Effective Fall 2013

Proposal for New Course

Please attach proposed Syllabus in approved university format.

1. Course subject and number:  **EPS 650**  
2. Units:  **3**

See upper and lower division undergraduate course definitions.

3. College:  **Education**  
4. Academic Unit:  **Educational Psychology**

5. Student Learning Outcomes of the new course.  *(Resources & Examples for Developing Course Learning Outcomes)*

At the conclusion of this course, the successful participant will be able to meet the professional training standards of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model for school counseling programs; and the specific accreditation standards of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). These outcomes include:

- Demonstrate knowledge of the primary roles and purposes that organize evaluation studies, and the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches utilized in evaluation.  
  {CACREP Section II #8; CACREP School Counseling I #2; NASP 2.9}

- Demonstrate understanding of the knowledge claims associated with various data gathering and analysis strategies in evaluation including quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method approaches.  {CACREP School Counseling I #3 and J #3}

- Demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to interpreting evaluation findings.  {CACREP Section II #8; NASP 2.9}

- Demonstrate an understanding of common evaluation challenges and methods of addressing these concerns.

- Demonstrate knowledge of the recognized professional standards for conducting program evaluation as well as the “Guiding Principles” adopted by the American Evaluation Association.  {CACREP Section II #8; ASCA Principles 21 -27; NASP 2.9}

- Demonstrate an ability to analyze published evaluation research reports.  {CACREP Section II #8; NASP 2.9}

- Demonstrate an appreciation of the power of program evaluation in supporting improvement in programs and professional practice, within the chosen area of emphasis.  
  {NASP 2.9a; CACREP Section III, School Counseling I. #1-5}

- Demonstrate an ability to conceptualize and delineate an evaluation project, including issues to explore, strategies for identifying stakeholder perspectives and personal predispositions and biases; along with identifying options for addressing competing stakeholder concerns and intercultural complications.  {NASP 2.9b; CACREP Section III, School Counseling J. #1-3}

6. Justification for new course, including how the course contributes to degree program outcomes, or other university requirements / student learning outcomes.  *(Resources, Examples & Tools for Developing Effective Program Student Learning Outcomes).*
In recent years, knowledge and skills in program evaluation has become a standard learning outcome expectation for human service graduate degree programs. Graduates of doctoral programs in Counseling, School Psychology, and Curriculum & Instruction are more likely to engage in efforts to evaluate programs and generate evidence to guide professional practice, than they are to conduct empirical research. Because of this need to engage with program evaluation as a management and leadership tool, coursework in this area has become a standard expectation of accrediting groups. The creation of this course is responsive to the recommendations of external accreditation agencies that such a class be included in a graduate’s program of study. Programs in the Department of Educational Psychology are designed to meet accreditation standards of Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) & National Association of School Psychologist (NASP). Course objectives for this class have been designed to meet these accreditation guidelines.

The nature of program evaluation as a domain of professional activity and study additionally enhances a graduate degree by providing important grounding in knowledge claims and epistemology; cultural competence as an aspect of quality professional practice; and strategies for conceptualizing evaluation studies that can credibly answer questions of interest.

Designed as a broadly based course with opportunities for individual student projects in the area of specialized practice, EPS 650 will provide both general knowledge and skill in program evaluation, as well as more specialized knowledge of how program evaluation applies to areas of future professional practice for each student.

7. Effective BEGINNING of what term and year? Fall 2014
   See effective dates calendar.

8. Long course title: THEORY AND PRACTICE IN PROGRAM EVALUATION
   (max 100 characters including spaces)

9. Short course title: PROGRAM EVALUATION
   (max. 30 characters including spaces)

10. Catalog course description (max. 60 words, excluding requisites):
    “Theory and Practice in Program Evaluation” introduces program evaluation theory, methodology, applications, and issues in both formal and informal application. The course also examines application of program evaluation within specific areas of professional practice and use of evaluation for thesis or dissertation projects. A central course theme is “thinking evaluatively” in all aspects of personal and professional life.

11. Will this course be part of any plan (major, minor or certificate) or sub plan (emphasis)?
    Yes ☒ No ☐
    If yes, include the appropriate plan proposal.

12. Does this course duplicate content of existing courses? Yes ☒ No ☐
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If yes, list the courses with duplicate material. If the duplication is greater than 20%, explain why NAU should establish this course.

EPS 650 Program Evaluation has been taught three times as EPS 599, a Contemporary Developments course. EPS 650 covers some of the content in EDR 730 Evaluation Research. However, the course is specifically designed to meet the accreditation requirements for candidates in educational psychology. Specifically, Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Educational Programs (CACREP) requires candidates to “know models of program evaluation for clinical mental health counseling.” The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) also requires program evaluation as part of the professional discipline’s standards. EPS 650 is designed to be taught concurrently with EPS candidates’ practicum experiences. With EPS faculty teaching the course, the requirements between the EPS 650 course and practicum experiences is more consistently achieved.

13. Will this course impact any other academic unit’s enrollment or plan(s)? Yes ☐ No ☒
If yes, describe the impact. If applicable, include evidence of notification to and/or response from each impacted academic unit

14. Grading option: Letter grade ☒ Pass/Fail ☐ Both ☐

15. Co-convened with: __________________________ 14a. UGC approval date*: __________________________
(For example: ESE 450 and ESE 550) See co-convening policy.
*Must be approved by UGC before UCC submission, and both course syllabi must be presented.

16. Cross-listed with: __________________________
(For example: ES 450 and DIS 450) See cross listing policy.
Please submit a single cross-listed syllabus that will be used for all cross-listed courses.

17. May course be repeated for additional units? Yes ☐ No ☒
16a. If yes, maximum units allowed? _________________
16b. If yes, may course be repeated for additional units in the same term? Yes ☐ No ☒

18. Prerequisites: NONE
If prerequisites, include the rationale for the prerequisites.

19. Co requisites: __________________________
If co requisites, include the rationale for the co requisites.

20. Does this course include combined lecture and lab components? Yes ☐ No ☒
If yes, include the units specific to each component in the course description above.

21. Names of the current faculty qualified to teach this course: Melvin Hall
22. Classes scheduled before the regular term begins and/or after the regular term ends may require additional action. Review “see description” and “see impacts” for “Classes Starting/Ending Outside Regular Term” under the heading “Forms” http://nau.edu/Registrar/Faculty-Resources/Schedule-of-Courses-Maintenance/.

Do you anticipate this course will be scheduled outside the regular term?  

Yes ☐  No ☒

**Answer 22-23 for UCC/ECCC only:**

23. Is this course being proposed for Liberal Studies designation?  

Yes ☐  No ☒

If yes, include a [Liberal Studies proposal](#) and syllabus with this proposal.

24. Is this course being proposed for Diversity designation?  

Yes ☐  No ☒

If yes, include a [Diversity proposal](#) and syllabus with this proposal.

---
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Scott, This e-mail will confirm that the EDL department has been informed of EPS650 as a new course in the School Psychology program of study. Without additional information and discussion with our lead faculty, we cannot confirm that there is, or is not, significant overlap with EDR730.

Dr. Michael Schwanenberger
Educational Leadership Department Chair
Assistant Professor, College of Education
Northern Arizona University
928-523-3202 (Flagstaff)
520-879-7937 (Tucson)
602-776-4690 (Mesa)
Educational Psychology has proposed this new course (EPS 650) for inclusion in the Educational Psychology-Counseling Psychology PhD, Educational Psychology-School Psychology PhD, and School Psychology EdS degree plans.
The College Curriculum Committee has approved the proposal but would like for you to review and confirm that there IS NOT significant overlap with EDF 730.
The proposal is attached.
Thank you!

Scott Galland
Curriculum Process Associate
Office of Curriculum, Learning Design, and Academic Assessment
928-523-1753
928-699-9147 (cell)
scott.galland@nau.edu

Effective Fall 2013
Course Syllabus EPS 650

_____ SEMESTER 20____

Course Dates

Mode of Delivery

Instructor:

Office address:

Office hours:

Course description:

“Theory & Practice in Program Evaluation” introduces evaluation theory, methodology, and issues. The course examines both formal and informal evaluation strategies as they relate to programs and services across the entire spectrum of human affairs. The course will also facilitate individual student focus on issues in the application of program evaluation or action research within their area of emphasis or employment, and use of program evaluation for thesis or dissertation projects. Paramount in the course design is attention to “thinking evaluatively” in all aspects of personal, academic and professional life.

Target Audience

The course is a comprehensive survey and introduction to program evaluation, and meets specific curricular and accreditation standards for masters and doctoral programs in School Psychology, Community Counseling, Human Relations, and Curriculum and Instruction. The course design aligns with components of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model for school counseling programs; and the specific accreditation standards of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). By aligning with these standards, the course well serves the needs of professional school counselors already in practice as well as those seeking initial certification. The course is also suitable for pre thesis or dissertation students, considering a project that incorporates program evaluation as a central element. Course discussions include attention to important epistemological, methodological, contextual, and practical considerations in program evaluation and action research.
Student Learning Expectations/Outcomes for This Course

At the conclusion of this course, the successful participant will be able to...

- Demonstrate knowledge of the primary roles and purposes that organize evaluation studies, and the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches utilized in evaluation; {CACREP Section II #8; CACREP School Counseling I #2; NASP 2.9}
- Demonstrate understanding of the knowledge claims associated with various data gathering and analysis strategies in evaluation including quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method approaches; {CACREP School Counseling I #3 and J #3}
- Demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to interpreting evaluation findings; {CACREP Section II #8; NASP 2.9}
- Demonstrate an understanding of common evaluation challenges and methods of addressing these concerns;
- Demonstrate knowledge of recognized professional standards for conducting program evaluation as well as the "Guiding Principles" adopted by the American Evaluation Association; {CACREP Section II #8; ASCA Principles 21 -27; NASP 2.9}
- Demonstrate an ability to analyze published evaluation research reports; {CACREP Section II #8; NASP 2.9}
- Demonstrate an appreciation of the power of program evaluation in supporting improvement in programs and professional practice, within the chosen area of emphasis; and, {NASP 2.9 a; CACREP Section III, School Counseling I. #1-5}
- Demonstrate an ability to conceptualize and delineate an evaluation project, including issues to explore, strategies for identifying stakeholder perspectives and personal predispositions and biases; along with identifying options for addressing competing stakeholder concerns and intercultural complications. {NASP 2.9 b; CACREP Section III, School Counseling J. #1-3}

Course Structure/Approach/Organization

As a graduate seminar, this course contains individual reading, small and large group discussion, optional online journal entries, exams, a position paper, and individual course projects. The class is comprised of overview material followed by sixteen content modules. The content modules explore core evaluation topics and common reading assignments provide the basis for group discussion. Written assignments include three take home exams, a position paper and a semester project that taken together provide an opportunity for course participants to focus on evaluation as applied to their particular area of specialization or expectations for future use of program evaluation.

The course project will provide an opportunity for participants to integrate and apply required readings and classroom activities. The organization of learning modules and support materials provides opportunity for students to customize their experience and establish a set of reference materials useful after the course has concluded. Exams are comprised of application
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questions, allowing students to develop responses that demonstrate mastery of the concepts and general evaluation literature.

Textbook and required materials

No textbook is required for this class; however, the course shell contains an extensive collection of required and supplemental reading made available as PDF documents. The course design focuses upon introducing participants to the authentic voices and ideas of key practitioners and theorists in the field. In addition, the course includes required and supplemental video material; an extensive bibliographic listing of materials focused on key aspects of program evaluation; and, links to public professional resources in program evaluation. Please note the highlighted supplemental designation. In an effort to reduce the volume of reading while maintaining the comprehensive coverage of the topics, some material is "supplemental". The links and titles for these materials appear highlighted in the same color throughout the course.

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Tests (2) - Evaluation as explored in this class, involves extensive use of judgment. Both informal and formal logic systems support the aims of evaluation, and those aims are often the subject of debate. To capture and apply the essence of evaluation and related strategies, students in this course are expected to wrestle with competing concepts, perspectives, trade-offs, and challenges. Two exams serve as the catalyst for this integration and synthesis work. Release of the take-home exam questions is simultaneous with the first module covered by the test. Finished and polished exam papers are due on or before the date outlined in the course calendar. Submit test responses as an attachment (MS Word or Rich Text Format). The following rubric provides the criteria used in test response review. Prepare your exam responses using APA style and include appropriately cited material from required texts and other outside sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Exceeded Standard</th>
<th>Met Standard</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity/Conciseness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive to issue/question</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument grounded in authoritative source</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage/Completeness</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Project - The project assignment for this class, presents an opportunity to integrate course materials and professional interests. Through the course project, related reading, and

Effective Fall 2013
instructor feedback students will prepare for the application of program evaluation within the professional community of their choice. Early in the course, identify a program of your choice and design an evaluation using course content. Selection of an evaluand early in the course will create an opportunity to develop the proposal iteratively during discussion of relevant topics. Each evaluation proposal is expected to fully describe the “bounded case” that is the evaluand, analyze the evaluation requirements and context, outline important stakeholder groups, develop and defend evaluation questions or issues, and identify a strategy for conducting the evaluation. As a final section of the project, students are expected to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the design proposed. Students are further encouraged to coordinate selected readings, class discussion questions, and other course components with the evaluand chosen for investigation. The completed project is due on XXX before 11:59 PM; however, students may submit an early draft of the project for instructor feedback. Where possible, students should plan to identify a “real” client for their evaluation proposal in order to ground the project in real world expectations and demands. By identifying a client, the proposal can benefit from interviews and fact finding from an actual evaluand.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Exceeded Standard</th>
<th>Met Standard</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delineation of the Evaluand (Full Description of the Bounded Case)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Contextual Variables &amp; Related Evaluation Requirements</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Stakeholder and Audience Groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions/Issues (Define Evidence Requirements)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Design for Data Collection</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths &amp; Weaknesses of Proposed Design Identified and Articulated</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class Discussion** - Ongoing and independent contributions to class discussion that reflects graduate level thinking and engagement is expected. Up to 75 points are available through five discussion questions. Students are especially encouraged to contribute to the discussion in ways that help the entire class discern the implications of applying evaluation to the various areas of specialization. Participating students will receive 15 points at the close of each discussion.

**Thought Leader Forum** - Each student will have an opportunity to serve as thought leader for a week of the course. The role of the thought leader is to post an interesting and important thought or question about evaluation from the module completed the week prior, and then oversee a weeklong discussion among class members and the course instructor. Further instructions are included in the course material along with an illustration of how the process works. Twenty-five points are available from this exercise.

**Weekly Journal** - Students will individually write a journal entry for each week of the course, detailing activities and reactions to the course material. The journal is an opportunity for one-on-one conversation with the course instructor, and each entry will result in 10 points, up to the maximum of 150. Additional information about the journal requirement is included with course materials.

**Course Grading System**

The points earned from class participation, exams, and the capstone assignment described below, will determine final course grade. A total of 700 points are available for the course: 2 Exams @ 100 points each = 200, Thought Leader Forum = 25 points; Discussion participation points (5@ 15 points each = 75), capstone project = 250 points; Journal entries = 150 points), with final course grades based upon the 700 points for required activities, and determined as follows:

630 - 700 points (90% and above) = A
The course calendar provides due dates for all course assignments and tests.

Course policies
Instances of academic dishonesty (plagiarism, cheating on exams or assignments) will be handled according to the policies included in the NAU Student Handbook.

Other University policies, which apply to this course, include:

NAU’s Safe Working and Learning Environment Policy seeks to prohibit discrimination and promote the safety of all individuals within the university. The goal of this policy is to prevent the occurrence of discrimination based on sex, race, color, age, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, disability, or veteran status and to prevent sexual harassment, sexual assault, or retaliation by anyone at this university.

You may obtain a copy of this policy from the college dean’s office. If you have concerns about this policy, it is important that you contact the departmental chair, dean’s office, the Office of Student Life (928-523-5181), the academic ombudsperson (928-523-9368), or NAU’s Office of Affirmative Action (928-523-3312).

Policy for Students with Disabilities: If you have a disability, you can arrange for accommodations by contacting the office of Disability Support Services (DSS) at 928-523-8773 (voice) 928-523-6906 (TTY). To meet your individual needs you are encouraged to provide documentation of the disability to DSS at least 8 weeks prior to the beginning of the semester. You must register with DSS each semester.

Faculty members are not authorized to provide accommodations without prior approval from DSS. Students are encouraged to notify their instructors a minimum of one week in advance of the need for accommodation. Failure to do so may result in a delay in provision of the accommodation. Bring any concerns to the attention of the office of Disability Support Services or to the ADA coordinator in the Affirmative Action Office.

Academic Integrity: The University takes an extremely serious view of violations of academic integrity. NAU’s administration, faculty, staff, and students are dedicated to promoting an atmosphere of honesty and are committed to maintaining the academic integrity essential to the education process; inherent in this commitment is the belief that academic dishonesty in all
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forms violates the basic principles of integrity and impedes learning. Students are therefore responsible for conducting themselves in an academically honest manner.

Individual students and faculty members are responsible for identifying instances of academic dishonesty. Faculty members then recommend penalties to the department chair or college dean in keeping with the severity of the violation. The complete policy on academic integrity is in Appendix F of NAU’s Student Handbook.

Classroom Management Statement: Membership in the academic community places a special obligation on all members to preserve an atmosphere conducive to a safe and positive learning environment. Part of that obligation implies the responsibility of each member of the NAU community to maintain an environment in which the behavior of any individual is not disruptive. Each student has the responsibility to behave in a manner that does not interrupt or disrupt the delivery of education by faculty members or receipt of education by students, within or outside the course. For online classes the classroom is virtual but nonetheless real. The faculty member at the time the behavior makes the determination of whether it connotes interruption or disruption. It becomes the responsibility of the individual faculty member to maintain and enforce the standards of behavior acceptable to preserving an atmosphere for teaching and learning in accordance with University regulations and the course syllabus. Faculty notifies students when their behavior has been determined to be disruptive. Serious disruptions, as determined by the faculty member, may result in immediate removal of the student from the instructional environment. Significant and/or continued violations may result in an administrative withdrawal from the class.

Course Calendar

*Each Module Opens on Monday and closes the following Sunday night; module numbers correspond to the weeks of the course i.e. Module 4 corresponds to week four of the course
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 1 (Dates)</th>
<th>Program Evaluation As Systemic Inquiry</th>
<th>What are the historical antecedents that have shaped the development of program evaluation? How can we usefully distinguish between evaluation and research? What is formal versus informal evaluation and formative versus summative evaluation? How do current calls for evidence-based practice relate to program evaluation, action research, and research in general? What are the links between program evaluation and other types of evaluation such as Product Evaluation, Personnel Evaluation, Student Evaluation, Accountability Systems, Accreditation Processes, and Evidence-Based Practice?</th>
<th>Course participant self-introductions due before 11:59 PM on XXX. Post introductions under Discussion Topic #1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 2 (Dates)</td>
<td>Intellectual Foundation of Program Evaluation &amp; The Significance of Context in defining evaluation practice</td>
<td>Determining the object of evaluation or &quot;Evaluand;&quot; The role of &quot;Valuing&quot; in evaluation; Foundations of Systematic Inquiry; Distinguishing Methods, Methodology, and &amp; Methodolatry. Examining the significance of context for program evaluation when the study is conducted in school, clinical, international, government, foundation, NGO, and other settings. Differentiating between the issues and professional identities associated with conducting evaluations in various settings and communities of practice.</td>
<td>Discussion Topic #2 posts due by midnight on XXX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3 (Dates)</td>
<td>Program Evaluation Purposes and Roles</td>
<td>The nature of evaluative evidence and evaluative reasoning; Distinguishing needs for Reliability, Validity, Generalizability, Understanding the Particular, Discerning the realities of &quot;variations on a central theme&quot; when looking at program implementation. Understanding the importance of &quot;unit of analysis&quot; as program evaluation focuses on an individual, group, institution, etc.</td>
<td>Discussion #3 posts due before 11:59 PM on XXX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4 (Dates)</td>
<td>Cultural Competence in Program Evaluation</td>
<td>What does cultural competence mean in the context of evaluation? Why is it a significant &quot;quality of practice&quot; issue? How can an evaluation reflect cultural competence? Impact of cultural competence concerns on: definition of evaluand and evaluation context definition of quality data; and data collection and reporting. Cultural Competence as an ethical imperative</td>
<td>First Forum Hosted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 5</th>
<th>The Nature of Credible Evidence in Program Evaluation</th>
<th>What are the key dimensions of this issue? Why is it a significant &quot;quality of practice&quot; issue for evaluators? How can we correctly target evaluations toward producing results that are {Compelling, Probable, Plausible, Possible, Illustrative, Good Enough}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 6</td>
<td>A Focus on Quantitative Data Collection Strategies</td>
<td>What knowledge claims undergird these approaches to evaluation? What are the key strengths and weaknesses of these strategies? What are the key implementation steps in these strategies? When might these strategies be preferred as a method of data collection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 7</td>
<td>Program Evaluation Use/Influence</td>
<td>What are the key dimensions of this issue? Why is it a significant &quot;quality of practice&quot; issue for evaluators? What defines use/influence in the various settings where evaluation is conducted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 8</td>
<td>A Focus on Qualitative Data Collection Strategies</td>
<td>What knowledge claims undergird in these approaches to evaluation? What are the key strengths and weaknesses of these strategies? What are the key implementation steps in these strategies? When might these strategies be preferred as a method of data collection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 9</td>
<td>Ethical Issues in Program Evaluation</td>
<td>What are the key dimensions of this issue? Why is it a significant &quot;quality of practice&quot; issue for evaluators? How does it differ from ethical issues facing professionals who run programs that are evaluated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 10</td>
<td>Case Studies as Program Evaluation</td>
<td>What knowledge claims undergird in these approaches to evaluation? What are the key strengths and weaknesses of these strategies? What are the key implementation steps? When might these strategies be preferred as a method of data collection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 11</td>
<td>Values in Evaluation and Social Science</td>
<td>What are key dimensions of this issue? Why is it a significant &quot;quality of practice&quot; issue for evaluators? Are values always present? Are any values, even professional values, universal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 12</td>
<td>Naturalistic, and Ethnographic Approaches to Data Collection</td>
<td>What knowledge claims undergird these approaches to evaluation? What are the key strengths and weaknesses of these strategies? What are the key implementation steps in these strategies? When might these strategies be preferred as a method of data collection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 13</td>
<td>Emerging Approaches to Program Evaluation &amp; Analysis of Performance Data and Public Records</td>
<td>What knowledge claims undergird these approaches to evaluation? What are the key strengths and weaknesses of these strategies? What are the key implementation steps in these strategies? When might these strategies be preferred as a method of data collection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 14</td>
<td>Communicating Program Evaluation Results</td>
<td>What is at stake in communicating program evaluation? Who is the audience and how does the audience relate to stakeholders? When the subject of the program is not defined as the unit of analysis, what rights or prerogatives must they have anyway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 15</td>
<td>Effectively Communicating Evaluation Results to Stakeholder Groups</td>
<td>What factors play a role in effective communication of evaluation results? What modes of communication are available to evaluators and what examples of successful (or unsuccessful) results communication illustrate these principals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 16</td>
<td>Professional Standards &amp; Guiding Principles; Discussion of Topics of Student Interest</td>
<td>Review of professional standards from various associations as they impact program evaluation or are impacted by program evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>