

York University

COURSE OUTLINE: AP/PPAS 4320 3.0
Winter 2020

PROGRAM EVALUATION II

Mondays 7-10 PM ACE 006

Course Director: Dr. Peter P. Constantinou

Office: 126 McLaughlin College

Cell: (647) 278-8790

Office hrs: 6-7pm Mondays or by appointment

Email: Peter.constantinou@rogers.com

Course Purposes and Descriptions:

The purpose of program evaluation is to examine the application of social science research techniques to the public policy process. Social science research techniques may be used either in conjunction with the design of public policies, or for evaluating policies which are already being or have already been implemented.

This course works to build on the theoretical foundations learned in AP/ PPAS 4310 3.0 and aims to get students applying what they are learning in real-life cases. This course includes an experiential education (EE) component – students will work in teams as consultants to government to design and implement an evaluation for a real client. More about the specifics of this component below.

This course provides students with a variety of methodological tools and case study practice necessary to effectively carry out the evaluation studies of government programs and public policies. Students will have an opportunity to undertake assessments, put research designs into practice for formative evaluations, summative evaluations and needs studies. Prerequisites: AP/PPAS/POLS 3300 6.00 and AP/PPAS 4310 3.00. Course credit exclusions: AP/PPAS/POLS 4300 6.00, GL/POLS 4300 6.00.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- Further develop critical thinking skills in the application of program evaluation and policy analysis theories, methods and practices.
- Articulate policy research questions, search the literature, compile a relevant bibliography and identify potential data sources.
- Differentiate between different types of program evaluation, their objectives and methodological tools and appreciate this difference at the implementation stage.
- Develop client relationship skills through the experience of working directly with a real client in the government or broader public sector.
- Be aware of the limitations of program evaluation in terms of its design, methodology and practical feasibility and implementation, and interpret findings in a critical manner.

- Design and implement a suitable program evaluation scheme.
- Be aware of ethical issues in conducting and implementing program evaluation.
- Collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data.
- Communicate research findings in both oral and written format clearly and effectively.
- Further develop group-work skills.
- Understand, appreciate and reflect on praxis, the relevance and application of conceptual and theoretical knowledge and information found in the literature and expounded in the classroom, to what happens in practice in the government and the broader public sector.
- Gain relevant work experience and knowledge, and have a project that can be added to their portfolio of work.
- Make valuable connections in the field that will help to develop a network of key government and broader public sector contacts that may lead to potential future employment.

Teaching Methodology:

Classes will comprise various formats; lecture, class discussion, workshops and simulations. Lectures will provide the context for the readings, which should be completed before the date listed. Discussions will build on the readings and lecture material and all students are expected to actively participate. In a number of instances, workshops will be conducted where students will be charged with working together in groups to produce results/answers to questions/challenges presented in class. These workshops will focus on how to conduct/prepare various analyses and government documents

Students are strongly encouraged to prepare for class by completing the readings, participate in the discussion and take an active role in the workshops.

Evaluation Components:

Summary

Evaluation Component	Value	Date
Take Home Mid-Term Test	20%	Distributed February 10 Due February 24
Group Presentations	10%	March 16
Final Evaluation Reports	30%	March 23
Take Home Final Test	20%	Distributed March 23 Due March 30
Participation	10%	Throughout the term
Reading presentation	10%	Sign up week 1 – Presentations throughout

Please note that late assignments will not be accepted.

Take-home mid-term (20%) and final test (20%):

Students will be presented with a series of questions that challenge them to think about the way the theory and literature presented in class are applied to real world problems. Students will have two weeks to work on the assignment independently and are expected to submit the assignment to the instructor in hard copy. Additional details and sample questions will be provided closer to the date.

Final Evaluation Report (30%) and Presentation (10%):

Students will work in groups to design and implement an evaluation for a real-world client, building on the work in AP/PPAS 4310 3.0 in the preceding Fall term. Students will work with the course instructor and the client to develop an approved evaluability assessment or proposal and will then implement it, gathering data, analyzing, and preparing recommendations for the client. Students will prepare a report for the client and instructor as well as present their findings to both. The details of expectations of the final report and presentation will depend on the type of evaluation undertaking and greater discussion of these components and expectations will be presented in class by the instructor. It is expected that the students will make a presentation to both the instructor and client, as well as provide both a hard copy of the final report.

Presentation - In groups, students will present their work to date so as to get feedback that will assist with the refinement of their final reports. This will include a draft of their PowerPoint deck. Further details about expectations will be provided closer to the date.

Participation (10%):

For an active class discussion attendance is a must, but passive attendance will not be assessed positively. In order to be able to participate in class discussion, it is important that you do the readings in advance of each class. For this course to work, students must participate in class discussion. In a class of this size it is impossible for all students to participate all the time. Students should, however, strive to attend class, demonstrate that they have read the assigned readings, thought about the material and the discussion at hand, and add value to the classroom discussion. Students will be provided with a participation rubric and be given a mid-term participation grade with detailed feedback.

Reading Presentation (10%):

Each student will pick an article or chapter assigned as reading for the class. We will sign up for these during class in week 1.

For each presentation you should prepare a PowerPoint file and a 1 page handout for the rest of the class. Expected length of presentation: 10 min. plus discussion.

Late Assignments/Missed Tests/Deadlines:

The graded assignments are not optional. Late assignments will not be accepted. There will be no opportunity to make-up missed tests.

Please see the important dates listed below: <https://registrar.yorku.ca/enrol/dates/fw19>

Access to Education is a Right:

The instructor will strive to make whatever accommodations are required so that each student has the opportunity to succeed regardless of disability. However, it is your responsibility to make the instructor aware of your need for such accommodation and to provide documentation at the start of the term to support your request. Such documentation might be in the form of a letter or form from the appropriate on-campus agency or your personal care-giver or counselor. Last minute requests will not be allowed.

Plagiarism and other forms of Cheating:

Plagiarism and other forms of cheating devalue the work of every student who works to complete a degree or any other sort of education. As noted in the University policies, York seriously frowns on it and has requested that all instructors vigorously pursue suspected cases. If plagiarism is suspected, the instructor reserves the right to use any tools at his disposal, including contacting other instructors and staff (both at York and other institutions) and text comparison software, to resolve the matter.

Review the following: <https://secretariat-policies.info.yorku.ca/policies/academic-honesty-senate-policy-on/>

Required Materials:

A Course Kit of readings has been prepared and will be provided to students on Moodle.

Brian W. Hogwood and Lewis A. Gunn, *Policy Analysis for the Real World* (Oxford: University Press, 1984).

Further Information and Engagement in Program Evaluation:

Students who wish to participate in the professional program evaluation community are urged to join the Canadian Evaluation Society. Student membership includes a subscription to the *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, and invitations to program evaluation conferences at discounted rates. (Address: Canadian Evaluation Society, 170 Metcalfe Street, Suite 601, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1P3.

Suggested Readings in Program Evaluation:

Pirog, M. A. (editor) *Social Experimentation, Program Evaluation, and Public Policy*, Journal of Policy Analysis & Management Classics Series, Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 2008. (ISBN: 9781405193931) Note: The articles published in this book can be also accessed free of charge through York Libraries eResources and the *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*.

Spaulding, D. T. *Program Evaluation in Practice: Core Concepts and Examples for Discussion and Analysis*, Jossey-Bass (A Wiley Imprint), 2008. (ISBN: 978-0-7879-8685-8)

Owen, J. M. *Program Evaluation: Forms and Approaches* (3rd edition), The Guilford Press, 2007. (ISBN: 13 978-1-59385-406-5 or 10 1-59385-406-4)

Posavac, E. I. and R. G. Carey. *Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies* (6th edition), Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2003.

Armit, A. and J. Bourgault (editors.) *Hard Choices or No Choices: Assessing Program Review*, Institute for Public Administration in Canada, Toronto, 1995.

Rossi, P. H. and H. E. Freeman. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (5th edition) Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1993.

Hudson, J. and J. Roberts (editors). *Evaluating Justice: Canadian Policies and Programs*, Thompson Educational Publishing, Toronto, 1993.

Online Sources in Program Evaluation:

Various on-line journals available through York Libraries eResources, for example:

- Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation
- Journal of Policy Analysis and Management
- Evaluation and Program Planning
- Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis

For interesting program evaluations in developing country contexts see:

The Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Free program evaluations available at <http://www.povertyactionlab.org/papers/>

Course Schedule

Date	Topic/Readings
January 6	Introduction to Course Review of expectations and course requirements, update on group EE projects
January 13	Case Studies in Human Services and Justice <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Rubin, "The Effectiveness of Outreach Counselling and Support Groups for Battered Women".2. Lehoux, Potvin, Proulx, "Linking User's Views with Utilization Processes in the Evaluation of Interactive Software", <i>CJPE</i> 14(1), 1999, 117-134.3. Umbreit and Pate, "Cross-National Assessment of a Canadian Justice Initiative: Having Crime Victim's Meet their Offender", in Hudson, <i>Evaluating Justice</i>
January 20	Case Studies in Policing Services and Law Enforcement <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Hornick, Leighton, Burrows, "Evaluating Community Policing", in Hudson, <i>Evaluating Justice</i>2. Linden and Fillmore, "An Evaluation Study of Women in Policing", in Hudson, <i>Evaluating Justice</i>3. Boyle and Willms, "Impact Evaluation of a National Community Based Program for At-Risk Children in Canada", <i>Canadian Public Policy</i> 27(3), 2002, 461-481 (AOL)
January 27	Creativity and Politics in Evaluation <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Sedgsworth, "Introduction" and "Evaluation Policy and Practice in Ontario", <i>CJPE</i> 16, 2001, 1-2, 59-72 (AOL)2. Reinke, "A Multi-Dimensional Program Evaluation Model: Considerations of Cost Effectiveness, Equity, Quality and Sustainability", <i>CJPE</i> 14(2), 1999, 145-160 (AOL)
February 3	The Public Policy Process <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hogwood and Gunn, Chapters 1-4, pp.1-64 Analysis in the Public Policy Process <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hogwood and Gunn, Chapters 5-7, pp.67-127

February 10	Forecasting, Objectives and Options Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hogwood and Gunn, Chapters 8-10, pp.128-195 TAKE HOME MID-TERM TEST DISTRIBUTED – Due February 24
February 17	Family Day and Reading Week – no class
February 24	Evaluation and the Policy Process Hogwood and Gunn, Chapters 11-14, pp.196-270 Quade and Carter, Chapters 19-21, pp. 338-399 TAKE HOME MID TERM TEST DUE
March 2	Group Work Session – supervised by instructor
March 9	Group Presentations to professor – practice run to prepare for client presentations scheduled for next week.
March 16	Group Presentations to clients
March 23	FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS DUE TAKE HOME FINAL TEST DISTRIBUTED
March 30	TAKE HOME FINAL TEST DUE Lecture: beyond program evaluation (material provided by instructor)

Participation Rubric – Expectations

Activity/Expectation	Point Value per half term (weeks 1-6 and 7-12)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sporadic attendance/not punctual • Passive attendance most of the time 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attendance/punctual • Awake/attentive most of the time 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above, plus: • Regularly participates – demonstrating a contribution to the discussion • Does not necessarily demonstrate a preparedness or command of the reading • Perhaps a cursory understanding of the topic 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above, plus: • Regularly and clearly prepared by reading the material • Actively seeking to be engaged in the discussion • Does not over participate or dominate the conversation • Respectful of other opinions • Does not participate just for the sake of participating, but to make a contribution to the collective understanding of the issue/topic 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above, plus: • Fully engaged at a superior level • Not only demonstrated a command of the material, but brings reflections/thoughts to the conversation • Takes a leadership role in the presentation of ideas • Contribution is thoughtful, does not take the classroom discussion off track • Brings questions to class that are provocative • Successfully brings in personal/work experiences that enhance/enrich the discussion 	5