

**University of Southern California
School of Policy, Planning, and Development**

PPD 542: POLICY AND PROGRAM EVALUATION: FALL 2004 (L.A.)

Session I: August 28–29, 2004
 Session II: October 15–17
 Session III: November 12–14
 Meeting Times: 9:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m. and 1:30 p.m.–5:00 p.m.
 Instructor: Joe Wholey
 E-mail: wholey@usc.edu (*Put PPD542 in the subject of your e-mail!*)
 Telephone: 703-524-0022 (for a speedier response to your e-mail!)

Welcome to the evaluation seminar! This seminar focuses on *program evaluation* (or *evaluation*): systematic, databased assessment of the performance, value, merit, worth, or significance of programs that have been implemented in public and nongovernmental organizations. A *program* may be *any policy, program, project, function, agency, bureau, process, or activity* that has an identifiable purpose or set of objectives. The primary focus of evaluation is on program *outcomes* (results after delivery of products or services), though evaluation may also focus on a program's context, program inputs, program activities, program *outputs* (products or services delivered by the program), or a program's net *impacts* (the difference between program outcomes and the outcomes that would have occurred in the absence of the program).

Program evaluation requires both interpersonal and technical skills, and is best learned through a combination of reading, classroom instruction, and on-the-job training. Your personal involvement and interaction with others—before, during, and after seminar sessions—are essential to your learning experience in the seminar. Seminar projects are to provide monitoring or evaluation information to one or more real clients. Seminar papers and seminar sessions will provide opportunities to practice clear communication of what you have learned through your reading, in our seminar sessions, and in evaluation work. I look forward to getting to know you through the seminar.

The objective of the seminar is to help participants develop knowledge, skills, and abilities in nine areas:

1. Purposes and uses of program evaluation
2. Evaluation methods and approaches, including logic modeling, evaluability assessment, performance monitoring (performance measurement), implementation evaluation, quasi-experiments, randomized experiments, cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and evaluation synthesis (meta-analysis)
3. Methods for collecting qualitative and quantitative data
4. Methods for analyzing qualitative and quantitative data, including content analysis, disaggregating data by client characteristics or other factors, summarizing information in tables and graphs, and regression analysis

Supplement to the *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, Second Edition*, edited by Joseph S. Wholey, Harry P. Hatry, and Kathryn E. Newcomer, ISBN 0-7879-6713-0, cloth, © 2004 Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley.

5. Methods for developing options and recommendations based on evaluation findings
6. Methods for communicating evaluation findings, options, and recommendations
7. Methods for getting evaluation results used
8. Evaluation guidelines and standards, including the standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation
9. Problems affecting the usefulness, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy of evaluation; practical ways to overcome those problems

Background

Public and nongovernmental organizations now face higher expectations, lower levels of confidence and trust, increasing levels of media scrutiny, and demands for better management, greater transparency and accountability, greater efficiency, higher program quality, and better program outcomes. Policy and program evaluation are central to current reforms in this country and throughout the world. The purposes of a specific evaluation project may be one or more of the following: improve policy or program design; improve agency or program management; increase transparency; improve accountability to key stakeholders or the public; deepen understanding; improve program quality and service delivery; identify “best practices” approaches; improve program effectiveness; support resource allocation or other policy decision making.

Key steps in program evaluation are: identifying *stakeholders* who may be interested in or affected by the program or its evaluation; clarifying the *purpose* of the evaluation; identifying *evaluation questions*; getting agreement on *evaluation criteria*; assessing program performance *in terms of the evaluation criteria*; identifying any *options or recommendations* based on the evaluation findings; *communicating* evaluation findings and any options or recommendations; and *getting evaluation results used*.

Program evaluation may be accomplished either through *performance monitoring systems* (which regularly measure progress toward program goals), through *evaluation studies* (which assess how well programs are working by examining a broader range of information on program performance and program context), or through a combination of monitoring systems and evaluation studies. *Descriptive* evaluations describe program inputs, program activities, or program outcomes, and answer the question, “*What’s happening?*” *Normative* evaluations (implementation evaluations, process evaluations, and performance monitoring systems) compare *what is* with *what should be* (comparing actual program inputs, activities, or outcomes with input, activity, or outcome *standards*), and answer the question, “*Does what’s happening meet the standards for what should be happening?*” *Explanatory evaluation studies* (experiments and quasi-experiments) test the existence of causal relationships, and answer the question, “*What difference has the policy or program made?*”

Monitoring systems and evaluation studies may use qualitative or quantitative social science research methods; most use a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. Typical evaluation designs include: *case study* (description and analysis of a program in its context); *implementation evaluation* (especially *process evaluation*, comparing actual and intended program inputs, program activities, and program outputs); *pre-post design* (comparing participants before and after program implementation); *comparison group design* (comparing outcomes for program participants with outcomes for those in a comparison or control group not receiving program services); *interrupted time series design* (comparing trends in outcomes at multiple points in time *before* and multiple points in time *after* program implementation); *randomized experiment* (or *controlled experiment*, comparing outcomes for participants

Supplement to the *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, Second Edition*, edited by Joseph S. Wholey, Harry P. Hatry, and Kathryn E. Newcomer, ISBN 0-7879-6713-0, cloth, © 2004 Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley.

randomly assigned to program services with outcomes for those randomly assigned to different or no services); *cost-effectiveness analysis* (*retrospective* study comparing program costs with program outcomes); and *cost-benefit analysis* (*retrospective* study comparing program costs with the dollar value of program impacts).

Required Readings

The assigned textbook and a variety of other resources provide information on the purposes and uses of evaluation, leading evaluation methods and approaches, and evaluation guidelines and standards (see Attachment 1). So that all participants can get as much as possible from the seminar sessions, you are required to complete the following readings before each seminar session:

Before Session I: Syllabus; Wholey, Hatry, and Newcomer (eds.). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, 2nd Ed.: Preface; Meeting the Need for Practical Evaluation Approaches: An Introduction; Introductions to Parts One, Two, Three, and Four; Chapter 24; and the program evaluation standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (available at <http://www.eval.org>).

Before Session II: Syllabus; Wholey, Hatry, and Newcomer (eds.). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, 2nd Ed.: Chapters 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21; and the program evaluation standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (available at <http://www.eval.org>).

Before Session III: Syllabus; Wholey, Hatry, and Newcomer (eds.). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, 2nd Ed.: Chapters 4, 21, and 22; and the program evaluation standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (available at <http://www.eval.org>).

Response to the Readings

On the first day of Session I, you are to submit your first two seminar papers. These papers should be clearly written and well edited. Each of the papers should be one or two pages in length. Paper #1, Introduction, should: (1) Include your name, mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address; (2) Describe your background in statistics, qualitative and quantitative research, performance monitoring systems, and program evaluation studies; (3) State what you would like to get out of the seminar; (4) Respond to the following questions: (a) If this were to be your best course ever, what would happen? (b) How could you contribute to that outcome? (c) How could the instructor and the other seminar participants contribute to that outcome?; (5) Identify at least one evaluation method, at least one data collection method, and at least one data analysis method in which you would like to become (more) proficient, and identify textbook chapters that appear to relate to those methods.

Seminar Projects, Reports, and Papers

As noted above, evaluation is best learned through a combination of reading, classroom instruction, and on-the-job training. In this seminar, participants are to work with real clients (individual people) to plan and design performance monitoring systems or evaluation studies;

Supplement to the *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, Second Edition*, edited by Joseph S. Wholey, Harry P. Hatry, and Kathryn E. Newcomer, ISBN 0-7879-6713-0, cloth, © 2004 Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley.

complete at least a pilot evaluation project, including collection and analysis of data on policy or program outcomes; develop preliminary findings and at least one option or recommendation based on the evaluation findings; report your findings, options, and recommendations to your client; and report on your project to other seminar participants and the instructor.

Seminar projects may be evaluation of policies, programs, projects, or processes that have been implemented in public or nongovernmental organizations. Your seminar project is to provide performance monitoring or evaluation information to one or more real clients. [Dion Jackson, a USC staff member and consultant (dljackso@usc.edu, 213-740-6868), or Meg Barclay, a 2004 MPP graduate and project manager (mbarclay@shelterpartnership.org, 213-688-2188, ext. 4584), may have potential clients for whom you could undertake your seminar project.]

Seminar projects will require some social science research skills, though the seminar sessions will not cover all the social science research methods that may be required in a specific project. Students may work on individual seminar projects or work in teams of two or three students who take joint responsibility for the project.

On the first day of Session I, you are to submit Paper #2, Project Description, a one- or two-page paper briefly describing your proposed seminar project, following the outline in Attachment 2. (Your initial choice of a seminar project may change between Session I and Session II, if you believe that such a change is desirable.) Bring 30 copies of Paper #2 to the first day of Session I.

On the first day of Session II, be prepared to make a 10-minute PowerPoint presentation on your seminar project, and submit a copy of your PowerPoint slides as Paper #3, Preliminary Report on Seminar Project, following the outline in Attachment 3. Bring 30 copies of your PowerPoint slides on the first day of Session II.

On the first day of Session III, be prepared to make another 10-minute PowerPoint presentation on your seminar project, and submit Paper #4, Preliminary Report on Seminar Project, following the outline in Attachment 4. Bring 30 copies of your PowerPoint slides, which should also cover the points listed in Attachment 4.

Paper #5, Project Paper. Your project paper, which is to be mailed *and* e-mailed to the instructor no later than December 6, 2004, should demonstrate competence in performance monitoring or evaluation, reflect what you have learned in the seminar, take into account suggestions made by the instructor and other seminar participants, and provide monitoring or evaluation information to one or more real clients. The project paper is to follow the outline in Attachment 5. It should be approximately 20 pages in length (typed, double-spaced, excluding appendices).

Each of your seminar papers should be professional in appearance and should be clearly written and well edited, reflecting at least the competence and communications skills expected of a master's degree candidate.

Course Organization and Schedule

The seminar will include several sets of activities over six overlapping time periods:

1. Registration through beginning of Session I. This reading and planning period includes completion of required readings, identification of a seminar project, and preparation of seminar Papers #1 and #2.
2. Session I. Session I will offer a menu of evaluation methods and approaches. It will be a combination of mini-lectures by the instructor, small group exercises and discussions, analyses of case materials, presentations by seminar participants, and opportunities for clarifying questions and feedback to participants.

We will explore the evaluation topics outlined in Attachment 6, as amended on the first day of Session I. Each seminar participant is to attend, and participate productively in, each full day of the seminar.

3. Application and reporting period. This period, from registration to the date when the final paper is due, will be devoted to monitoring and evaluation of projects conducted by seminar participants, progress report briefings, and preparation of seminar papers #2, #3, #4, and #5. Paper #2 is due at the beginning of Session I; Paper #3, at the beginning of Session II; Paper #4, at the beginning of Session III. Paper #5, your project paper, is to be mailed *and* e-mailed to the instructor no later than December 6, 2004.
4. Session II. Session II will further explore evaluation methods, focus particular attention on reporting evaluation findings and getting evaluation results used, and provide opportunities to evaluate ongoing and completed evaluations in terms of specific utility, feasibility, and accuracy standards. We will explore the topics in Attachment 6, as amended on the first day of Session I. The format for this session will be similar to that of Session I.

You are to present a progress report briefing on your project during Session II. Your briefing is to be limited to a *maximum* of 10 minutes, and is to be accompanied by a handout that duplicates your PowerPoint slides. Each seminar participant is to attend, and participate productively in, each full day of the seminar.

5. Session III. Section III will explore performance monitoring systems, managing for results, performance budgeting, report cards, and current uses of performance monitoring and evaluation. We will explore the topics in Attachment 6, as amended on the first day of Session I. The format for this session will be similar to that of Session II.

You are to present another progress report briefing on your project during Session III. Your briefing is to be limited to a *maximum* of 10 minutes, and is to be accompanied by a handout that duplicates your PowerPoint slides. Each seminar participant is to attend, and participate productively in, each full day of the seminar.

6. Completion of the project paper. Time remaining after Session III will be devoted to completion of your project paper. The project paper, Paper #5, should demonstrate competence in performance monitoring or evaluation, reflect what you have learned in the seminar, take into account suggestions made by the instructor and other seminar participants, and provide monitoring or evaluation information to one or more real clients. Your project paper is to be mailed to the instructor at P. O. Box 747, Arlington, Virginia 22216-0747 (or 2103 21st Road North, Arlington, Virginia 22201) *and* e-mailed to the instructor at wholey@usc.edu by December 6, 2004.

Evaluation Criteria and Course Grades

Grades will be determined on the bases of participant's seminar presentations and seminar papers. Each of the seminar papers should be clearly written and well edited, reflecting at least the competence and communications skills expected of a master's degree candidate. Timely submission of your seminar papers is a course requirement. "A" grades will signify timely performance of excellent or exceptional quality.

1. Response to the readings and project description: 25 percent.

On the first day of Session I, seminar participants are to submit Papers #1 and #2. These papers are to follow the outlines presented above and in Attachment 2. The papers should include complete references to the books, articles, reports, and other resources cited. For Papers #1 and #2, a half-grade will be deducted for late papers.

2. Progress reports on seminar projects: 25 percent.

On the first day of Session II, seminar participants are to submit Paper #3 (a set of PowerPoint slides that follow the outline in Attachment 3), and are to be prepared to present 10-minute PowerPoint briefings on their seminar projects. Bring 30 copies of your PowerPoint slides.

On the first day of Session III, seminar participants are to submit Paper #4, which is to follow the outline in Attachment 4, and are to be prepared to present 10-minute PowerPoint briefings on their seminar projects. Bring 30 copies of your PowerPoint slides, which are also to follow the outline in Attachment 4.

For Papers #3 and #4, a half-grade will be deducted for late papers.

3. Project paper: 50 percent.

Paper #5 is to follow the outline in Attachment 5, demonstrate knowledge and skills in the areas enumerated on page 1 of the syllabus, and provide evaluation information to one or more real clients. It is to be approximately 20 pages in length (typed, double-spaced, excluding appendices) and include a table of contents that tells readers where to find each of the items listed in Attachment 5. The project paper should: demonstrate competence in data collection, data analysis, and evaluation; reflect what you have learned in the seminar; and take into account suggestions made by the instructor and other seminar participants. It should be professional in appearance, clearly written, and well edited, reflecting at least the competence and communications skills expected of a master's degree candidate. The paper should include relevant tables or graphs.

A hard copy of your project paper is to be mailed to the instructor at P. O. Box 747, Arlington, Virginia 22216-0747 (or 2103 21st Road North, Arlington, Virginia 22201) by December 6, 2004. An electronic copy is to be submitted to the instructor at wholey@usc.edu in addition to the hard copy. For Paper #5, a half-grade will be deducted for late papers.

Disability Services and Programs

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP (213-740-0776). Please be sure that the letter is delivered to the instructor as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Academic Integrity

Students must maintain strict adherence to standards of academic integrity, as described in Scampus. In particular, the university recommends strict sanctions for plagiarism, as defined below:

Plagiarism:

- A. The submission of material authored by another person but represented as the student's own work, whether that material is paraphrased or copied in verbatim or near-verbatim form.
- B. The submission of material subjected to editorial revision by another person that results in substantive changes in content or major alteration of writing style.
- C. Improper acknowledgment of sources in essays or papers.

Note: Culpability is not diminished when plagiarism occurs in drafts that are not the final version. Also, if any material is prepared or submitted by another person on the student's behalf, the student is expected to proofread the results and is responsible for all particulars of the final draft.

Attachment 1: ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Web Sites

American Evaluation Association: <http://www.eval.org>
 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: <http://www.cdc.gov/eval>
 Governmental Accounting Standards Board: <http://www.gasb.org>
 Kellogg Foundation: <http://www.wkkf.org>
 U. S. Department of Education, What Works Clearinghouse: <http://www.w-w-c.org>
 U. S. Department of Justice: <http://www.bja.evaluationwebsite.org>
 U. S. General Accounting Office: <http://www.gao.gov>
 U. S. Office of Management and Budget: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb>
 United Way of America: <http://www.unitedway.org/outcomes>
 World Bank: <http://www.worldbank.org>

Periodicals

- *American Journal of Evaluation*
- *New Directions for Evaluation*
- *Evaluation and Program Planning*
- *Evaluation Review*
- *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*

Books and Reports

Campbell, D. T., and Stanley, J. C. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963).

Cook, T. D., and Campbell, D. T. *Quasi-Experimentation* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979).

Gormley, W. T., and Weimer, D. L. *Organizational Report Cards* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Hatry, H. P. *Performance Measurement: Getting Results* (Washington: Urban Institute Press, 1999).

Hatry, H. P., Morley, E., Rossman, S. B., and Wholey, J. S. *How Federal Program Managers Use Outcome Information* (Arlington, Va.: IBM Center for the Business of Government, 2003). Available at <http://www.businessofgovernment.org>.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. *The Program Evaluation Standards* (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1994). Summary available at <http://www.eval.org>.

Light, R. J., and Pillemer, D. B. *Summing Up: The Science of Reviewing Research* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984).

Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., Freeman, H. E. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*, 7th ed. (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2004).

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Performance Measurement and Evaluation*, GAO/GGD-98-26 (Washington, D.C.: Author). Available at <http://www.gao.gov>.

Vedung, E. *Policy and Program Evaluation* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1997).

Yin, R. K. *Applications of Case Study Research*, 2nd ed. (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2003).

Yin, R. K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd ed. (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2003).

Supplement to the *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, Second Edition*, edited by Joseph S. Wholey, Harry P. Hatry, and Kathryn E. Newcomer, ISBN 0-7879-6713-0, cloth, © 2004 Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley.

Attachment 2: OUTLINE FOR PAPER #2 (PROJECT DESCRIPTION)*

1. Project title.
2. Your name, telephone number, and e-mail address.
3. Date.
4. The primary client(s) for your seminar project: Name one or more individuals to whom you will present your monitoring or evaluation report, and provide their titles and their e-mail addresses or telephone numbers.
5. Brief description of the policy, agency, program, project, or process on which your seminar project will focus.
6. The purpose of your seminar project.
7. Your current thoughts on one or more evaluation questions that might be answered by your performance monitoring system or evaluation study, including at least one question focusing on policy or program outcomes (results).
8. Your current thoughts on possible uses of the evaluation information that your seminar project will provide.

Attachment A: Complete, correct references to any books, articles, reports, or other resources cited.

* Participants are to submit 30 copies of Paper #2, a one- or two-page Project Description, on the first day of Session I.

Attachment 3:
 OUTLINE FOR PROGRESS REPORT BRIEFING*
 PAPER #3 (PRELIMINARY REPORT ON SEMINAR PROJECT)**

1. Project title.
2. Your name, mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address.*
3. Date.
4. Executive summary, briefly summarizing sections 7a, 8, 9, and 12.
5. Background: Include information on the context around the program on which the seminar project is focused, information on your primary client including the e-mail addresses or telephone numbers of one or more individuals to whom you will present your monitoring or evaluation report, and the *purpose* of your seminar project.
6. Findings from the literature on your program or similar programs (at least two relevant reports, articles, books, or other sources).
7. Objectives, scope, and methodology: (a) *Questions (to be) answered by the monitoring system or evaluation study*, including at least one question focusing on policy or program outcomes (results); (b) *The data (to be) collected to answer each question*; (c, d) The data sources and data collection procedures (to be) used to answer each question; (e) Evidence as to the accuracy and credibility of the data; and (f) *The data analysis methods (to be) used to answer each question* (for example, content analysis, disaggregating performance data by client characteristics or other factors, summarizing information in tables or graphs, or regression analysis).
8. *Findings to date, including relevant tables, charts, or graphs.*
9. One or more options or recommendations for policy or program change; which evaluation findings support each option or recommendation; likely costs and consequences of implementing the options or recommendations.
10. How the findings to date, and any options or recommendations, were or will be communicated to the primary client and other stakeholders; how use of the evaluation information will be encouraged.
11. Likely or actual uses of the seminar project.
12. Reactions from the primary client and other stakeholders.

Attachment A: Design matrix.

Attachment B: Copies of questionnaires and other data collection instruments used in the evaluation.

Attachment C: Complete, correct references to any books, articles, reports, or other sources cited in section 6 or elsewhere in the briefing.

*Participants are to make 10-minute PowerPoint presentations on their seminar projects during Session II, and distribute copies of their PowerPoint slides to the instructor and the other seminar participants. The PowerPoint presentations and handouts may omit participants' addresses.

**Participants are to submit 1 copy of their PowerPoint slides as Paper #3, Preliminary Report on Seminar Project, on the first day of Session II.

Supplement to the *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, Second Edition*, edited by Joseph S. Wholey, Harry P. Hatry, and Kathryn E. Newcomer, ISBN 0-7879-6713-0, cloth, © 2004 Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley.

Attachment 4:
 OUTLINE FOR PROGRESS REPORT BRIEFING* AND FOR
 PAPER #4 (PRELIMINARY REPORT ON SEMINAR PROJECT)**

1. Project title.
2. Your name, mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address.*
3. Date.
4. Executive summary, briefly summarizing sections 8a, 9, 10, and 13.
5. Table of contents (including page numbers).
6. Background: Include information on the context around the program on which the seminar project is focused, information on your primary client including the e-mail addresses or telephone numbers of one or more individuals to whom you will present your monitoring or evaluation report, and the *purpose* of your seminar project.
7. Findings from the literature on your program or similar programs (at least two relevant reports, articles, books, or other sources), with complete references.
8. Objectives, scope, and methodology: (a) *Questions (to be) answered by the monitoring system or evaluation study*, including at least one question focusing on policy or program outcomes (results); (b) *The data (to be) collected to answer each question*; (c, d) The data sources and data collection procedures (to be) used to answer each question; (e) Evidence as to the accuracy and credibility of the data; and (f) *The data analysis methods (to be) used to answer each question* (for example, content analysis, disaggregating performance data by client characteristics or other factors, summarizing information in tables or graphs, or regression analysis).
9. *Findings*, including relevant tables, charts, or graphs.
10. One or more options or recommendations for policy or program change; which evaluation findings support each option or recommendation; likely costs and consequences of implementing the options or recommendations.
11. How the findings to date, and any options or recommendations, were or will be communicated to the primary client and other stakeholders; how use of the evaluation information will be encouraged.
12. Likely or actual uses of the seminar project.
13. Reactions from the primary client and other stakeholders.
14. Limitations (*a brief critique of your seminar project in terms of specific utility standards, specific feasibility standards, specific propriety standards, and specific accuracy standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation*).

Appendix A: Copies of questionnaires and other data collection instruments used.

Appendix B: Complete references to any books, articles, reports, or other sources cited.*

Appendix C: Examples of the data collected; where the data are stored.

*Participants are to make 10-minute PowerPoint presentations on their seminar projects during Session III, and distribute copies of their PowerPoint slides to the instructor and the other seminar participants. The PowerPoint presentations and handouts may omit participants' addresses.

**Participants are to submit 1 copy of their PowerPoint slides, and submit Paper #4, Preliminary Report on Seminar Project, on the first day of Session III.

Attachment 5:
OUTLINE FOR PAPER #5 (PROJECT PAPER)*

1. Project title.
2. Your name, mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address.
3. Date.
4. Executive summary, briefly summarizing sections 8a, 9, 10, and 13.
5. Table of contents (including page numbers).
6. Background: Include information on the context around the program on which the seminar project is focused, information on your primary client including the e-mail addresses or telephone numbers of one or more individuals to whom you will present your monitoring or evaluation report, and the *purpose* of your project.
7. Findings from the literature on your program or similar programs (at least two relevant reports, articles, books, or other sources), with complete references.
8. Objectives, scope, and methodology: (a) *Questions answered by the monitoring system or evaluation study*, including at least one question focusing on policy or program outcomes; (b) *The data collected to answer each question*; (c, d) The data sources and data collection procedures used to answer each question; (e) Evidence as to the validity, reliability, and credibility of the data; and (f) *The data analysis methods used to answer each question* (for example, content analysis, disaggregating performance data by client characteristics or other factors, summarizing information in tables or graphs, or regression analysis).
9. *Findings*, including relevant tables, charts, or graphs.
10. One or more options or recommendations for policy or program change; which evaluation findings support each option or recommendation; likely costs and consequences of implementing the options or recommendations.
11. How the findings and any options or recommendations were (or will be) communicated to the primary client and other stakeholders; how use of the evaluation information was (or will be) encouraged.
12. Likely or actual uses of the evaluation information.
13. Reactions from the primary client and other stakeholders.
14. Limitations (*a brief critique of your seminar project in terms of specific utility standards, specific feasibility standards, specific propriety standards, and specific accuracy standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation*).
15. How these limitations could have been overcome if a more extensive evaluation effort had been conducted.

Appendix A: Copies of data collection instruments used in your seminar project.

Appendix B: Complete, correct references to any books, articles, reports, or other sources cited in section 7 or elsewhere in the reports.

Appendix C: Examples of the data collected; where the data are stored.

*A hard copy of the Project Paper is to be mailed to the instructor at P. O. Box 747, Arlington Virginia 22216-0747 (or 2103 21st Road North, Arlington, Virginia 22201) no later than December 6, 2004. An electronic copy is to be submitted to the instructor at wholey@usc.edu in addition to the hard copy.

Attachment 6:
SEMINAR SCHEDULE

August 28–29: Evaluation planning and design, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, performance monitoring systems, meta-analysis, impact evaluation, getting monitoring and evaluation information used

Setting the stage: Review of participants' backgrounds and expectations for the seminar; refinement of seminar objectives and schedule

Evaluation planning and design; identifying stakeholders; clarifying the purpose of the evaluation; evaluation questions and how to answer them; the design matrix

Logic modeling; evaluability assessment; rapid-feedback evaluation; sequential purchase of information

Qualitative evaluation methods, including implementation evaluation, process evaluation, and case study research

Collection of qualitative data: use of administrative data from agency or program records or documents; use of interviews, focus groups, and surveys; observation; role-playing; use of purposive or random sampling to reduce data collection costs

Analysis of qualitative data: content analysis; disaggregating data by client characteristics, community characteristics, or other factors; summarizing information in tables or graphs; enhancing the reliability and credibility of qualitative information

Collection of quantitative data: use of administrative data from agency or program records or documents; use of interviews and surveys; trained observer ratings; role-playing; use of purposive or random sampling to reduce data collection costs; quality control; enhancing the validity, reliability, and credibility of quantitative data

Analysis of quantitative data: disaggregating performance data by client characteristics, community characteristics, or other factors; summarizing information in tables or graphs; using regression analysis to describe relationships among program inputs, program activities, and program outcomes; using statistical tests

Quality control: improving the accuracy and credibility of qualitative and quantitative research

Performance monitoring systems (performance measurement systems), especially outcome monitoring systems

Impact evaluation: experimental and quasi-experimental designs for estimating the causal impact of a policy or program (estimating what difference the policy or program has made); overcoming threats to valid causal inference

Getting evaluation information used to increase transparency and accountability to key stakeholders and the public, deepen understanding, improve program performance, and support resource allocation and other policy decision making

Assigned readings: Wholey, Hatry, and Newcomer (eds.). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, 2nd Ed.: Preface; Meeting the Need for Practical Evaluation Approaches: An Introduction; Introductions to Parts One, Two, Three, and Four; Chapter 24; and the program evaluation standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (available at <http://www.eval.org>).

October 15–17: Impact evaluation, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis, evaluation guidelines and standards, evaluating evaluations, meta-analysis, developing briefings and reports, getting evaluation information used

Collecting and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data

Impact evaluation: experimental and quasi-experimental designs for estimating the causal impact of a policy or program (what difference the policy or program has made)

Threats to valid causal inference; overcoming threats to valid causal inference

Cost-effectiveness analysis and cost-benefit analysis in program evaluation

Guiding principles for evaluators; evaluation standards; ethical issues

Evaluating ongoing and completed evaluations

Meta-analysis; systematic research reviews; evaluation synthesis

Developing evaluation findings

Developing options or recommendations for policy or program change

Developing briefings and reports

Getting evaluation information used to improve policy or program design, improve agency or program management, increase transparency, improve accountability to key stakeholders or the public, deepen understanding, improve program quality and service delivery, identify “best practices” approaches, improve program effectiveness, or support resource allocation or other policy decision making

Review and analysis of participants’ projects; feedback on participants’ presentations

Assigned readings: Wholey, Hatry, and Newcomer (eds.). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, 2nd Ed.: Chapters 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21; and the program

evaluation standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (available at <http://www.eval.org>).

Optional reading: Hatry, Morley, Rossman, and Wholey. *How Federal Program Managers Use Outcome Information*. Available at <http://www.businessofgovernment.org>.

November 12–14: Performance monitoring, current performance monitoring and evaluation issues, evaluation standards, organizational report cards, managing for results, performance budgeting, developing briefings and reports, getting evaluation information used

Performance monitoring

Current performance monitoring and evaluation issues

Organizational report cards

Managing for results; performance budgeting

Using performance monitoring and evaluation in horizontal programs that cut across agencies

Developing briefings and reports

Getting evaluation information used to improve policy or program design, improve agency or program management, increase transparency, improve accountability to key stakeholders or the public, deepen understanding, improve program quality and service delivery, identify “best practices” approaches, improve program effectiveness, or support resource allocation or other policy decision making

Evaluation standards

Review and analysis of participants’ projects; feedback on participants’ projects

Assigned readings: Wholey, Hatry, and Newcomer (eds.). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, 2nd Ed.: Chapters 4, 21, and 22; and the program evaluation standards promulgated by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (available at <http://www.eval.org>).

Optional reading: Hatry, Morley, Rossman, and Wholey. *How Federal Program Managers Use Outcome Information*. Available at <http://www.businessofgovernment.org>.

Attachment 7:
JOSEPH S. WHOLEY

Joe Wholey is professor of public administration at the University of Southern California. An internationally known evaluation expert, he advises public and nongovernmental organizations, foundations, and international organizations on strategic planning, managing for results, performance budgeting, and program evaluation issues. He received his B.A. in mathematics from Catholic University and his M.A. in mathematics and Ph.D. in philosophy from Harvard University. He is author of many journal articles and book chapters and is senior author or editor of eight books including *Evaluation and Effective Public Management, Performance and Credibility* (with Mark Abramson and Christopher Bellavita), *Improving Government Performance* (with Kathryn Newcomer), and *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (with Harry Hatry and Kathryn Newcomer).

Wholey recently served as senior advisor for evaluation methodology and then as senior advisor for performance and accountability at the U.S. General Accounting Office, and served earlier as senior advisor to the deputy director for management at the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Before coming to USC, he was deputy assistant secretary for planning and evaluation at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and director of program evaluation studies at the Urban Institute. He is cofounder and director of the Alliance for Housing Solutions, and was cofounder of the American Evaluation Association. For eight years, he was a member of the County Board of Arlington, Virginia, serving as chairman for three years and leading Arlington's strategic and land use planning efforts in preparation for the coming of the Metro transit system. He chaired the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the Virginia Board of Social Services, and the Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing, and was president of the Evaluation Research Society and of Hospice of Northern Virginia.

Wholey is a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration and a principal in the Council for Excellence in Government. He received the Gunnar and Alva Myrdal Prize from the Evaluation Research Society, the Elmer B. Staats Award from the American Society for Public Administration, National Capital Area Chapter, and the Joseph Wholey Distinguished Scholarship Award from the American Society for Public Administration.