

CARLETON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

PADM 5420W: POLICY AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

SYLLABUS
WINTER TERM 2014

Instructor:	Prof. Leslie A. Pal	Fax:	(613) 520-2551
Office:	RB 5132	E-Mail:	leslie.pal@carleton.ca
Telephone:	(613) 520-2600 ext. 2554		lesliepal@gmail.com
Class:	Tuesday, 11:30 – 2:30	Office Hours:	Tuesdays 10:00 – 11:00 or by appointment
Starts:	January 7, 2014		
Ends:	April 8, 2014		

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Program evaluation is about trying to figure out how successful a policy has been, whether it met its objectives, how far it fell short, and what might be done to improve its impact. In recent years there has been a renewed emphasis on results, accountability, and performance, not just in Canada but around the world. The specifically Canadian drivers have been initiatives like the *Federal Accountability Act* as well as evolving frameworks around performance management. Another driver, common to Canada and other countries, is fiscal pressure. When money is tight, it is all the more important to try to systematically assess whether government programs are making any difference.

The improvement of programs is the core function or purpose of evaluation as it is conducted in governments, but there are other purposes as well. One is management accountability—in this instance, the objective is oversight once the program is close to completion. Evaluations can also be done to generate more general knowledge that may or may not be directly relevant to the program but that might cast light on a social issue or casual questions. When it comes to evaluating programs (or the activities that make them up, and their consequent ultimate objectives or intended outcomes), there is a broadly accepted series of systematic steps whereby information can be gathered in terms of the program's underlying logical structure (What are the objectives and why? What are the causal pathways in which the program/activities are trying to intervene? What are the actual results, when compared to what was originally intended?).

This course will introduce you to these steps and techniques, in a non-technical way. The important thing is to understand the steps themselves and the decisions and judgements that have to be made along the way. The course also demonstrates how program evaluation can contribute to the informational base for decision-makers in the public sector, and the role that these decision-makers

play in both the evaluation function as well as the broader policy and program management function.

Although there are several types of program evaluation that vary according to context, the focus of this course will be on federal public sector management applications. A number of methods will be reviewed in this context that will equip students to proceed confidently. The course will not provide a detailed conveyance of quantitative and qualitative evidence gathering methods but will highlight these so that students are aware of them. It is more important for purposes of this course, that students understand and critically assess the process of program evaluation and how to apply it in a public sector management context.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

At the end of this course, you will:

- Understand the application of performance measurement and program evaluation within the context of federal government planning and reporting processes. These applications extend to other orders of government, to industry and to society-at-large.
- Understand the various types of evaluation activity.
- Understand the evaluation planning processes necessary for the professional evaluator to competently and objectively assess public policy programs at the national, provincial and local levels of government. This understanding includes program theory, performance monitoring, evaluation design, evaluation implementation, evaluation analysis, and evaluation reporting and presentation.

cuLEARN

cuLearn is the university's on-line course system. When you go to the Carleton University main page, you see a button for cuLearn on the top right. You login with your Carleton ID and password, and all your courses (including this one) will be listed.

Please be sure that you are familiar with cuLearn, since I will be using it extensively for the course. It is where you will upload assignments and papers, find your grades, corrected assignments, e-mails from me (though any e-mails sent through cuLearn go to your general Carleton e-mail account as well), a bulletin board, news, and additional resources as I/we post them through the term. There is a help facility in cuLearn once you log on (bottom left of the screen), as well as support through CCS (<http://carleton.ca/ccs/all-services/websites/culearn/>).

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Students are expected to:

- Read the materials assigned each week. I encourage students to do this in small informal groups of their own choosing.
- Come to class prepared to answer as well as pose questions. Remember that I will be making "cold calls," i.e., asking questions randomly.

- Engage in class discussions and group work.
- Submit assigned work on time and by deadline.

Students are also expected to be thoroughly familiar the University’s standards on academic integrity, as set out in sections 18.3, 18.4, and 18.5 of the General Regulations of the Graduate Calendar (see <http://calendar.carleton.ca/grad/gradregulations/administrationoftheregulations/#18>), and in greater detail in the Carleton University Academic Integrity Policy (see <http://www1.carleton.ca/senate/ccms/wp-content/ccms-files/Academic-Integrity-Policy.pdf>). Of particular note in both documents are the sections on plagiarism, the most serious academic offence. Instructors are required to report all suspected cases of this violation to the Faculty Dean.

REQUIRED TEXTS

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage. **[To be purchased at bookstore.]**

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. **[On reserve, and also available at the Carleton Library as an e-book, with only four simultaneous users]**

As well, the Treasury Board Secretariat of the federal government has a host of tools and resources, as well as policy guides, offered through its Centre on Excellence for Evaluation: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/cee/index-eng.asp>

All other readings, with the exception of websites, are available on Ares in ucLearn.

REQUIREMENTS

Short Paper	20%	Monday, February 3, 12:00 pm
Creating a Logic Model	20%	In class presentation, February 11
Program Profile	20%	Monday, March 17, 12:00 pm
Creating Evaluation Plan	30%	Monday, April 14, 12:00 pm
Presentation	10%	In class presentation, April 8

Short Paper

The paper should be between 2,000 (minimum) and 2,250 (maximum) words in length, exclusive of bibliography or any appendices. It is to be a critical review of the literature and discussions covered in the course up to and including Week 4 (January 28). The paper should not be a mere summary of the readings, but an analytical as well as critical discussion. Imagine that your reader is an intelligent

fellow-student in the program who missed those weeks, and who needs to be able to speak and write intelligently and thoughtfully about the material and the class discussions. I've emphasized the class discussions to alert you to be sure to take notes of the key arguments and questions that came up in those discussions.

The paper should be submitted via cuLearn. Your paper must be in Word format (not PDF), with a file name as follows: lastname_Short Paper_PADM5420.

Late submissions will not be accepted, except in cases of significant personal affliction or documented medical illness. Unauthorized late submissions will receive a "0".

Creating a Logic Model

For this assignment, your group comprising three persons will be required to construct a logic model (referred to as a "program theory" in your text) for your program following the instructions in class. At a minimum, your logic model should contain a description of key product processes, activities, expected results and strategic objectives over the short, medium and long term (if applicable).

A list of programs is provided to base this exercise on as follows:

- Computers for Schools Program (Industry Canada)
- Northern Ontario Development Program (Industry Canada)
- Aboriginal Justice Strategy (Justice Canada)
- EcoEnergy Home Retrofit Program (NRCan)
- Federal Student Work Experience Program (Service Canada)
- Canada Food Guide Program (HC)
- Another program of interest (with approval by the instructor)

Creating a Program Profile for Quality Assurance

Prepare a program profile for your designated MAPA concentration, including a logic model and performance indicator strategy.

Creating an Evaluation Plan

The goal of this assignment is to prepare an evaluation plan for your designated MAPA concentration. This includes an evaluation approach, evaluation matrix of questions and indicators, and a data collection strategy. Do not worry about a reporting strategy or budget as per the RMAF guide. Your paper should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages.

Presentation

You will be asked to make a 10-minute presentation of your evaluation plan before a committee of faculty. If available, we will invite the concentration leaders. Your objective is to provide your understanding of the concentration's learning objectives, and how you would evaluate against these. Presentations will be followed by a short question and answer session.

GRADING

The following explanation of grades is the policy of the School of Public Policy and Administration.

In graduate school, expectations about analytical abilities and performance are higher than in undergraduate work, and what is an acceptable grade is also different. Whereas a C+ is a passing grade in undergraduate studies, it is not in graduate school. We have expanded upon the grading system outlined in the Graduate Calendar in order to give you a fuller description of standards. This explanation is intended to provide clarification of the Graduate Calendar, and does not override it.

Carleton University uses a 12-point grading scale from A+ (12) to D- (1). Your overall Grade Point Average (GPA) will be calculated on the basis of this 12 point scale and the final evaluation you receive in courses will be submitted as letter grades corresponding to this scale. Here is how to interpret grades in terms of our expectations of performance:

Letter Grade	Carleton Numerical System	% Ranges	Explanation
A+	12 Outstanding	90-100	For written work, virtually publishable. Demonstrates exceptional evaluative judgement, outstanding critical thinking, and mastery of technical as well as literary aspects of writing.
A	11 Excellent	85-89	Demonstrates superior grasp of material, very strong critical thinking, and capacity to understand and extend underlying patterns.
A-	10 Very Good	80-84	Demonstrates strong grasp of material, its component parts, and capacity to analyze their relationships to each other.
B+	9 Good	77-79	Demonstrates clear understanding of material and ability to apply concepts. Written work is competent.
B	8 Satisfactory	73-76	Satisfactory, but below average. Demonstrates comprehension of material, reasonable but not strong analytical capacity, with limitations in the ability to apply concepts.
B-	7 Barely Adequate	70-72	Clearly below average. Demonstrates comprehension and understanding, with limited capacity for application. Communication skills problematic.

C+	6	Less Than Adequate	67-69	Did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the material or the ability to apply the concepts. Writing and/or presentations show serious problems.
C to D-			50-66	Grades in this range indicate work that is passable in some respects but does not meet the standards of graduate work.
F		Failure		Did not meet minimal requirements.

Grades of A- or B+ should be considered as good, solid performance. Statistically, the mean for graduate courses at the Master's level is between B and B+. A grade of B- is a signal that your work was weak in some important respect. Normally, graduate students do not get credit for courses with a grade less than B-.

In the case of this course, final grades will be awarded as letter grades, but I will calculate your final grades based on the weighted mean of the grade point equivalencies. Example: A- on an exam worth 30%; B+ on a paper worth 45%; and B for participation worth 25%:

A-	10	x	.30	=	3.00
B+	9	x	.45	=	4.05
<u>B</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>.25</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>2.00</u>
Final					9.05 or B+

Please note in the example above that your letter grade will correspond to the interval in which your numerical grade falls (e.g., anything between 9.0 and 9.9 is a B+).

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATION

You may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term. For an accommodation request the processes are as follows:

Pregnancy obligation: Write to me with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details visit the Equity Services website: <http://www.carleton.ca/equity/>

Religious obligation: Write to me with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details visit the Equity Services website: <http://www.carleton.ca/equity/>

Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:

1. Identify your needs for disability-related academic accommodations to the Paul Menton Centre (PMC), supported by relevant and recent documentation from a registered health care professional, by booking an intake appointment with a PMC Coordinator. Documentation forms are available for download on the [PMC website](http://www.carleton.ca/PMC/) <http://www.carleton.ca/PMC/>.

2. With appropriate documentation and your input, your PMC Coordinator will formally evaluate your needs for accommodation by establishing a protocol. Factors taken into consideration when establishing an accommodation protocol are the specific impact of your disability on academic functioning, the degree of the impact, the extent in which your documentation supports your requests, and whether the accommodation will significantly compromise the essential requirements and/or academic integrity of the course or program.
3. You must request accommodations at the beginning of each academic term. New students are required to meet their PMC Coordinator in the Fall and Winter Terms. If you are a returning student, you may have the option of submitting your request for accommodation on line via myPMC.
4. You will be issued a “Letter of Accommodation” for each course, stating your documented accommodation needs. The Letter is sent by email to your course instructor and your Carleton email.
5. You are required to speak to your course instructor soon after receiving the Letter to discuss how best to implement your accommodations. Please note that a 2-week notice is required for instructors to make accommodation arrangements for any in-class scheduled tests/quizzes/midterm exams.
6. The deadline to request accommodations for formally scheduled exams each term is published on the PMC website, on the [Deadline Dates page](http://www.carleton.ca/pmc/students/dates-and-deadlines/) <http://www.carleton.ca/pmc/students/dates-and-deadlines/>.
7. If your course instructor does not agree to any or all of your accommodations as stated on your Letter of Accommodation, you should contact your PMC Coordinator to request that s/he initiates an informal review of the decision.

You can visit the Equity Services website to view the policies and to obtain more detailed information on academic accommodation at <http://www.carleton.ca/equity/>

SEMINAR SCHEDULE AND READINGS

This provides a general plan for the course. Changes in the plan may be necessary, and can be made at the discretion of the instructor.

Week 1 (January 7): Introduction and Overview of Course/Some Definitions

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, *Policy on Evaluation* (2009) at: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=15024§ion=text#cha1>

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, *Policy on Internal Audit* (2012) at: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=16484§ion=text#cha1>

Week 2 (January 14): Overview: What is Evaluation?

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, chap. 1.

Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, chaps. 1, 2.

Rossi, P. H., Lispey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage, chap. 1.

Week 3 (January 21): Evaluation Uses and Federal Evaluation Policy

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, chap. 19.

Bovens, M., 't Hart, P., & Kuipers, S. (2006). The politics of policy evaluation. In M. Moran, R. E. Goodin & M. Rein (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy* (pp. 319-335). Oxford: Oxford University Press, chap. 15.

Shepherd, R. (2012). In search of a balanced evaluation function: Getting to relevance. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 26(2), 1-45.

Pal, L. A. (2013). *Beyond Policy Analysis: Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times* (5th ed.). Toronto: Nelson Educational, chap. 7 (pp. 293-300).

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, *Policy on Evaluation* (2009) at: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=15024§ion=text#cha1>

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, *Directive on the Evaluation Function* (2009) at: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=15681§ion=text#cha1>

Week 4 (January 28): Needs Assessment for Program Development

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, chap. 6.

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, chap. 2.

Week 5 (February 4): Logic Models: Design Principles

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, chap. 2.

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, chap. 1.

American Evaluation Society, *Logic Models as a Platform for Program Evaluation Planning, Implementation, and Use of Findings* (2010 PowerPoint presentation). See Resources section in cuLearn course site.

W. W. Kellogg Foundation, *Logic Model Development Guide* (2004) available for download at: <http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide.aspx>, chaps. 1, 2.

Week 6 (February 11): Logic Models: Presentations and Discussion

Groups will come to class with a preliminary logic model which can be posted in class. We will make comments on each model and offer suggestions.

No Class on February 18 due to Reading Week

Week 7 (February 25): Performance Measurement

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, chaps. 4, 8, 9.

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, chap. 4.

Week 8 (March 4): Research Design: Qualitative Methods

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, chaps. 3, 5.

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, chap. 10, 12, 15.

Week 9 (March 11): Research Design: Quantitative Methods

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, chap. 7.

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, chaps. 5, 6.

Week 10 (March 18): Data Collection

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, chap. 13.

Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, chap. 7.

Week 11 (March 25): Managing Evaluation Projects

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, chaps. 10, 11.

Wholey, J. A., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, chap. 20.

Week 12 (April 1): Evaluation Ethics and Standards

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, chap. 12.

American Evaluation Society, *Guiding Principles for Evaluators* (2004), at <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51>

Canadian Evaluation Society, at: <http://www.evaluationcanada.ca>

OECD. DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance at:
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/31/12/2755284.pdf>

OECD. DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance, at:
http://www.oecd.org/document22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html

Russon, Craig (2000). The Program Evaluation Standards in International Settings, at: <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/pubs/ops/ops17.pdf>

United Nations Evaluation Group. United Nations Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, at:
<http://www.uneval.org/index.cfm?module=UNEG&Page=UNEGDocuments&LibraryID=96>

Week 13 (April 8): Presentations and Wrap-up