



**The Trachtenberg School of Public Policy
and Public Administration
Spring 2024**

Course: PPPA 6016 (Section 10)

Course Title: Public and Non-Profit Program Evaluation

Location: Tompkins 307

Day/Time: Wednesdays 8/28 – 12/4, 3:30 - 5:20 **EXCEPT SESSION 9 ON 10/23**

Course Description:

This course is intended to give the student an appreciation of the contributions and limitations of public and non-profit program evaluation, as well as a familiarity with the basic skills needed to conduct evaluations. Emphasis will be given to coping with the conceptual, methodological, organizational, political, and ethical problems which face evaluators. The various tasks facing evaluators will be discussed, from developing the questions to presenting the data. The specific issues addressed in class sessions are noted on the attached class schedule.

Prerequisites: Preferably PPPA 6002 or an equivalent basic course on research design.

Professor: Dr. David J. Bernstein

Cell Telephone: 301-928-7220. Include your name in the text so I know it's you. Please text first to arrange a call time.

E-mail: d.bernstein@gwu.edu

Office Hours: I do not have an office at GWU. Please text or email me to make an appointment to chat via Zoom (most weekdays) or in-person (Wednesdays before class).

Student Learning Objectives:

Through course discussions, readings, and assignments, students will develop knowledge and skills to enable them to:

- 1) develop knowledge of and skills in culturally responsive evaluation;
- 2) develop theory of change and program logic models;
- 3) work with stakeholders to frame utilization-oriented evaluation questions;
- 4) design clear and useful data collection instruments for use in evaluation work;
- 5) identify pertinent professional standards and ethical principles affecting specific dilemmas confronting evaluators in the field;
- 6) design implementation, outcome, and impact evaluations;
- 7) develop useful performance measures and design performance measurement systems for public and non-profit programs;
- 8) design user-oriented reports to convey evaluation findings; and
- 9) develop useful and feasible recommendations based on evaluation findings.

Method of Instruction:

The tasks and constraints facing professionals involved in the design and implementation of program evaluations are explored by class participation in both in-class and written exercises. Questions and problems facing both evaluators and managers of programs being evaluated are examined.

Classroom Expectations:

Higher education works best when it becomes a vigorous and lively marketplace of ideas in which all points of view are heard. Free expression in the classroom is an integral part of this process and works best when all of us approach the enterprise with empathy and respect for others, irrespective of their ideology, political views, or identity. We value civility because that is the kind of community we want, and we care for it because civility permits intellectual exploration and growth.

Respect for Diversity:

It is my intent that students from all backgrounds and perspectives be well-served by this course, that students' learning needs be addressed both in and out of class, and that the diversity that students bring to this class be viewed as a resource, strength, and benefit. I strive to create an inclusive classroom and present materials and activities that are respectful of diversity including gender, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, culture, and political affiliation. **Your suggestions on how to help me succeed with this are encouraged and appreciated.**

Acknowledging Historical Realities about GW:

GW and Slavery:

“Although additional work remains to be done, initial research into Columbian College [GW’s predecessor] clearly shows that the practice of slavery influenced the school from the president down to enslaved servants. The college was located in a slave-owning city, financed and led by slave owners and men who profited from the slave economy, educated pro-slavery students, and depended on the labor of enslaved people” (library.gwu.edu/slavery-columbian-college).

GW & Native American Lands

“George Washington University’s Foggy Bottom Campus in downtown Washington, D.C. ... resides on the traditional and ancestral homelands of the Piscataway and Anacostan peoples. ... The District borders the confluence of the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers, a historic center of trade and cultural exchange between several tribal nations. For generations, the Piscataway and Anacostian Peoples have resided in this region and served as stewards of the local land and waterways” (cipp.cps.gwu.edu/land-acknowledgement).

Recurring Readings: Posted in the Recurring Readings folder on Blackboard:

Assigned readings are selected to give students a representative sample of the professional evaluation literature, as well as to expose them to the sorts of issues which arise in the context of real-life evaluations. **Readings must be completed prior to each class, including the readings for the first class on August 28.**

The readings below are included on Blackboard under Readings labeled Recurring Readings. Check the contents list for list of chapters by clicking on the lower icon in the left column once you open the document in Blackboard.

1. **Kimmel.** *Ethics and Values in Applied Social Research*, Sage 1988.
2. **Newcomer et al, or HPPE.** Kathryn Newcomer, Harry Hatry, and Joseph Wholey, *The Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, Jossey-Bass, 4th Edition, 2015. Check the Contents list for list of chapters.
3. **Newcomer and Hart.** Kathryn Newcomer and Nick Hart, *Evidence-Building and Evaluation in Government*, Sage, 2022.
4. **Gertler.** Paul J. Gertler, et al, *Impact Evaluation in Practice*, The World Bank, 2011. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sief-trust-fund/publication/impact-evaluation-in-practice>

5. **GAO**, U.S. Government Accountability Office reports and other readings by a diverse set of authors are also provided on Blackboard. Readings are sorted under each Session.
6. **Websites:**
 - **Better Evaluation:** Timely and free materials at betterevaluation.org.
 - **AEA, American Evaluation Association:** <https://www.eval.org/>
 - **NOTE:** AEA Student membership is \$73 (electronic documents). While not required, you will find a lot of great continuing evaluation education via AEA.
7. Unless otherwise noted, all readings will be available by session in Blackboard under the Readings folder.

Assignments:

Email written assignments to d.bernstein@gwu.edu **prior to the beginning of class on the due date.** All assignments must include your name (or the name of all class members who participated) and emails for all participants. Assignment due dates are show below and under the session by which the assignment is due. **ALL written assignments must be submitted as editable Microsoft Word documents via electronic copy to my email, d.bernstein@gwu.edu on or before the due date.** Feedback and grades for assignments will be provided via comments and track changes on a copy of submissions. Due dates are firm for all assignments. Late submissions or lack of preparation for in class presentations will be penalized with lower grades.

1. **Class Participation (5% of grade):** Attendance is required for successful completion of this course. Students are expected to complete the required readings prior to the class meeting for which they are listed. Class discussion on the required readings will affect course grades, especially in borderline cases. Active participation (attentive listening and concise speaking is expected. Use of electronic devices (PCs, tablets, phones) except for the purpose of taking notes is prohibited.
2. **In-Class Exercises and Ethics Debates (15% of grade):** In-class exercises and ethics debates will be held throughout the semester and require an oral presentation. Students will be graded on their performance in the exercises and debates. A schedule of student presentations is provided below.
3. **Critique Report of an Evaluation (20% of grade):** Students will critically review an evaluation selected by the student. **Critique proposal due September 25 (Session 5). Critique report due October 16 (Session 8).**

NOTE: The evaluation report to be critiqued must present results from an impact or outcome evaluation of an existing or recent program (within the last 5 years). You may not critique an article about how to conduct surveys, research, or evaluations. The evaluation should not primarily be focused on formative evaluation issues, but

formative issues may be addressed as part of the evaluation. The critique should focus on the impact or outcome aspects of the evaluation.

Critique Proposal: Prior to September 25 (Session 5), you must send d.bernstein@gwu.edu a link to your selected evaluation for your critique. Dr. Bernstein must approval your selection before you write the critique. The deadline is intended to allow you enough time to find an alternative evaluation to critique if I determine that the proposed evaluation is not appropriate.

The maximum five-page, single-spaced (size 12 font) critique of the evaluation should be prepared in the following format:

- 1) Your name, the name and author of the evaluation, and a link to the evaluation
- 2) a brief introduction;
- 3) a description of the evaluation focus and findings;
- 4) identification of 3a) the key evaluation questions addressed **or 3b)** your take on what they must have been if not specified by the author;
- 5) a brief summary of the research design and data collection methods used;
- 6) **a table** that contains a systematic list of threats to:
measurement validity, measurement reliability, internal validity, external validity, and statistical conclusion validity. Note that the threats should be clearly presented; e.g., do not simply state “Hawthorne Effect,” but clarify how/why that threat occurred; and label the threats to validity as: those the authors acknowledged and addressed; threats the authors acknowledged but did not address; and those the authors did not acknowledge or address.

Please see Blackboard for a good example to emulate.

4. **Exams-Memos on Course Content (30% of grade):** A take-home essay exam covering the readings and content of the course will consist of three focused, brief memoranda spaced out across the semester. Guidance on writing clear memoranda can be found on Blackboard. **Students will be given the topics and intended audiences for each memorandum at least two weeks before each is due. The memoranda are due by the start of class on October 2 (Session 6), November 6 (Session 11), and December 6 (Session 14).**
5. **Applied Impact Evaluation Design Group Project (30%):** All students must work in groups of three (or two if needed) to prepare a written program evaluation design. The names and emails of students working on each group project should be included on all work products. The design should include a proposal for an impact evaluation. There are two options: (A) The primary way to satisfy the requirement is to; (A) Students may prepare a comprehensive evaluation design for an RFP provided by Dr. Bernstein; or (B) responding to an actual RFP. Both options will be discussed in more detail in class. All projects must be approved by the professor before proceeding.

- Proposal for Group Applied Evaluation Design Project: Due on or before **October 23 (Session 9)**.
- Draft Logic Model and Design Presented: **During class on November 13 (Session 12)** (10% of class grade; 33.3% of assignment grade)
- **Final Applied Evaluation Design Project and Logic Model: Due COB on November 29**. This deadline is intended to allow you to finalize the Applied Evaluation Design Project and Logic Model during the Thanksgiving break (20% of class grade; 66.6% of assignment grade).

This assignment is intended to provide you with training for developing an evaluation proposal and study design that could be submitted in response to an RFP. For those who work for government and nonprofit organizations that sponsor contracted evaluations, the process of responding to a proposal is a great exercise in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of evaluation RFPs.

You are asked to develop an evaluation design as a response to (A) an RFP available on Blackboard OR an RFP from a federal, state, or local government agency, a foundation, nonprofit organization, or international organization calling for an impact or outcome evaluation of a program, project, or demonstration. You will only be developing an evaluation proposal and will not be conducting the evaluation. However, the proposed evaluation design must be realistic and operational. Further details will be discussed in class before you begin.

The response you develop to present to the class on (Session 12) and for submission on or before November 29, 2024, will be in the form of a written product. The maximum length for the report is 20-page single-spaced (size 12 font) report, not including tables or graphics, and should include ALL of the components identified below:

- Executive Summary: Describe key attributes of your proposal with a 1-page summary.
- Introduction and Background: An introduction to the project, including the names of the team and their roles on the evaluation should be provided. Describe the scoping activities, including a brief description of the program and a synthesis of relevant past research and evaluation findings; also, cite relevant literature on the program, which will require original research.
- Evaluation Questions: The issues that have been identified and the specific questions that are addressed, or should be addressed, must be provided. Explain the usefulness of the questions. If you believe the RFP misses some important aspects of how the study should be conducted, include these as well and explain why they are useful. Be sure to clearly identify the impact and outcome evaluation questions.
- Program Design: Develop and include a logic model to identify inputs, activities, outputs, short- and long-term outcomes, impacts, and mediating factors. A logic

model of the program/policy must be developed and presented in the body of the report with an appropriate introduction and explanation of key features.

- Evaluation Design: Provide the design(s) undertaken, or to be undertaken, including the concepts and variables, the theory underlying the policy/program, etc. Explain what type of approach, why it is most appropriate, and how it answers the evaluation questions.
- Data Collection Plan: Discuss the sources of data available, measures used to address the research questions, data collection methods, and sampling procedures.
- Data Analysis Plan: Discuss and explain the proposed analytic strategies and explain how you are answering the evaluation questions with the analysis. Describe the outcome and explanatory variables to be used, the statistical techniques to be used, and how you would be able to draw inferences about the program's impacts. Discuss the size of the sample to be analyzed and indicate if it is large enough to obtain statistically significant findings if the program has the desired impact (i.e., conduct minimum detectable impact analysis). If relevant, describe how data from subgroups of interest will be developed.
- Reports and Products: Describe the proposed Presentation and Utilization Plan (e.g., how the evaluation findings will be presented): Provide strategies for presenting the results to key stakeholders and decision-makers and strategies for facilitating use.
- Potential Problems and Fall-back Strategies: Identify the potential problems that may arise in conducting the evaluation and the strategies that will be used to either avoid the problem or deal with its occurrence. Also, there should be a table of limitations to validity and reliability, an assessment of the issues and types of threats posed, as well as actions undertaken in your proposal to reduce the impact of the limitations identified.
- Suggested Deviations from the RFP: If you believe the evaluation could be improved by modifying the outcome variables, analytical method, alternative data sources, or anything else, present your alternative strategies here and explain the pros and cons. If the RFP lacked complete information to produce a complete evaluation design, identify the issues and the assumptions that you are making in order to ensure a complete evaluation design.
- Proposed Summary Workplan and Schedule: This section should be brief and consist of a Task List and schedule for tasks and the proposed project.
- Draft Budget: This section should include a brief budget summary associated with the proposed work. (You Do Not Need to submit a budget)
- Conclusion: A brief conclusion should be provided.

Examples of high-quality projects from past students are available on Blackboard.

Grading

1. Class participation/attendance (**5% of final grade**)
2. In-Class Exercises and Ethics Debates (**15% of final grade**)

3. Critique Report of an Evaluation (**20% of final grade**):
4. Exams-3 memos on course content (**30% of final grade**)
5. Applied Impact Evaluation Design Group Project (**30% of final grade**):

Class Schedule and Assignments

Session 1 (August 28)

Introduction to the Course and Overview of the Field of Program Evaluation

Readings on Blackboard:

1. Chapter 1 in **Newcomer et al.**
2. Patton on Use of Metaphors
3. **AEA**: “What is Evaluation” Statement Report?
<https://www.eval.org/Portals/0/What%20is%20evaluation%20Document.pdf>
4. **AEA**: American Evaluation Association Evaluation Guiding Principles for Evaluators; <https://www.eval.org/About/Guiding-Principles>
5. **AEA**: AEA 2018 Evaluator Competencies Report;
<https://www.eval.org/About/Competencies-Standards/AEA-Evaluator-Competencies>

Questions:

- What is program evaluation? What types of studies and analytical support fall under this concept?
- How does program evaluation differ from other forms of analysis?
- What are the different approaches to evaluation?
- How did the field of evaluation evolve?
- Where does evaluation take place and who conducts evaluations?
- What are some of the more critical issues that face the evaluation profession?
- Who are “professional evaluators?”
- What is the status of program evaluation in other nations, e.g., performance auditing?
- What role does program evaluation play for international funders, e.g. the World Bank?
- How do current performance measurement efforts relate to program evaluation?
- How does organizational culture shape evaluation capacity?

Session 2 (September 4)

Professor Kathryn Newcomer will be leading Session 2.

Scoping Evaluations: Establishing Objectives for Evaluation Work

Readings on BB

1. **Newcomer and Hart** Chapter 3
2. **AEA Guiding Principles**-review from Session 1
3. **AEA 2018 Evaluator Competencies Report**-review from Session 1

Questions:

- What is the guidance provided to evaluators by the American Evaluation Association (AEA) Guiding Principles and Evaluator Competencies?
- What role should staff and external stakeholders play in evaluation?
- What role can the evaluator play in program development and design?
- What pre-design steps are desirable for the evaluator to take?
- What is the program theory? How can it be developed and refined?
- What is logic modeling?
- How might theories of change (ToC) models guide program design AND evaluation?
- How does a ToC differ from a traditional logic model?
- What are complex, adaptive systems? And what are the key concepts relevant to program evaluation from systems thinking?
- What should be contained in a Statement of Work (SOW)?

Session 3 (September 11)

Strategies for Engaging Stakeholders

Readings on BB

1. **Newcomer et al.**, Chapter 2, Bryson and Patton
2. Kolko, Design Thinking Comes of Age
3. Coghlan, Preskill, Catsambas-Appreciative Inquiry
4. PCORI Equity and Inclusion Guiding Engagement Principles
5. Skim Bernstein et al., Addressing sponsor and stakeholder needs in the evaluation authorizing environment
6. Transit Planning 4 All Website:
<https://transitplanning4all.org/introduction-to-inclusive-planning/>
<https://transitplanning4all.org/pathway-to-inclusion/>
<https://transitplanning4all.org/inclusive-planning-guide/>: Click links for:
[1. Explore](#); [2. Design](#); [3. Implement](#); [4. Evaluate](#); [5. Sustain](#)

Questions:

- What role do stakeholders play in evaluation?
- How might stakeholders be most fruitfully engaged?
- What is appreciative inquiry, and when is it helpful and when is it not as applicable?
- How do nonprofits measure outcomes?
- What are the difference between evaluation sponsors and evaluation stakeholders?
- What are the considerations in evaluating participant inclusion of program planning and operations?

Session 4 (September 18)

Ethical and Legal Dilemmas and Advocacy in Evaluation Practice

Assignments:

1. At the end of class Dr. Bernstein will demonstrate how the ethics in evaluation debates will be conducted using a Demonstration ethics issue from 7 Ethics in Evaluation-Debate Topics. You are expected to read the full document, (#7 below), including the Demonstration and the 18 ethical dilemmas. At the beginning of Session 5 on September 25 we will conduct a process to form teams of two students for each ethics debate.
2. Dr. Bernstein will provide the topics and intended audiences for Exam Memo #1.

Readings on BB

1. **Kimmel**, Chapter 2, An Overview of Ethical, Problems in Social Research, page 26-41
2. **Kimmel**, Chapter 6, ETHICS AND EVALUATION: SOME ILLUSTRATIVE PROBLEMS, page 110-114
3. **Newcomer et al.**, page 818 to 820, “Challenge 3: Maintaining Standards and Ethics”
4. Stake, How Far Dare an Evaluator Go Toward Saving the World?
5. Podems article, Making Feminist Evaluation Practical
6. Review American Evaluation Association Evaluation Guiding Principles for Evaluators; <https://www.eval.org/About/Guiding-Principles>
7. Ethics in Evaluation-Debate Topics.

Questions:

- What protections should be given to participants in an evaluation?
- What procedures are possible in ensuring confidentiality?
- What procedures can be developed for maintaining the credibility and fairness of the evaluation?
- What are the essential elements and desired format for informed consent agreements?
- What are Institutional Review Boards and why are they important?
- What is the ethical role of evaluators as policy advocates?
- What is feminist evaluation?

Session 5 (September 25)

**An Overview of Evaluation in the Non-profit Sector/International Development:
Conducting Evaluations in Non-profit Agencies and Expectations of Foundations
and Other Funders**

Assignments:

1. Proposal to critique an evaluation is due to d.bernstein@gwu.edu prior to class. Please include your name, the name and organization of the evaluation, and a link to the evaluation.

Readings on BB

1. International Handbook of Practice-based Performance Management, Chapter 2, Newcomer, Assessing Performance in Nonprofit Agencies
2. Innovation Network, 2016-State_of_Nonprofit_Evaluation [skim]
3. *Dealing with Complexity in Development Evaluation*, Chapter 1
4. *Dealing with Complexity in Development Evaluation*, Chapter 2
5. “Randomistas-RCTs” set of two articles

Questions:

- What/who drives evaluation in the nonprofit sector? Who funds it?
- How do funders approach the evaluation process?
- What information is sought?
- What do stakeholders do with the findings?
- What are the challenges of applying evaluation in the sector?
- In what ways can evaluation be useful to nonprofits?
- What are the various models or approaches used in the sector?
- Who conducts evaluation in the nonprofit sector?
- What is the state of practice of evaluation in international development?
- What are the arguments, pro and con, of the use of RCTs in the international context?
- What are expectations of funders of capacity building in developing countries? And how realistic are they?
- What are challenges facing nonprofit agencies in developing countries to using monitoring and evaluation?

Session 6 (October 2)

Evaluating Implementation and Process, and Anticipating Pitfalls in Evaluation Work

Assignments:

1. Exam Memorandum #1.
2. Review McMahan, et al. and be prepared to critique in class discussion (to help prepare you for the critique assignment).
3. Ethics Debate Team 1 will make a presentation in class.

Readings on BB

1. Holcomb and Nightingale, Conceptual Underpinnings of Implementation Analysis
2. **Newcomer et al.** Wholey, Chapter 4, Exploratory Evaluation
3. **Newcomer and Hart**, Chapter 2, Assessing the Quality of Evidence
4. McMahan, et al., Basic Reading Through Dance [Critique on common threats]

Questions:

- How should formative evaluations be designed?
- How do you measure program implementation?
- How should feedback be incorporated in an implementation study?
- How should an implementation study be linked with an outcome study?
- What is evaluability assessment? What are the steps? How can it be used to guide evaluation? How can it be used as a management tool?
- What are the most common threats to measurement validity and measurement reliability, and to internal, external, and statistical conclusion validity?

Session 7 (October 9)

Outcome and Impact Evaluation

Assignments due to d.bernstein@gwu.edu prior to class:

1. **Critique Proposal:** Link to evaluation that you will critique.
2. Ethics Debate Team 2 will make a presentation in class.

Readings on BB

1. **Newcomer et al.**, Chapter 6. Henry, Comparison Group Designs
2. Skim **Gertler**, et al. Chapter 4, 5, and 6
3. Cartright. Knowing what we are talking about: why evidence doesn't always travel
4. Review Bernstein EERS PowerPoints: Quick and Not So Random Thoughts About RCTs 04-2015Notes.pptx. Review the slides **AND the Notes**.

Questions:

- What are the commonly used designs to measure program outcomes?
- What are the considerations in selecting a design to evaluate program impact?
- How do the evaluators weigh the tradeoffs in various designs?
- What strategies are available for controlling or ruling out various rival explanations?
- What is propensity scoring, and how do you implement the technique?
- What designs are applicable for longitudinal data?

Session 8 (October 16)

How is Cultural Responsiveness and an Equity Focus built into Design, Data Collection and Measurement?

Assignments Due by email to d.bernstein@gwu.edu prior to class:

1. Critique Report of an Evaluation (see Assignments #3, page 4 above)
2. Ethics Debate Team 3 will make a presentation in class.

Readings on BB

1. Hood, Hopson, and Kirkhart, Chapter 12 in **Newcomer et al.**

2. AEA Statement on Cultural Competence in Evaluation; in Blackboard and online <https://www.eval.org/Portals/0/Docs/aea.cultural.competence.statement.pdf>
3. Toldson Chapters 1,2, 3 (separate files on Blackboard as 3A, 3B, and 3C)
4. Jordan and Hall, Framing Anticolonialism in Evaluation: Bridging Decolonizing Methodologies and Culturally Responsive Evaluation

Questions:

- What is involved in culturally responsive evaluation planning, data collection and analysis?
- What is entailed in equity-focused evaluation?
- What procedures can enhance multicultural validity and reliability in measurement?
- How do we ensure more cultural competency in our evaluation work?
- What is entailed in framing anti-colonialism in evaluation and decolonizing our methods?

Session 9 (October 23): SESSION BEGINS AT 2:15 PM

Please arrive for this session at Tompkins 307 by 2:15 PM. The session will conclude at 4:15. If you are unable to arrive by 2:15 please let Dr. Bernstein know so alternative arrangements can be made.

Data Collection Instrument Design and Qualitative Data Analysis

Assignments

1. Proposal for Group Applied Evaluation Design Project. Include names of group and evaluation RFP with links or name in Blackboard to which you will respond.
2. Dr. Bernstein will provide the topics and intended audiences for Exam Memorandum #2.

Readings on BB

1. Newcomer and Triplett Chapter 14 in **Newcomer et al.**
2. Krueger and Casey Chapter 20 in **Newcomer et al.**
3. Goodrick and Rogers Chapter 22 in **Newcomer et al.**
4. Bernstein Diss Methodology and Lincoln & Guba. Skim or read Bernstein Dissertation Methodology Section; **definitely read** “Limitations” starting on page 19 AND Lincoln and Guba’s Evaluative Criteria, pages 25 and 26 (not part of the dissertation).

Questions:

- What are the relative advantages of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods? That is, what types of evaluation questions are best addressed with qualitative versus quantitative methods?
- What design characteristics bolster the validity of survey instruments?
- How are program participants most effectively surveyed?

- When are focus groups most helpful?
- How should focus groups be designed and implemented?
- What are useful strategies for analyzing “qualitative” data?
- How do threats to validity in qualitative methods differ from quantitative methods?
- What is entailed in mixed methods evaluation?

Session 10 (October 30)

Performance Measurement and Performance Management

Assignments:

1. Ethics Debate Team 4 will make a presentation in class.

Readings on BB

1. Poister Chapter in **Newcomer et al.**
2. Behn Paper on “PerformanceStat”
3. Bernstein, Local government measurement use to focus on performance and results, 2001 EPP24
4. Perrin, Effective Use and Misuse of PM, AJE 19-3
5. Bernstein Comments on Perrin, AJE 1999 vol 20 no 1

Questions:

- What is performance measurement? What is performance/program monitoring? What is performance management?
- What are the challenges to measuring performance?
- What is outcome monitoring?
- How might performance measurement and program evaluation be effectively coordinated? How can evaluators contribute to performance monitoring?
- What are challenges to “PerformanceStat”-like processes in government?
- What are challenges to performance-based contracting?
- What is the “balanced score card?”

Session 11 (November 6)

"Evidence-based Decision-making": Assessing Evidence, Meta-Evaluation and Systematic Reviews

Assignments Due to d.bernstein@gwu.edu:

1. **Exam:** Second memo due.
2. Proposal for Group Applied Evaluation Design Project
3. Ethics Debate Team 5 will make a presentation in class.

Readings on BB

1. Boruch and Petrosino, Chapter 25 in **Newcomer et al.**

2. Newcomer et al., From Noise to Knowledge article
3. Please visit and assess **one** of the following websites for its usefulness and accessibility, and be ready to discuss your impression of it:
 - A. IES What Works Clearinghouse (education) <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>
 - B. The Campbell Collaboration <http://campbellcollaboration.org/>
 - C. Collaboration for Environmental Evidence <http://www.environmentalevidence.org/>
 - D. HHS/ACF <https://www.pathwaystowork.acf.hhs.gov/>
 - E. Dept of Labor Clearinghouse at <https://clear.dol.gov/>

Questions:

- What is meta-evaluation and how is it best conducted?
- What are systematic reviews?
- What is “evidence-based” policy/management/practice?
- When are findings from evaluations sufficient to constitute such “Evidence?”
- Why is it difficult to transfer evaluation and research findings into practice?
- What is practice-based evidence?

Session 12 (November 13)

The Institutional Context for Evaluation and Evaluation Capacity Building

Assignments Due to d.bernstein@gwu.edu prior to class:

1. Draft Logic Model and Design Presented: During class on November 13 (Session 12)
2. Ethics Debate Team 6 will make a presentation in class.
3. Dr. Bernstein will provide the topics and intended audiences for Exam Memo #3.

Readings on BB:

1. American Evaluation Association Roadmap;
<https://www.eval.org/Portals/0/Docs/AEA%20Evaluation%20Roadmap%202019%20Update%20FINAL.pdf>
2. Johnson and Newcomer, US Inspectors General, Chapter 4
3. Johnson and Newcomer, US Inspectors General, Chapter 6
4. Skim GAO Report, “Program Evaluation: An Evaluation Culture and Collaborative Partnerships Help Build Agency Capacity” (GAO-03-454).
5. Skim Davies, Newcomer, and Soydan, Chapter 7 on Institutions and Evaluation

Questions:

- What does the American Evaluation Association recommend in terms of institutionalizing evaluation?
- What is evaluation capacity-building?
- What difference does the source of evaluation expertise make in terms of approach, methods and use?
- How do auditors (Inspector General offices) approach evaluation?
- What skills are required for effective evaluation practice and for oversight of contracted evaluation work?

Session 13 (November 20)

Analyzing and Reporting Data AND Presentation of Draft Logic Models and Designs

Assignments:

1. Ethics Debate Team 7 (if needed) will make a presentation in class

Readings on BB

1. Grob, Providing Recommendations, Suggestions, and Options for Improvement, Chapter 27 in **Newcomer et al.**
2. Grob, Writing for Impact, Chapter 28 in **Newcomer et al.**

Questions:

- What are characteristics of effective data presentation?
- What are rigorous procedures for analyzing qualitative data?
- How should results be displayed?
- How are “null results” most appropriately reported?
- What do useful recommendations look like?

NOVEMBER 27: NO CLASS (HAPPY THANKSGIVING!)

Assignment DUE NOVEMBER 29 by email to d.bernstein@gwu.edu:

1. **Final Applied Evaluation Design Project/Logic Model Report.** See p. 5-7 above. While we won't be meeting due to Thanksgiving I wanted you to have time that week to wrap up your evaluation design report.

Session 14 (December 4) Final Class

Enhancing Utilization of Evaluation/Building Evaluation Capacity, Class Overview

Assignments Due to d.bernstein@gwu.edu prior to class:

1. **Exams:** Third memo due.

Readings on BB

1. Hatry, Wholey, and Newcomer, Evaluation Challenges, Issues, and Trends in **Newcomer et al.**
2. **Newcomer and Hart** Chapter 4, Developing Learning Agendas for Public Organizations
3. **Newcomer and Hart**, Chapter 7, Sustaining Momentum for Evidence-Building Capacity in Government

Questions:

- What factors influence utilization of evaluation results?
- What are the various types of utilization? How can they be measured?
- What can be done during evaluation design and implementation to enhance utilization?
- How can you help to build an evaluation and performance-friendly culture?
- What are emerging and continuing significant issues in the evaluation profession?

Policies in Trachtenberg School Courses:

1. Incompletes: A student must consult with the instructor to obtain a grade of I (incomplete) no later than the last day of classes in a semester. At that time, the student and instructor will both sign the CCAS contract for incompletes and submit a copy to the School Director. Please consult the TSPPPA Student Handbook or visit our website for the complete CCAS policy on incompletes.
2. Submission of Written Work Products Outside of the Classroom: It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that an instructor receives each written assignment. Students can submit written work electronically only with the express permission of the instructor.
3. Submission of Written Work Products after Due Date: Policy on Late Work: All work must be turned in by the assigned due date in order to receive full credit for that assignment, unless an exception is expressly made by the instructor.
4. Academic Honesty: Please consult the “policies” section of the GW student handbook for the university code of academic integrity. Note especially the definition of plagiarism: “intentionally representing the words, ideas, or sequence of ideas of another as one’s own in any academic exercise; failure to attribute any of the following: quotations, paraphrases, or borrowed information.” All examinations, papers, and other graded work products and assignments are to be completed in conformance with the George Washington University Code of Academic Integrity. See the GW Academic Integrity Code (<http://www.gwu.edu/~integrity>).
5. Changing Grades After Completion of Course: No changes can be made in grades after the conclusion of the semester, other than in cases of clerical error.
6. Syllabus: This syllabus is a guide to the course for the student. Sound educational practice requires some flexibility, and the instructor may therefore, at her/his discretion, change content and requirements during the semester but only to give students more, not less, time. Excused absences will be given for absences due to religious holidays as per the university schedule, but please advise the instructor ahead of time.

University Policies

University Policy on Religious Holidays

1. **Students should notify faculty during the first week of the semester of their intention to be absent from class on their day(s) of religious observance.**
2. Faculty should extend to these students the courtesy of absence without penalty on such occasions, including permission to make up examinations.
3. Faculty who intend to observe a religious holiday should arrange at the beginning of the semester to reschedule missed classes or to make other provisions for their course-related activities.

Support for Students Outside the Classroom

Disability Support Services (DSS)

Any student who may need an accommodation based on the potential impact of a disability should contact the Disability Support Services office at 202-994-8250 in the Rome Hall, Suite 102, to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. For additional information please refer to: gwired.gwu.edu/dss/

Mental Health Services 202-994-5300

The University's Mental Health Services offers 24/7 assistance and referral to address students' personal, social, career, and study skills problems. Services for students include: crisis and emergency mental health consultations confidential assessment, counseling services (individual and small group), and referrals. counselingcenter.gwu.edu/

Academic Integrity Code

Academic dishonesty is defined as cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information. For the remainder of the code, see: studentconduct.gwu.edu/code-academic-integrity

Out of Class Learning

Average minimum amount of independent, out-of- class, learning expected per week: In a 14-week semester, including exam week, students are expected to spend a minimum of 100 minutes of out-of- class work for every 50 minutes of direct instruction, for a **minimum** total of 2.5 hours a week.

Academic Commons

[Academic Commons](http://academiccommons.gwu.edu) is the central location for academic support resources for GW students. To schedule a peer tutoring session for a variety of courses visit go.gwu.edu/tutoring. Visit academiccommons.gwu.edu for study skills tips, finding help with research, and connecting with other campus resources. For questions email academiccommons@gwu.edu.

GW Writing Center

GW Writing Center cultivates confident writers in the University community by facilitating collaborative, critical, and inclusive conversations at all stages of the writing process. Working alongside peer mentors, writers develop strategies to write independently in academic and public settings. Appointments can be booked online at gwu.mywconline.

Support for students in and outside the classroom

Disability Support Services (DSS) 202-994-8250

Any student who may need an accommodation based on the potential impact of a disability should contact Disability Support Services at disabilitysupport.gwu.edu to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations.

Student Health Center 202-994-5300, 24/7

The Student Health Center (SHC) offers [medical](#), [counseling/psychological](#), and [psychiatric](#) services to GW students. More information about the SHC is available at healthcenter.gwu.edu. Students experiencing a medical or mental health emergency on campus should contact GW Emergency Services at 202-994-6111, or off campus at 911.

GW Campus Emergency Information

GW Emergency Services: 202-994-6111

For situation-specific instructions, refer to [GW's Emergency Procedures guide](#).

GW Alert

GW Alert is an emergency notification system that sends alerts to the GW community. GW requests students, faculty, and staff maintain current contact information by logging on to alert.gwu.edu. Alerts are sent via email, text, social media, and other means, including the Guardian app. The Guardian app is a safety app that allows you to communicate quickly with GW Emergency Services, 911, and other resources. Learn more at safety.gwu.edu.

Protective Actions

GW prescribes four protective actions that can be issued by university officials depending on the type of emergency. All GW community members are expected to follow directions according to the specified protective action. The protective actions are Shelter, Evacuate, Secure, and Lockdown (details below). Learn more at safety.gwu.edu/gw-standard-emergency-statuses.

Shelter

- Protection from a specific hazard
- The hazard could be a tornado, earthquake, hazardous material spill, or other environmental emergency.
- Specific safety guidance will be shared on a case-by-case basis.

Action:

- Follow safety guidance for the hazard.

Evacuate

- Need to move people from one location to another.
- Students and staff should be prepared to follow specific instructions given by first responders and University officials.

Action:

- Evacuate to a designated location.
- Leave belongings behind.
- Follow additional instructions from first responders.

Secure

- Threat or hazard outside of buildings or around campus.
- Increased security, secured building perimeter, increased situational awareness, and restricted access to entry doors.

Action:

- Go inside and stay inside.
- Activities inside may continue.

Lockdown

- Threat or hazard with the potential to impact individuals inside buildings.
- Room-based protocol that requires locking interior doors, turning off lights, and staying out of sight of corridor window.

Action:

- Locks, lights, out of sight
- Consider Run, Hide, Fight