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<table>
<thead>
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<th>E-mail</th>
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</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Ambyr Rios</td>
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Rationale for Course

Edit

The proposed changes are for accreditation purposes.

Other

The proposed changes are part of a routine curriculum review.

Explain other rationale

Update for distance education equivalency.

Course prefix: EDCI 632

Department: Teaching, Learning & Culture
College/School: Education & Human Development
Academic Level: Graduate
Academic Level: Undergraduate
Effective term: 2018-2019

Complete Course Title

Program Evaluation in Curriculum and Instruction

Abbreviated Course Title

PROG EVAL IN C & I

Catalog course description

Program evaluation, investigating its purposes and procedures, with attention to settings, personnel and performance; review of standards, principal theories and models; study of histories, political contexts, ethics and the nature of evidence.

Prerequisites and Restrictions

Graduate classification.

Concurrent Enrollment

No

Should catalog prerequisites

No

In Workflow

1. TLAC Department Head Review
2. Curricular Services Review
3. ED Committee Preparer GR
4. ED Committee Chair GR
5. ED College Dean GR
6. GC Preparer
7. GC Chair
8. Faculty Senate Preparer
9. Faculty Senate
10. Provost II
11. President
12. Curricular Services
13. Banner
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1. 01/31/18 9:48 am
   Michael DeMiranda (demiranda): Approved for TLAC Department Head
2. 02/01/18 2:01 pm
   Sandra Williams (sandra-williams): Approved for Curricular Services Review
3. 02/01/18 3:15 pm
   Melanie Robideau (mrobideau): Approved for ED Committee Preparer GR
4. 02/13/18 3:42 pm
   Beverly Irby (irbyb): Approved for ED Committee Chair GR
5. 02/13/18 3:45 pm
   Beverly Irby (irbyb): Approved for ED College Dean GR
6. 02/16/18 12:50 pm
   Meagan Kelly (meagankelly): Approved for GC Preparer
7. 03/01/18 3:13 pm
   LaRhysa Johnson (lrjohnson): Approved for GC Chair

https://nextcatalog.tamu.edu/courseleaf/approve/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concurrent enrollment be enforced?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosslistings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacked</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hour(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeatable for credit?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-peat?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP/Fund Code</td>
<td>1303010004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default Grade Mode</td>
<td>Letter Grade(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Grade Modes</td>
<td>Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of instruction</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will sections of this course be taught as non-traditional? (i.e., parts of term, distance education)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Outcomes

*Meets traditional face-to-face learning outcomes.*
Describe how learning outcomes are met or provide justification why they are not met.

1. Learning Outcome: Students will have a working knowledge of the terminology of the area of program evaluation, which will permit them to readily comprehend the terms in the literature of the field.
   - Learning Outcome will be met through readings of the assigned text/instructor provided literature and ongoing class discussions

2. Learning Outcome: Students will be able to state several similarities and difference between educational research and evaluation research.
   - Learning Outcome will be met via assigned reading of Chapter 1 and on-going class discussions

3. Learning Outcome: Students will have a working knowledge of the role of political and cultural contexts involved in program evaluation.
   - Learning Outcome will be met via assigned reading of Chapter 3 in text/instructor provided literature and on-going class discussions

4. Learning Outcome: Students will know and understand how to apply the Five Standards of Program Evaluation (Joint Committee, 2009): utility standards, feasibility standards, propriety standards, accuracy standards, and evaluation accountability standards.
   - Learning Outcome will be met through readings of the assigned text/instructor provided literature and ongoing class discussions and through conducting a mini metaevaluation of the program evaluation proposals students complete as the final project.

5. Learning Outcome: Students will have a working knowledge of the assumptions behind the different approaches for conducting program evaluations.
   - Learning Outcome will be met through readings of Chapters 4-10 in the assigned text/instructor provided literature and ongoing class discussions.

6. Learning Outcome: Students will have a working knowledge of the importance of utilization in program evaluation.
   - Learning Outcome will be met through readings of the assigned text/instructor provided literature and ongoing class discussions and through developing a dissemination plan as part of the program evaluation proposals students complete as the final project.

7. Learning Outcome: Students will be aware of the importance of interpersonal and communication skills in evaluation.
   - Learning Outcome will be met through readings of the assigned text/instructor provided literature and ongoing class discussions and through developing a reporting plan as part of the program evaluation proposals students complete as the final project.

8. Learning Outcome: Students will be able to critically analyze evaluation articles and reports.
   - Learning Outcome will be met through readings of the assigned text/instructor provided literature and ongoing class discussions and through writing a critique of an evaluation article or report.

9. Learning Outcome: Students will be able to design and prepare an evaluation proposal.
   - Learning Outcome will be met through developing a model evaluation proposal for conducting an evaluation of an educational program.

10. Learning Outcome: Students will have a working knowledge of how to present evaluation findings.
    - Learning Outcome will be met through readings of the assigned text/instructor provided literature and ongoing class discussions and through developing a reporting plan as part of the program evaluation proposals students complete as the final project.

**Hours**

Meets traditional face-to-face hours.

Describe how hours are met or provide justification why they are not met.

The required hours for EDCI 632 are met in several ways:

- Readings from the text/instructor-provided literature and on-going discussions via the eCampus course room discussion board
- Regular virtual meetings via Collaborate Ultra in eCampus facilitated by instructor
- Regular phone conferences with individual students and student teams facilitated by instructor via FreeConferenceCall.com
- Virtual meetings of students for discussion and/or for group assignments via Google Hangout and eCampus Collaborate Ultra
- Assignments completed independently
- Assignments completed as part of a team

Will this course be taught as a distance education course?  Yes  No

I verify that I have reviewed the FAQ for  Yes  No
Export Control Basics for Distance Education. Yes

Is 100% of this course going to be taught in Texas? No

Will classroom space be needed for this course? No

This will be a required course or an elective course for the following programs:
Required (select program)
Elective (select program)

Course Syllabus

Syllabus: Upload syllabus
Upload syllabus: EDCI 632 Program Evaluation Syllabus Fall 2017.docx

Letters of support or other documentation No
Additional information
Reviewer Comments
Reported to state? No
SYLLABUS*

EDCI 632: Program Evaluation in Curriculum and Instruction
Fall 2017
Website: eCampus.tamu.edu

This syllabus is intended as a guide, not as a contract. If it is in the best interest of the class to make revisions, the instructor will do so. The instructor will notify students promptly of any revisions.

Meeting Times/Location: Online

Instructor: Dr. Jacqueline Stillisano

Contact Information: 979-845-8098 (office)
jstillisano@tamu.edu

Virtual office hours: By request.

Communication: I am generally at my computer and available for phone conferences and Collaborate meetings during the workday or the early evenings. Please use my TAMU e-mail address to contact me at any time. I try to answer e-mails within 24 business hours of when I receive them. If it's something urgent, please call me on my office telephone. If I'm not there, leave a message and I'll call you as soon as I'm available.

Please email me directly, with an appropriate subject line, if you have questions or concerns that are of a private nature. For general, class-related questions, please cc everyone in the class. I, in turn, will cc everyone on my responses. That way all of your colleagues can have the benefit of my responses, everyone will feel more a part of the class community, and hopefully, I won't receive the same question from multiple people. Plus, if my response is delayed, one of your colleagues may jump in and answer your question. 😊

I regularly post information in the “Announcements” section of the eCampus classroom and send it out via email to make sure students receive information in a timely manner. Please check for announcements every time you enter the eCampus classroom, and check your TAMU email frequently—as well as your SPAM or junk email—for emails from me.

In addition, I hold regular Collaborate meetings, which are recorded for you to watch at your convenience. Everyone in this class, including me, is a busy working professional with many demands on our time. In addition, students in my online courses are usually situated in several different time zones, making it impossible to schedule a meeting to fit everyone’s schedule. I try
to rotate Collaborate meetings around so they are held on different days and times, and hopefully, at least one of the meetings will be at a time convenient to you. **You are not required to attend the Collaborate meetings, but you are responsible for watching the Collaborate recordings and making yourself familiar with information discussed in the meetings.**

**Course Description:** Study of program evaluation in education, investigating its purposes and procedures, with attention to settings, personnel, and performance; with review of standards, principal theories, and models; and study of histories, political contexts, ethics, and the nature of evidence.

**Prerequisites:**
- Graduate classification
- Reasonable level of understanding of research “paradigms,” worldviews, and quantitative and qualitative methods
- Basic understanding of experimental design and sources of invalidity
- Basic library and computer research skills to conduct an effective review of research
- Familiarity with requirements contained in the APA Publication Manual 6th edition

**Learning Outcomes or Course Objectives:** EDCI 632 is concerned with the areas of program evaluation design and the investigative, methodological, and evaluative techniques pertaining to this field. Approaches to evaluating school-based and other educational programs, as well as conducting more limited investigations, will be examined. It is the purpose of this course to examine various approaches to the evaluation of educational programs, to develop understandings of basic contemporary evaluation designs, and to apply known and evolved designs to simulated problems. Various philosophical as well as measurement and methodological questions will be explored.

Students will be involved in formulating, reviewing, designing, and critiquing program evaluation studies. More specifically, EDCI 632 is designed to provide graduate students with a framework that will allow them to demonstrate the following competencies:

- Students will have a working knowledge of the terminology of the area of program evaluation, which will permit them to readily comprehend the terms in the literature of the field.
- Students will be able to state several similarities and difference between educational research and evaluation research.
- Students will have a working knowledge of the role of political and cultural contexts involved in program evaluation.
- Students will know and understand how to apply the Five Standards of Program Evaluation (Joint Committee, 2009): utility standards, feasibility standards, propriety standards, accuracy standards, and evaluation accountability standards.
- Students will have a working knowledge of the assumptions behind the different approaches for conducting program evaluations.
- Students will have a working knowledge of the importance of utilization in program evaluation.
- Students will be aware of the importance of interpersonal and communication skills in evaluation.
- Students will be able to critically analyze evaluation articles and reports.
- Students will be able to design and prepare an evaluation proposal.
• Students will have a working knowledge of how to present evaluation findings.

**Course Pedagogy:** The course will be taught using the Five Standards of Effective Pedagogy (Tharp, 1997; Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi (2000). The five standards are (a) Teacher and Students Producing Together, (b) Developing Language and Literacy Across the Curriculum, (c) Making Meaning: Connecting School to Student’s Lives, (d) Teaching Complex Thinking, and (e) Teaching Through Conversation.

The first standard, **Teacher and Students Producing Together**, indicates that the classroom environment will be collaborative. In other words, there will be many opportunities where students will work together (i.e., cooperatively) to produce specified products (i.e., assignments). The second standard, **Developing Language**, indicates that the course will emphasize learning the language of program evaluation as well as the content. The third standard, **Making Meaning**, suggests that an important aspect of the course will be connecting what we learn about program evaluation to students’ personal interests and prior experiences. In other words, we will highlight the need to contextualize the knowledge we learn about evaluation research to everyday issues and concerns. The fourth standard, **Teaching Complex Thinking**, illustrates the point that the course will focus on developing students’ higher-level thinking skills such as analyzing, synthesizing, and examining evaluation situations. The fifth standard, **Instructional Conversation**, suggests that there will be extended online discussions about the course content.

**Group Participation:** I will randomly assign students to small groups periodically to collaboratively complete Think/Pair/Share-type discussion activities.

In addition, by the end of Week 5, students will self-select into small teams of ~3 people to begin planning the final project, which will consist of a formal proposal for the evaluation of a **complex educational program**. (See below for more information regarding the final project.) You are not required to participate as a member of a team, although I strongly encourage it. Writing a quality evaluation proposal is hard work, and most successful evaluation plans of the complexity I’m expecting for this assignment are a group effort. **Teams must be approved by instructor.**

**Attendance:** "Attendance" and presence are required for this class.

**Class discussions:** Students should expect to log into the classroom several times per week and are expected to actively participate in online discussions initiated by the instructor and/or other students by posting substantive contributions to the discussions. (See Response/Participation Criteria below.) The course depends heavily on class discussion, which makes the quality of the course dependent on the quality of each student’s preparation and class participation. Discussion postings that are not submitted on time detract from the quality of the class discussion. Discussion postings submitted late, therefore, will not receive credit.

If this were a face-to-face class in which discussion/participation were part of your grade, and you showed up on the day after the class to contribute your voice to the discussion, it wouldn’t be much of a discussion—it would just be you, talking to yourself. The same thing applies to an online discussion; but in addition, it’s unprofessional to your colleagues who cannot meet their requirement to respond to you, if you don’t post in a timely manner.

**Assignments:** The course will have specific dates by which assignments will be due; assignments are due by 11:59 p.m. Central Daylight Time. (Please note that daylight savings time ends on Sunday, November 5, at 2:00 a.m.) Points will be assigned for each course
assignment, and failure to complete assignments by due dates may result in reduced or no credit for the assignment (See Make-up Work Policy below).

**Make-up Work Policy:** My policy regarding late work is based on Texas A&M University student rule guidelines ([http://student-rules.tamu.edu/rule07](http://student-rules.tamu.edu/rule07)) regarding excused/unexcused absences. Specifically, students are responsible for providing satisfactory evidence to the instructor to substantiate the reason for an absence. If you foresee difficulty of any type that may prevent timely submission of assignments, please notify me as soon as possible. For unexcused absences, I typically assign a 10% penalty for each day that an assignment is late.

If you have some extraordinary circumstance that necessitates a request for an extension, please contact me as soon as possible.

**Course Netiquette:** Students should show respect to fellow students and the professor during all online class discussions. Remember, discussion boards are for whole-group/class discussions. If a question that is private in nature needs to be asked of the professor or of a fellow student, a personal e-mail is the appropriate communication tool. When in doubt, an email to the individual(s) is always best.

**Required Materials:**


[https://libcat.tamu.edu/vwebv/holdingsInfo?searchId=1983&recCount=50&recPointer=0&bibId=5291048](https://libcat.tamu.edu/vwebv/holdingsInfo?searchId=1983&recCount=50&recPointer=0&bibId=5291048)


In addition to the assigned readings from the textbooks, articles from professional journals will be assigned as required reading. These articles will be available on the course web site.

**Course Assignments and Values.** You will be evaluated in this course based on your participation in class (via the discussion board), your submission of written assignments, and your completed evaluation proposal. Each requirement for the course has specified points.

- Reaction Postings 70 points
- Class Participation 70 points
  - (Discussion Board Responses & Peer Feedback)
- Presentation of Chapter Reflections 20 points
- Article Critique 20 points
- Final Project (Evaluation Proposal) 100 points

**Total** 280 points
Grading Policy: Grades will be assigned as follows:

Grade of “A” will be assigned for accumulating between 90% and 100% of total points.
Grade of “B” will be assigned for accumulating between 80% and 89.999% of total points.
Grade of “C” will be assigned for accumulating between 70% and 79.999% of total points.
Grade of “D” will be assigned for accumulating between 60% and 69.999% of total points.
Grade of “F” will be assigned for accumulating less than 60% of total points.

An incomplete will be given only upon written request and then only if the request meets the requirements listed in the Student Rules under Section 10: Grading (http://student-rules.tamu.edu/rule10). If a student receives an “incomplete” grade (i.e., “I”) for EDCI 632, he or she must make up the missing work within one semester or the grade for the course will become a “Fail.”

Student Concerns: If you have a concern about any aspect of the course, I would appreciate it if you could let me know as soon as possible. If I cannot resolve the issue to your satisfaction, then you are expected to complete the TLAC Concern/Opportunity/Acknowledgement Form (COAF) and submit it to the TLAC Department Head (Dr. Michael de Miranda). The COAF is available on the TLAC website (http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/gradforms).

Academic Integrity: An Aggie does not lie, cheat or steal or tolerate those who do.

All students are bound by the Aggie Honor Code. Honor Council Rules and Procedures can be found on the web at: http://www.tamu.edu/aggiehonor.

As part of the first week’s assignments, students will submit a signed copy of the Aggie Honor Statement (see Week 1 Assignments in eCampus).

Response/Participation Criteria:

The following criteria are used to evaluate your response to assigned prompts listed in eCampus and your responses to others’ postings in the follow-up class discussions:

1. Does your response show respect toward others’ opinions?
2. Does your response address all the relevant issues or questions posed in the prompt?
3. Does your response integrate concepts from the readings?
4. Does your response demonstrate reflection or thoughtful discussion of the content of the readings?
5. Does your response make explicit connections between your professional and personal experiences and content of the assigned readings?
6. Does your response present the content in an organized and coherent format?
7. Does your response contain minimal errors in grammar and spelling?
8. Does your response include references to professional literature and/or web sites, where appropriate?
9. When directly quoting or paraphrasing from another’s work, does your response include APA citations and page numbers?

Major Assignments: In addition to discussion board postings and discussions, three major assignments will be due for this course, as described below.
Summary of Chapter Learnings: This assignment will consist of a PowerPoint (or Prezi, etc.) presentation, summarizing major ideas from each chapter in Parts 1 & 2 of the text (Chapters 1-10.) Develop a slide for each chapter, discussing three major ideas/concepts you learned, regarding the history of program evaluation as a discipline; political and ethical issues in evaluation; and theoretical approaches to the field, from that individual chapter. This assignment will not be due until late in the course, but I urge you to reflect and develop each slide as you complete the reading and discussion of each chapter.

Evaluation Article/Report Critique. This assignment will consist of a written critique of a journal article or an evaluation report discussing the process and results of a program evaluation. The written critiques should follow the specific guidelines provided in the “Evaluation Critique” folder in eCampus. A list of possible evaluation articles and reports that I’ve collected over the years is also included in that folder. You may choose an article from that list to review, or you may identify an article on your own that you would like to critique. Either way, your article/report must be approved by me in advance of the assignment. Each student must critique a different article/report.

Final Project: The final project will consist of a written, formal program evaluation plan of a complex educational program. This does not have to be a PK-12 educational program. The evaluation plan will be 20-25 pages in length, including references. The proposal will follow APA guidelines and will be in Times New Roman12-point font, double-spaced, with 1-inch margins all around. The plan will be based on Smith and Costello’s model for constructing an operational evaluation design (in Mertens, 1989).

A brief (1 page) description of your proposed final evaluation project will be due early in the semester. This brief proposal should succinctly describe the program you intend to evaluate and provide some initial thoughts on how you will be evaluating it (keeping in mind that these ideas may change as you work through the course). Students must receive written approval from the instructor before proceeding with the formal proposal.
### Tentative Calendar of Readings, Assignments, and Due Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments/Directions/Resources</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;8/28/17 – 9/3/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Read syllabus&lt;br&gt;• Read Syllabus again 😊&lt;br&gt;• Submit questions/discrepancies noted in relation to the syllabus to the instructor; CC your colleagues</td>
<td>• Roster Post</td>
<td>8/29/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post/update your picture of yourself in eCampus</td>
<td>• Submit Academic Integrity Statement using the assignment tool in the Week 1 folder&lt;br&gt;• This file should be saved as lastnamefirstinitialhonorcode.doc</td>
<td>8/29/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• &quot;Sign&quot; and return Honor Code Statement.</td>
<td>• Introduction video</td>
<td>8/29/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Assignment</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Use the FlipGrid link in the Week 1 folder to introduce yourself to your colleagues. Provide (a) your time zone, (b) some personal information, and (c) a description of your qualifications/experience in regard to program evaluation—internal evaluation, external evaluation, as a member of the evaluation team or as a member of the organization being evaluated. This posting is to help us all get a feeling for the group’s collective experience in program evaluation—don’t worry if you have very little or no experience!</td>
<td>• Reaction post</td>
<td>9/3/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Discussion</strong></td>
<td>• Watch your colleagues’ introduction videos&lt;br&gt;• Respond to all</td>
<td>9/1/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readings</strong>&lt;br&gt;• FSW: Chapter 1&lt;br&gt;• FCM: Interview with James Riccio - <em>The Evaluation of GAIN – A Welfare-to-Work Program in California</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Assignment</strong></td>
<td>• Reaction post</td>
<td>9/3/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write a 1-page reflection/reaction to this week’s readings.</td>
<td>• Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues&lt;br&gt;• Post a thoughtful response to at least 3&lt;br&gt;• Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2 colleagues who responded to your reaction post</td>
<td>9/6/17&lt;br&gt;9/7/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;9/4/17 – 9/10/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readings</strong>&lt;br&gt;• FSW: Chapter 2&lt;br&gt;• Interviews from the American Journal of Evaluation (AJE): <em>The Oral History of Evaluation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Assignment</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Think_PAIR_SHARE: Your group will be assigned one interview to read from AJE. Collaboratively develop</td>
<td>• Interview Post</td>
<td>9/10/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and post an 8- to 10-page presentation (PPT, Prezi, etc.), sharing important points from your interview article

| **Online Discussion** | • View presentations of other groups  
• Based on learnings from Chapter 2 and your colleagues’ presentations, respond to instructor-generated questions on discussion board  
• Reply to responses of 2 colleagues | 9/13/17  
9/14/17 (5 pts) |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| **Week 3**  
9/11/17 – 9/17/17 |  |  |
| **Readings** | • FSW: Chapter 3  
• Morris & Clark: *You Want Me to do What??!* |  |
| **Assignment** | • Write a 1-page reflection/reaction to this week’s readings | 9/17/17 (5 pts) |
| **Online Discussion** | • Read reaction posts of your colleagues  
• Post a thoughtful, substantive response to at least 3 interviews  
• Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2 colleagues who responded to your reaction post | 9/20/17  
9/21/17 (5 pts) |
| **Week 4**  
9/18/17 – 9/24/17 |  |  |
| **Readings** | • FSW: Chapters 4  
• Reichardt & Rallis: *Qualitative & Quantitative Inquiries Are Not Incompatible* |  |
| **Assignment** | • Interview Report: You will be assigned a colleague to interview regarding his/her learnings from this week’s reading assignments. Report results of interview back to the group via a posting (~1-page) on the discussion board. | 9/24/17 (5 pts) |
| • Online Discussion | • Interview Report |  |
|  | • Read interviews of at least 5 of your colleagues  
• Post a thoughtful, substantive response to at least 3 interviews  
• Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2 colleagues who responded to your interview | 9/27/17  
9/28/17 (5 pts) |
| **Additional Assignment** | • Submit evaluation article to instructor for approval via email  
• See Evaluation Critique Directions and Evaluation Critique Questions in the Evaluation Critique folder in eCampus. | 9/24/17 (No Grade) |
| **Week 5**  
9/25/17 – 10/1/17 |  |  |
| **Readings** | • FSW: Chapter 5  
• FCM: Interview with Gary Henry - *The Council for School Performance: Performance Reports for Georgia Schools* |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Online Discussion</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write a 1-page reflection/reaction to this week’s readings</td>
<td>Reaction Post</td>
<td>10/1/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post a thoughtful, <strong>substantive</strong> response to at least 3</td>
<td>10/4/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2</td>
<td>10/5/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form groups for final project. Choose group</td>
<td>Submit group members’ names to instructor via email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“communicator” and submit group members’ names to instructor</td>
<td>Submit Group Contract, using the assignment tool in Week 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboratively complete “Group Contract” and submit Group Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assignment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Week 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSW: Chapter 6</td>
<td>Write a 1-page reflection/reaction to this week’s readings</td>
<td>10/2/17 – 10/8/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with Len Bickman - <em>Evaluation of the Ft. Bragg and Stark County Systems of Care for children and Adolescents</em></td>
<td>Reaction Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post a thoughtful, <strong>substantive</strong> response to at least 3</td>
<td>10/11/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2</td>
<td>10/12/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Article Critique</td>
<td>Critique evaluation article, using guidelines provided in the <strong>Evaluation Critique</strong> folder in eCampus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit as a Word document, using the assignment tool in Week 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This file should be saved as <strong>LastnameFirstinitialArticleCritique.doc</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assignment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Week 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSW: Chapter 7</td>
<td>Write a 1-page reflection/reaction to this week’s readings</td>
<td>10/9/17 – 10/15/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM: Interview with David Fetterman - <em>Evaluation of the Stanford Teacher Education Program (STEP)</em></td>
<td>Reaction Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post a thoughtful, <strong>substantive</strong> response to at least 3</td>
<td>10/18/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2</td>
<td>10/19/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Assignment</strong></td>
<td>Submit proposed project description using the assignment tool in the <strong>Final Project</strong> folder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a 1-page description of proposed final project</td>
<td>Program must be approved by instructor before you begin the final project</td>
<td>10/15/17 (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See “Selecting the Program” guidelines, and examples, in the <strong>Final Project</strong> folder.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Week 8
**10/16/17 – 10/22/17**

**Readings**
- FSW: Chapter 8
- FCM: Interview with Jean King. *Evaluation of the Special Education Program at the Anoka-Hennepin School District*

**Assignment**
- Write a 1-page reflection/reaction to this week's readings

**Online Discussion**
- Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues
- Post a thoughtful, **substantive** response to at least 3 colleagues who responded to your reaction post
- Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2 colleagues who responded to your reaction post

**Reaction Post** 10/22/17 (5 pts)

### Week 9
**10/23/17 – 10/29/17**

**Reading/Resources**
- FSW: Chapter 9
- FCM: Interview with Katrina Bledsoe – *Evaluation of the Fun with Books Program*

**Assignment**
- 1-page reflection/reaction to this week's readings

**Online Discussion**
- Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues
- Post a thoughtful, **substantive** response to at least 3 colleagues who responded to your reaction post
- Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2 colleagues who responded to your reaction post

**Reaction Post** 10/29/17 (5 pts)

### Week 10
**10/30/17 – 11/5/17**

**Readings**
- FSW: Chapter 11
- FCM: Interview with Wallis & Dukay – *Evaluation of Godfrey’s Children Center in Tanzania*

**Assignment**
- 1-page reflection/reaction to this week's readings

**Online Discussion**
- Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues
- Post a thoughtful, **substantive** response to at least 3 colleagues who responded to your reaction post
- Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2 colleagues who responded to your reaction post

**Reaction Post** 11/5/17 (5 pts)

### Week 11
**11/6/17 – 11/12/17**

**Readings**
- FSW: Chapter 12
- FCM: Interview with Stewart Donaldson – *Evaluation of the Work and Health Initiative with a Focus on Winning New Jobs*

**Assignment**
- 1-page reaction to this week's readings

**Reaction Post**
### Online Discussion
- Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues
- Post a thoughtful, **substantive** response to at least 3
- Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2 colleagues who responded to your reaction post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/17</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/17</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Assignment
- Chapter Summaries Presentation
- Submit your Chapter Summaries presentation, using the **Assignment Tool** in Week 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/17</td>
<td>20 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Readings
- FSW: Chapter 13
- FCM: Interview with Debra J. Rog – **Evaluation of the Homeless Families Program**

### Assignment
- 1-page reaction to this week’s readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/19/17</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Online Discussion
- Read reaction posts of at least 5 of your colleagues
- Post a thoughtful, **substantive** response to at least 3
- Continue the dialogue by posting a reply to at least 2 colleagues who responded to your reaction post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/22/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/17</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weeks 13 –15
- **Final Project**

### Assignment (Team)
- Use the “8-Step Outline” provided in the **Final Project** folder as a guide to completing your final project evaluation proposal

### Assignment (Team)
- Based on feedback from instructor, make any necessary revisions to your evaluation proposal and submit the final draft.
- Submit final copy of your evaluation proposal to instructor as a Word document using the assignment tool in the Weeks 13-15 folder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/7/17</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Statement**

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact Disability Services, in Cain Hall, Room B118, or call 845-1637. For additional information visit [http://disability.tamu.edu](http://disability.tamu.edu)

**Diversity Statement for the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture**

The Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) does not tolerate discrimination, violence, or vandalism. TLAC is an open and affirming department for all people, including
those who are subjected to racial profiling, hate crimes, heterosexism, and violence. We insist that appropriate action be taken against those who perpetrate discrimination, violence, or vandalism. Texas A&M University is an Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity institution and affirms its dedication to non-discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, age, sexual orientation, domestic partner status, national origin, or disability in employment, programs, and services. Our commitment to non-discrimination and affirmative action embraces the entire university community including faculty, staff, and students.

Plagiarism Statement

The handouts used in this course are copyrighted. By “handouts,” I mean all materials generated for this class, which include but are not limited to syllabi, quizzes, exams, lab problems, in-class materials, review sheets, and additional problem sets. Because these materials are copyrighted, you do not have the right to copy the handouts, unless I expressly grant permission.

As commonly defined, plagiarism consists of passing off as one’s own the ideas, words, writings, etc., which belong to another. In accordance with this definition, you are committing plagiarism if you copy the work of another person and turn it in as your own, even if you should have the permission of that person. Plagiarism is one of the worst academic sins, for the plagiarist destroys the trust among colleagues without which research cannot be safely communicated.

If you have any questions regarding plagiarism, please consult the latest issue of the Texas A&M University Student Rules, under the section “Scholastic Dishonesty.”
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The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) requires that student grades be accessible only to individual students and other authorized personnel. Posting grades in a secure course management system like Blackboard Vista (Bb Vista, formerly WebCT Vista) is the preferred method for distributing grades online at Texas A&M University. Instructors may either enter grades directly into the Bb Vista Grade Book or upload grades into Note. However, that giving student’s access to shared grading spreadsheets from within Bb Vista is NOT a secure way to post grades. Students must log into Bb Vista using their NetIDs and all Web pages are delivered via SSL encryption. Once logged in, students may only view their own grades as posted in the Grade Book, so there is no chance of inadvertently releasing confidential student information. Since 2003, there have been five separate incidents at Texas A&M reported to Computing and Information Services in which confidential student information has been accidentally released. In one incident, a spreadsheet containing confidential student information was accidentally sent as an email attachment to over 1,300 undergraduate students. In the other four incidents, grading personal information within either hidden columns or
additional worksheets (tabs). Anyone with access to the spreadsheets could basically unhide the columns or view the confidential student information on the extra worksheets. Based on the small number of these types of incidents, most faculty clearly understand the university regulations regarding the posting of student grades and often the issue is essentially human error. Instructional Technology Services (ITS) would like to remind faculty of the secure, online technologies available on campus for delivering student grades. It is available to support faculty in adhering to university regulations, especially in terms of incorporating new technologies. If you would like more information about using the Bb Vista Grade Book, contact ITS at 979-862-3977 or email http://its@tamu.edu. Handouts specifically written for Grade Book use are available on the ITS Web site: http://itsinfo.tamu.edu/workshops/vista_handouts.htm. In addition, a university Standard Administration Procedure (SAP) concerning notification of unauthorized disclosure of sensitive personal information was approved July 27, 2006 and is posted on the TAMU Rules Web Site: http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/24.99.99M1.24.pdf Instructional Technology Services, 004C Heldenfels Hall, Texas A&M University, 3002 TAMU, 979-862-3977, its@tamu.edu, http://itsinfo.tamu.edu

Additional Resources

