UNSW SYDNEY

Arts & Social Sciences

School of Education

EDST5436

Evaluation of Educational Programs

Semester 2, 2017

Contents

IMPORTANT:
For student policies and procedures relating to assessment, attendance and student support, please see website, https://education.arts.unsw.edu.au/students/courses/course-outlines/

The School of Education acknowledges the Bedegal and Gadigal people as the traditional custodians of the lands upon which we learn and teach.

1. LOCATION

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
School of Education
EDST5436 Evaluation of Educational Programs (6 units of credit)
Semester 2, 2017

2. STAFF CONTACT DETAILS

Course Coordinator:	Dr Leila Morsy
Office Location:	John Goodsell 108
Email:	l.morsy@unsw.edu.au
Phone:	9385 9318
Availability:	Email, phone, or by appointment

3. COURSE DETAILS

Course Name	Evaluation of Educational Programs	
Credit Points	6 units of credit (6 uoc)	
Workload	Includes 150 hours including class contact hours, readings, class preparation, assessment, follow up activities, etc.	
Schedule Lecture	03, 04, 05, 06 October 9:00-16:00	John Goodsell 119

Summary of Course

In this course, you will learn to evaluate educational programs, becoming informed consumers of and contributors to what works in education. The course will focus on evaluation theory and practice. It draws from the full range of literature on evaluation, but focuses on the literature and cases in educational evaluation contexts. The course will develop and stimulate student critical thinking about educational evaluation using a blend of traditional face-to-face lectures and practical seminar activities. These will help students understand and develop their own views on the appropriate use of theories and application of educational evaluation. Group discussion, problem-based activities and case studies are designed to allow the application of evaluation strategies to aid in the realisation of an evaluation plan for students' choice of educational program.

The main ways in which the course has changed since last time as a result of student feedback:
- This is the first time the course is being offered in the current format. MyExperience surveys will be an invaluable part of ongoing course improvement for future semesters.

Student Learning Outcomes

Outcome		Assessment/s
1	Describe the fundamentals of evaluation.	1, 2 and 3
2	Identify, analyse and appraise different approaches to evaluation.	2 and 3
3	Describe the steps in the execution of a program evaluation.	1, 2 and 3
4	Apply knowledge of evaluation practices to a program evaluation plan in an educational organisation.	1, 2 and 3
5	Describe and discuss the issues in evaluation practice	2 and 3

Program Learning Outcomes

Standard		Assessment/s
1	**Advanced disciplinary knowledge and practices** Demonstrate an advanced understanding of the field of education as it relates to their specialist area of study, and the ability to synthesize and apply disciplinary principles and practices to new or complex environments.	1 and 3
2	**Enquiry-based learning** Demonstrate an in-depth understanding of research-based learning and the ability to plan, analyse, present implement and evaluate complex activities that contribute to advanced professional practice and/or intellectual scholarship in education.	1 and 3
3	**Cognitive skills and critical thinking** Demonstrate advanced critical thinking and problem solving skills	3
4	**Communication, adaptive and interactional skills** Communicate effectively to a range of audiences, and be capable of independent and collaborative enquiry and team-based leadership	2

AITSL Professional Teaching Standards (Proficient, Highly Accomplished, Lead)

Standard	Assessment/s
2.3.2 2.3.3 2.3.4	1, 2, 3
3.6.2 3.6.3 3.6.4	1, 2, 3
5.4.2 5.4.3 5.4.4	2, 3
5.5.2 5.5.3 5.5.4	2, 3

4. RATIONALE FOR THE INCLUSION OF CONTENT AND TEACHING APPROACH

This course will enable students to develop an understanding of evaluation that will enhance their practice as leaders of education organisations. It reflects a view that an understanding of evaluation theory offers a coherent set of conceptual, hypothetical, pragmatic and ethical principles to guide the study and practice of educational evaluation.

5. TEACHING STRATEGIES

The course will develop and stimulate student critical thinking using a blend of traditional face-to-face lectures and practical seminar activities. These will help students understand and develop their own views on the appropriate use of theories and application of educational evaluation.

Group discussion, problem-based activities and case studies are designed to allow the application of evaluation strategies to aid in the realisation of an evaluation plan for students' choice of educational program.

6. COURSE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE

Day	Date	Lecture Topic
30/08/2017 Pre-Assessment Due		
1	3/10/2017	Introduction to evaluation - Text Ch 1
1	3/10/2017	Evaluation approaches - Text Ch 2, 4 &10 Logic models and program theory - Knowlton Ch 1
1	3/10/2017	Focusing on evaluation design - Text Ch 11-12
2	4/10/2017	Evaluation questions and criteria - Text Ch 13
2	4/10/2017	Planning how to conduction an evaluation - Text Ch 14
2	4/10/2017	Ethics, sampling and cost choices - Text Ch 15
3	5/10/2017	Data sources, methods and analysis - Text Ch 16
3	5/10/2017	Data sources, methods and analysis - quantitative
3	5/10/2017	Reporting an evaluation - Text Ch 17
4	6/10/2017	Workshop: Preparing an evaluation report
13/10/2017 Assessment 2 Due		
3/11/2017 Assessment 3 due		

7. RESOURCES

Required Readings

AEA. (2004). *Guiding Principles For Evaluators*: American Evaluation Association. available from
http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51

AES. (2013). Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations: Australasian Evaluation Society Inc.
available from
http://www.aes.asn.au/images/stories/files/membership/AES_Guidelines_web_v2.pdf

Fitzpatrick, J., Sanders, J., & Worthen, B. (2012). *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines.* **4th International Edition New York: Pearson**

Knowlton, L. W. (2009). Introduction to Logic Models. In L. W. Knowlton & C. C. Phillips (Eds.), *The logic model guidebook: Better strategies for great results*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Further Readings

BetterEvaluation. (n.d.). Retrieved May, 2016, from http://betterevaluation.org/

Fitzpatrick, J. (2002). Dialogue with Stewart Donaldson. *American Journal of Evaluation, 23*, 347-365.

NSW Government. (2016). *NSW Government Evaluation Toolkit*. Department of Premier and
Cabinaet. Retrieved May, 2016, from
http://www.dpc.nsw.gov.au/programs_and_services/policy_makers_toolkit/evaluation_toolkit

Owen, J. M. (1991). An Evaluation Approach to Training Using the Notion of Form: An Australian
Example. *Evaluation Practice*, 12(2), 131-137.

Stufflebeam, D. & Shinkfield, A. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models and applications*. San Francisco ,
CA: Wiley & Sons.

Pell Institute and Pathways to College Network. (2016). *Evaluation Toolkit*. Retrieved May, 2016, from
http://toolkit.pellinstitute.org/

8. ASSESSMENT

Assessment Task	Length	Weight	Student Learning Outcomes Assessed	Program Learning Outcomes Assessed	Due Date
Pre-assessment Annotated Bibliography	1,200 words	20%	1, 2, 3, 4	1, 2	30/08/2017
Evaluation Planning Document	1,600 words	30%	1, 2, 3, 4	1, 2	13/10/2017
Final Evaluation Plan	3,000 words	50%	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1, 2	3/11/2017

Students are required to follow their lecturer's instructions when submitting their work for assessment.
All assessment will be submitted online via Moodle by 5pm.

Students no longer need to use a cover sheet. Students are also required to keep all drafts, original data and other evidence of the authenticity of the work for at least one year after examination. If an assessment is mislaid the student is responsible for providing a further copy. Please see the Student Policies and Procedures for information regarding submission, extensions, special consideration, late penalties and hurdle requirements etc.

Assessment Details

Pre-assessment Annotated Bibliography: Select 5 program evaluations that you consider to be high quality and provide annotations for each of them. The evaluations need not show positive results, but you should be able to defend the evaluations as methodologically and conceptually robust. These can be drawn from peer-reviewed publications, government reports, foundation reports, or other sources.

Evaluation Planning Document: The assessment is in two parts. The purpose of the first part is to provide basic information about the program to be evaluated: the rationale and context that constrains or enables its performance; and a description of the program as it really is using a logic model. The purpose of part 2 of this task is to identify the purpose of the evaluation, those involved, the key evaluation questions and the criteria you will use to determine program success.

Final Evaluation Plan: This assessment builds on the evaluation planning document. In it, you will provide the following: Program background, Purpose, Questions and Criteria, Design, Information and Sources, Measurement and Data Collection Methods.

Detailed information on each of these assessments can be found on the EDST5436 Moodle site.

Feedback

Assessment Task	Feedback Mechanism	Feedback Date
Pre-assessment annotated bibliography	Oral (recorded on Turnitin)	*Within 10 working days of submission deadline*
Evaluation planning document	Oral (recorded on Turnitin)	*Within 10 working days of submission deadline*
Final evaluation plan	Oral (recorded on Turnitin)	*Within 10 working days of submission deadline*

Student Name: Student No.:

Assessment Task: 1 – Pre-assessment Annotated Bibliography

SPECIFIC CRITERIA	(-) ⟶ (+)				
Understanding of the question or issue and the key concepts involved • Select 5 program evaluations that you consider to be high quality and provide annotations for each of them. The evaluations need not show positive results, but you should be able to defend the evaluations as methodologically and conceptually robust. These can be drawn from peer-reviewed publications, government reports, foundation reports, or other sources.					
Depth of analysis and/or critique in response to the task • Your annotations should address whether the objectives are clear and measurable. • The overall merit (quality), worth (value), and significance (importance) of the evaluation • The clarity of the purpose of the evaluation, including whether the evaluation was/ is ongoing (formative) or at the program conclusion (summative) • The inputs (including data sources, sampling strategies, ethical considerations) • The outcomes • The methodology (qualitative, quantitative, mixed) and its strength (or lack thereof) • The validity of the conclusions drawn based on the inputs, outcomes, and methodology.					
Familiarity with and relevance of professional and/or research literature used to support response • Reasons provided for inclusion of evaluations					
Structure and organisation of response • Use of APA throughout.					
Presentation of response according to appropriate academic and linguistic conventions • Clarity and appropriateness of sentence structure, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation.					
GENERAL COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT TIME					

Lecturer   **Date:**

Recommended: /20   (FL PS CR DN HD)   Weighting: 20%

UNSW SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
FEEDBACK SHEET
EDST5436 EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Student Name: Student No.:

Assessment Task: 2 - Evaluation Planning Document

SPECIFIC CRITERIA	(-) —————————→ (+)				
Understanding of the question or issue and the key concepts involved • Description of the program to be evaluated. Provide an explanation of what it is, who it serves and how it operates.					
Depth of analysis and/or critique in response to the task • Develop a theory of change and logic model to explain how the program is intended to work in enough detail so that anyone can understand what it is and what it does. • Purpose of the evaluation • Stakeholder analysis • Questions for evaluation • Criteria or standards that will be used with each question to determine program success					
Familiarity with and relevance of professional and/or research literature used to support response • Use of appropriate models and diagrams • Reasons provided for decisions made and questions selected					
Structure and organisation of response • Concise evaluation plan					
Presentation of response according to appropriate academic and linguistic conventions • Clarity and appropriateness of sentence structure, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation.					

GENERAL COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT TIME

Lecturer   **Date:**

Recommended: **/20**   **(FL PS CR DN HD)**   **Weighting:**   **30%**

NB: The ticks in the various boxes are designed to provide feedback to students; they are not given equal weight in determining the recommended grade. Depending on the nature of the assessment task, lecturers may also contextualize and/or amend these specific criteria.

The recommended grade is tentative only, subject to standardisation processes and approval by the School of Education Learning and Teaching Committee.

Student Name: Student No.:

Assessment Task: 3 - Final evaluation plan

SPECIFIC CRITERIA	(-) ⟶ (+)				
Understanding of the question or issue and the key concepts involved • Program background. Provide the purpose, questions and criteria, design/s, information and sources, measurements and data collection methods.					
Depth of analysis and/or critique in response to the task • Program background description and logic model • Purpose, questions and criteria • Process evaluation • Outcome Evaluation					
Familiarity with and relevance of professional and/or research literature used to support response • Use of appropriate models and diagrams • Description of the evaluation design/s • Supporting arguments for decisions made and methods selected					
Structure and organisation of response • Detailed evaluation plan • Identification of the evaluation questions • Criteria/standards • Evaluation design • Sources of information • Proposed data analysis					
Presentation of response according to appropriate academic and linguistic conventions • Clarity and appropriateness of sentence structure, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation.					
GENERAL COMMENTS					

Lecturer   **Date:**

Recommended: **/20**   **(FL PS CR DN HD)**   **Weighting:**   **50%**

NB: The ticks in the various boxes are designed to provide feedback to students; they are not given equal weight in determining the recommended grade. Depending on the nature of the assessment task, lecturers may also contextualize and/or amend these specific criteria.

The recommended grade is tentative only, subject to standardisation processes and approval by the School of Education Learning and Teaching Committee.