsoe, K.L., & Hopson, R.K. (2013). Conducting ethical research and evaluation in underserved communities. In D. Mertens and P. Ginsbert (eds.) <i>The Handbook of Social Research Ethics</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.</p> <p>Hood, S., Hopson, R.K., & Kirkhart, K.E. (2015). Chapter Twelve: Culturally Responsive Evaluation: Theory, Practice, and Future Implications. In K.E. Newcomer, H.P. Hatry, & J.S. Wholey (eds) <i>Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation</i>, 4th Ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.</p> <p>Zukoski, A. & Luluquisen, M. (2002). <i>Participatory Evaluation. What is it? Why do it? What are the challenges?</i> Long Beach, CA: Partnership for Public Health.</p>
10	5/29	None	<p>Roundtable day</p> <p><i>Please note: we will meet in Parrington Forum</i></p>	Come to class prepared to present your evaluation plan to other students. Prepare a 5-minute presentation and a 1-page handout.
Finals	6/5	By Tuesday 6/5, 8pm: Submit your final evaluation plan to Canvas	None	None