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COURSE DESCRIPTION
The primary focus of this course is the assessment of programs and policy, within the particular cases of education systems, educational governance, and non-profit organizations. The topics for inspection include theories, research, and practices related to program and policy, and, practically, the evaluation of almost anything. For heuristic purposes, the work is contextualized in key issues relevant to those who are teaching or practicing in the field. The skills learned from this course are expected to assist the practitioner in determining the effectiveness of new or existing programs or policies in organizations. The course will introduce several evaluation models and it will encourage students to select among models or elements of models that are best for particular evaluation needs or for various contexts of study.

COURSE OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES:
For all students, as the framer of this course, I seek to cultivate approaches directed towards the many factors which may influence formal and informal judgments and decisions. Students will acquire knowledge and skills essential for developing and implementing useful and productive program evaluation procedures, for critically analyzing program evaluation results and for sharing program evaluation results with stakeholders. –John Stoothoff

To assist students in achieving the course purposes, the following objectives have been developed for the course:

1. To obtain a grounding in program and policy evaluation as leadership functions and as transformative acts.
2. To develop knowledge in the fundamental principles of evaluating educational programs and policies.
3. To engage in practical experience in the development of plans and designs to evaluate major policy initiatives, programs, and/or interventions in education.

4. To continue toward mastery in the basic skills of analysis and presentation of data.

5. To enhance skills of critical analysis by discussing the evidence provided by evaluation reports concerning important issues in educational policy and practice.

6. To continue growth toward mastery of writing for those who are engaged in doctoral-level study tasks.

7. To observe, first-hand, how program and policy evaluation can be bridged to the executive practitioner’s needs in the leadership of workplaces.

**Course Policies:**

1. Attendance is expected for all such scheduled sessions including attention to all online activities.

2. Participation in class and online discussion is required.

3. Assignments are due on Blackboard, online as posted. Late work may be subject to a grade reduction.

4. University Policies on Academic Dishonesty, Harassment, and Disruptive Student Behavior are fully applicable for this course.

5. Students with any type of recognized and confirmed disability that would require accommodations in assignments or assessment practices should provide written notification to the instructor by no later than the second class meeting. Students may request that this notification be provided to the instructor by the Office of Student Special Services.

6. Reporting of Child Abuse:
   Please be aware that according to state law in Maryland, educators are required to report current and past child abuse and neglect even when the former victim is now an adult and even when the former alleged abuser is deceased. If you disclose current or past abuse/neglect in class, in papers, or to me personally, I am required by law to report it. Please see me if you are interested in more information about this law.

7. A Course Policy of Special Note: Particular and specific expectations for upper graduate level work are in force. Required – absolutely - is the respectful consideration of the demands for the written communications of the school organization’s workplace in addition to those expectations of our University. Therefore, a high value is placed on what written work should look like for us. The gauging of “mechanics”, “presentation”, citation parlance, and “style” is taken seriously, though it is recognized as an ever changing area of endeavor. Observe below the scoring mechanics, particularly for written assessments which are assigned.

**Office Hours:** A wide variety of daily morning and afternoon office hours is offered per University regulation. However, an important reality is recognized: Unique to this program concentration, nearly all students are employed among leadership and/or teaching ranks in a three state region and will likely benefit from late afternoon and evening appointments. An even wider array of that order of appointment days and times is possible, including via phone, Skype, IVN, or email and Blackboard communication,
and most certainly including consideration for face to face meetings at students’ places of work. Students are encouraged to utilize any of the contact points in order to arrange a time for meeting.

Text:


Additional Key Resources:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Philosophy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course is based on a 200-point scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great use is made of discrete variable achievement in the evaluation of assessment products. This means that, among other things, the first steps of evaluation are focused on determining the achievement or inclusion of each assessment part. Then, a rubric is generally applied to analyze, further, the student’s achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Rubrics (percentages below multiplied by the assignment’s point value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written Papers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics, style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References, citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References, citation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = 93% - 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = 84% - 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = 75% - 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = Below 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Percentages are rounded up from .5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: The standard for our writing, unless otherwise specified, calls for a 12-point Times New Roman font, double spaced, with a 1½” left margin and 1” margin elsewhere. It is further expected that students will use American Psychology Association (APA) citation parlance for within-text citations and for references. This particular segment on this page conforms to that model.
Assessments

Assigning the Readings for Assessment #1

Assessment #1: (40 points) Readings Synopses

Two Page Synopsis Writing

Students demonstrate their progress in the area of synopses-writing, the likes of which will be needed for ‘Chapter 2’ purposes. The assigned readings differ from classmate to classmate, with a goal that the entire group will earn a substantial collection of appropriately cited references and ‘executive summaries’. The readings are will be made up of scholarly journal titles and of articles which have been selected from books on reserve in our USMH library. Each article and a correspondingly assigned student appear below in the reference list.

The three (3) ‘two-pager’ synopses on the assigned readings or focus pieces are due on the dates listed below. However, because of reserve book availability, students are welcomed to submit their articles in any order. Two-pagers are to be submitted via email to the instructor. These submissions are expected to comply with all of our course’s demands for writing. As soon as possible, the instructor will conduct a quick review, in order to clear the way for class distribution purposes. A more thorough review for ‘Assessment #1’ scoring purposes (see immediately below) will occur soon after. Upon securing clearance for distributing a filed synopsis, the student will load it onto their individual “Place” in our Blackboard Discussion Board.

For ‘Assessment #1’ purposes, each synopsis will be graded on a 40-point scale. Students will be informed per submittal on a “score sheet” which features a restatement of this assessment’s per submittal requirements as well as rubrics which convey expectations for achievement levels of “Target”, “Proficient”, and “Developing”. A viewing of such a score sheet will be shared on the opening evening of the course.

The total number of scores for Assessment #1 submittals will be converted to reflect the 40 course points for award. This provides the instructor with an opportunity to not be held to mathematical averaging, but with latitude for subjective rewarding of the learning of lessons or for reductions for uninspired performances.

Due: 1) February 11; 2) March 11; 3) April 27

It is strongly recommended that students monitor fellow students’ Blackboard: Discussion Board: Places for two pagers and for reference list citations which may become of potential value at literature review preparation times.
Assessment #2  (40 points) Class Leadership: In-Depth Treatment of the Evening’s Readings and Topics.

A second key assessment requires pairs of candidates to engage in their own creative "in-depth" analysis of the week's text. Among the objectives are for tandem teams of 'In-Depth' leaders to (1) identify something supplementary to the evening’s preparations thereby adding to the purpose of the readings and topics for the session, (2) provide classmates with more citations for future use, and (3) model behaviors which critique the content, the assumptions, and the approaches under consideration for the class session.

What the ‘In-Depth’ treatment cannot be —under any circumstance - is a survey of the entire reading for the session topic, with vast sub-sets or parts of the topic treated superficially. The instructor will demand more of that of the entire class. Instead, what should be envisioned for the “In Depth Leadership” would be much more of a “drilling-down” of a key element of the evening's content. What should be envisioned is decision-making on the duo’s part of what is most important, or of the greatest utility, feasibility, propriety, or accuracy.

In-Depth Leaders are invited to provide or share materials of their design. And, if text-like-only written materials are provided for any purpose, it is expected they will comply with all of our course's demands for writing. As a measuring stick, the In-Depth Leader duos would consider themselves responsible for no more than twenty (20) minutes of the class meeting.

Assessment #3: (30 points) Reacting Quickly to the ‘Collaborate’/Extender

For nine (9) of what are, generally, ‘Program and Policy Evaluation Introduction’ weeks, a second, brief ‘Collaborate’-recorded session will be provided, usually available on the Mondays following our Thursday class meetings. Among the purposes of these recorded sessions will be (1) for summing-up, supplementing, or commenting on the previous face-to-face session’s high points and controversies, (2) for supplementing preparations for the upcoming week’s work, (3) for elaborating on various developments as they unfold during the course, (4) for reinforcing our course’s requirements for interaction and scholarly approaches, and (5) for meeting FSU graduate course time expectations. Points toward satisfaction of this assessment are earned as students formulate creative and appropriate responses online, and do so consistently throughout the weeks. For this purpose, among others, each student has their own “Place” as a discussion thread in Blackboard: Discussion Board.

Assessment # 4: (60 points) The May “Big Finish”, the approved Evaluation Design Presentation

Working individually or in approved team configurations, the students will devote the late April weeks and any March days – among the 14th to the 30th - of their choosing, to their design of a full-scale evaluation of an existing program or policy or of an educational enterprise’s work or offerings. The default convention or format to each student’s or team’s evaluation will be Scriven’s Key Education Checklist. However, students and teams are not only welcomed to work within another evaluation convention, but they will certainly be given additional course
performance evaluation consideration for their attempts in using an alternative evaluation design
convention. All presentations are to include data or background which shares insight into
individuals’ or teams’ evaluation convention. We all will look forward to an individual’s or a
team’s addition of vital details regarding the entity to be evaluated.

Each individual or team will be expected to provide a five- (5) page overview of the evaluation
design. This overview is also to be accompanied by a single-page abstract or executive
summary. These submissions will carry the need to have complied with all of our course’s
demands for writing.

All presentations will be delivered on the evenings of May 5, and May 12, at times to be
determined. The clock minutes these two sessions represent will be allocated to individuals and
evaluation teams according to the total number of evaluations in design. All participants will be
made fully aware of their respective presentation lengths. Every effort will be made to
accommodate students’ and teams’ needs for presentation time, including their interests in
supplementing with audio-visual aids. Forms of approval will be in order:

- Students’ team configurations must be approved by Noon of Friday, February 5th
- Students’ and Teams’ evaluation topic must be approved by, Noon of Friday, February
  12th
- Students’ evaluation conventions must be approved by Noon of Tuesday, April 12th

Let us say it this way: The crafting of an evaluation’s design is of immense importance to
success in this course for each individual student, whether performing as an individual or
as a member of a team. The effective sharing of the evaluation’s design is a critically
important commodity as well. The evaluation design, its subsequent May-evening class
session sharing, and the minimum six pages of written product must be such that –
together - they accurately and substantially reflect an entire month of doctoral –level work,
and are justifiable in their value of nearly one-third of the grade for the entire course.

Assessment #5: (30 points) General Class Participation

Grades in this category for a ‘face-to-face’ and Blackboard-and Collaborate-based course will
reflect the professor’s expectation that a professional practitioner’s active engagement is
expected at all times within all modes of exchange and interaction. Reflecting ‘Assessment #4’s’
statement as a matter of grade value justification, the general and specific interactions should
make it easily recognizable that a cohort has been assembled for an exemplary purpose, and that
its members are all well-prepared for a rich combination of scholarly pursuits, marked by a
steady pace, a sense of achievement, reward, and development, and all manner of collegial
discourse.
The professor’s ‘Participation’ grades are due immediately following the final class meeting of May 12th.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Mtg</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 1    | Th. Jan 28 | Welcome to EDLP 785  
*Educational Assessment and Program and Policy Evaluation*  
A Mid-Winter Warm-Up: Prepare for our first meeting by having read ‘Weiss’, Chapter 1, in *Blackboard*:  
Course Materials, and having reviewed our text, pp. 139-145.  
- **Welcomes, Introductions, and Answers to Questions**  
- A Thorough Review of the Syllabus and the Assessments  
- A Focus on Writing for our Purposes  
- A Focus on The Evaluation You’ll Be Designing / Thinking of a team configuration for your presentation? Operators are standing by.  
- Those references on our text pages 139-145  
- Those School Districts’ Independent Audits  
- Other Audits  
- Thorough Review of the Materials in *Blackboard*  
- The Reserve Book Cart  
- Assessment Score Sheets  
- Sign Up for ‘In-Depth’ Leadership Duo Responsibility  
- **Collaborates:** Our first one is set for Monday, February 1  
  Prepare for it by reading ‘Weiss’, Chapter 2  
  *The Collaborates’ First Responder: Kelly Fahey*  

| Week 2    | Th. Feb 4 | For EDLP 785  
Prepare by reading ‘Stufflebeam and Shinkfield’: Chapter 1  
- A Duo provides “In Depth Class Meeting Leadership”_Kelly Fahey and Sarah Gardenghi_  
- “Big E” Evaluation  
- The Mysterious Case of “Chapter 4” |
| **Week 3** Th. Feb. 11 | • **Chapter 1: Whatdyagot?**  
• **Due Friday the 5th:** Any team configurations must be sent along to the instructor for an approval by Noon  

For EDLP 785  
Perhaps Not the First Clue of the Professor’s Mental Illness  
‘Stufflebeam and Shinkfield’: Chapter 2 and 3  
Our Duo for “In Depth Class Meeting Leadership”  
Those School District Audits/ Other Audits: Whaaaaaat?  
Chapters 2 and 3: Whatdyagot?  
Due: Your Practice Synopses: A School District Audit from 2015  
• **Due Friday the 12th:** Students’ and Teams’ Evaluation topics must be approved by Noon  
• **First Assessment #1** Two-Pager due via email to the instructor |
| **Week 4** Th. Feb 18 | For EDLP 785  
Wait. *Pseudo-Evaluations? Why waste the time?*  
‘Stufflebeam and Shinkfield’: Chapter 5 and 6  
Our Duo for “In Depth Class Meeting Leadership”  
Ev-ver-y-bod-yy: 1. What will you evaluate?  
2. But really. What would you be dying to evaluate?  
Chapters 5 and 6: Whatdyagot? |
| **Week 5** Th. Feb 25 | It’s *Michael Scriven Night* in Hagerstown  
‘Stufflebeam and Shinkfield’: Chapter 16  
• **The KEC:** Get Your Best, Most Comprehensive Grasp (BMCG) of the Key Evaluation Checklist  
• **Our Duo for “In Depth Class Meeting Leadership”**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Th. Mar. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Don’t worry about our expectations for writing. Submit: your Consumer Reports ’1 to 25’  
  - All of It Together, Now: whatdyagot? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Th. Mar. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Checklists  
  - Get Your BMCG of the many checklists in Course Materials: “Big E” Evaluation Materials  
  - Our Duo for “In Depth Class Meeting Leadership”__________  
  The Checklists: Whatdyagot? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Th Mar 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Festival of Articles, Part I  
  - Prepare by reading for a thorough command of the “Part I Articles” in Course Materials  
  - Our Duo for “In Depth Class Meeting Leadership”__________  
  - Second Assessment #1 Two-Pager due via email to the instructor |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*</th>
<th>Th Mar 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The FSU Spring Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*</th>
<th>Th Mar 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The School Districts’ Spring Breaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Th Mar. 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program and Policy Evaluation: Our First Look at Specific ‘Approaches’  
  “Stufflebeam and Shinkfield”: Chapters 7 and 15  
  Our Duo for “In Depth Class Meeting Leadership”__________  
  TBA: A Guest Appearance or Two |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Th Apr 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Festival of Articles, Part II  
  - Prepare by reading for a thorough |
| Week 10 through Week 12 | Apr 14 through Apr 28 | The Evaluation Design Work Period, continues
- **Third Assessment #1 Two-Pager due via email to the instructor**

| Week 13 | Th. May 5 | For EDLP 785 It’s *the Big Finish*, Part I
The first half of the Evaluation Design Presentations

| Length of Presentations’ Requirements, TBD/@ 20 Minutes |

| Week 14 | Th. May 12 | For EDLP 785 It’s *the Big Finish*, Part II
The second half of the Evaluation Design Presentations
TBD/@ 20 Minutes |

command of the “Part II Articles” in *Course Materials*
- Our Duo for “In Depth Class Meeting Leadership”
- The Part II Articles: Whatdyagot? / U, F, P, A
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