

*Evaluation of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course*

*Offered at Syracuse University*

**Submitted By:**

Devin Butler, Gaye Ceyhan, Jason Emerich, Bart Tanski, Guwen Zhang

**Submitted on:**

April, 2017

**Submitted to:**

Nick L. Smith, Ph.D.

Course Instructor — Techniques in Educational Evaluation

## **Description of Program Selected for Evaluation**

The object of this evaluation is the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course, which is offered as a graduate course in the Instructional Design, Development and Evaluation (IDD&E) Department at Syracuse University. This course is typically offered at least once for fall or spring semester and as a MayMester course in summer.

### **Program Purpose**

The Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course mainly focuses on educational evaluation, but the tools and strategies covered are relevant to the evaluation of products, personnel, and policies within different fields (as reported in the course syllabus, Smith, 2017). The primary purposes of this course are:

- to introduce the basic concepts and procedures for conducting evaluations
- to present guidelines for planning, implementing, managing, and evaluating service-oriented field evaluations (as reported in the course syllabus, Smith, 2017).

These instructional goals suggest that after completing this course, students will be able to:

- describe program evaluation terminology
- define the processes of an evaluation design
- develop an evaluation plan using a variety of evaluation strategies (as reported in the course syllabus, Smith, 2017).

### **Program Clients**

The Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course is designed as an introductory course for graduate students who may find themselves currently or in the future managing small or very large educational evaluation projects. This is a required course for students who enroll to the Master of Science (M.S.) degree in IDD&E Department, M.S. degree in Instructional Technology and the Certificate Programs that are offered in the IDD&E Department. It is also listed in the courses that students should have completed during their master's degree preparation to be considered for a doctoral student in IDD&E Department. Besides, this course does not have pre/co-requisite, and graduate students from other departments, who are interested in educational evaluation, can enroll into the course.

The Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course has been part of the course offerings at the IDD&E Department for about 35 years. Each time it has offered, approximately 20 students enroll in this course, most of whom are graduate students in the IDD&E Department and a few are graduate students in other programs at Syracuse University. The majority of the students have little or no experience in program evaluation. Over 80% of the students enrolled complete the course at least with a fully satisfactory performance.

### **Basic Operation**

The Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course is a 14-week program in fall or spring semester and a 2-week program in summer. In order to achieve the purpose of the course, it uses a combination of individual and collaborative work activities in and outside the classroom. The course offers meetings once a week for three hours.

In Spring-2017 semester, the course operates by;

- classroom meetings including instructor lectures, student discussion and group activities
- readings and assignments as formative evaluation
- design critique, quizzes, and the final project as summative evaluation

*Readings:* For each week, specific reading assignments are determined and students are expected to be prepared to discuss all readings on the assigned dates.

*Assignments:* Working collaboratively in small groups, students complete 10 assignments, which systematically help them design an evaluation plan as the final project for the course. These assignments focus on the processes of evaluation design. The purpose and the guideline for each assignment are explained clearly. In each group, students determine which assignments they want to be responsible for. Students receive formative feedback on the quality and the progress of each assignment through peer review and the instructor discussion. Regarding the feedbacks, decisions about a current assignment may require modifications to prior assignments. Students' final course grade is based 15 percent on the Assignments they have personal responsibility for. The Assignments are judged on a 4-point scale (Missing, Weak, Adequate, and Strong) (as reported in the course syllabus, Smith, 2017).

*Design Critique:* The Design Critique is a review of the evaluation plan of a group of classmates. Each student is randomly assigned to evaluate the evaluation plan of a group in terms of (1) the adequacy of the instructions for each assignment, (2) the quality of the design, and (3) the clarity, readability, and comprehensibility of the plan. This is considered as a formative evaluation for groups to help them improve their current draft. In addition, this is a summative evaluation for the students as their final course grade is based 15 percent on their Design Critique. The Design Critique is judged on a 4-point scale (Missing, Weak, Adequate, and Strong) (as reported in the course syllabus, Smith, 2017).

*Final Project:* The Final Project is a revised, final evaluation design of groups. The evaluation design includes all the revised assignments in different sections with connection phrases between the sections if necessary. Students' final course grade is based 30 percent on the Final Project. The Final Project is judged on a 6-point scale (Unacceptable, Poor, Adequate, Good, Strong, and Outstanding) (as reported in the course syllabus, Smith, 2017).

*Quizzes:* There are three in-class quizzes that cover the assigned readings and the materials covered in class to quiz date. Students' final course grade is based 40 percent on the three Quizzes combined (as reported in the course syllabus, Smith, 2017).

### **Purpose of the Evaluation**

This evaluation is being conducted upon the request of the instructor of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course, Dr. Nick Smith. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the effectiveness of the course (1) to determine the appropriateness of the course content in the IDD&E curriculum, (2) to determine to what extent students meet the required knowledge and skills to complete this course (regarding student objectives), (3) to identify the effectiveness of the course materials, (4) to identify the instructor performance. As the instructor of the course is retiring, this evaluation seeks to discover the quality of the instruction, if and how effective the course and the course materials are in order to provide information about which aspects need to be revised when another instructor is teaching this course in the future.

## **Focus Summary**

### **Focus of the Study**

Our focus for this project is the evaluation of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course. This is one of the required courses for the IDD&E Master Degree offered by Syracuse University School of Education. This course is available for students in Spring and MayMester, as of 2017. For our evaluation, we need to focus on the Spring semester class of 2018. This needs to be our main focus, because this is the form of the class where students have the ability to learn more about the subject, due to the full-length semester.

The primary focus of our evaluation is to determine if the instructor's techniques, in teaching the course, are connected to whether the students of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course offered by Syracuse University are learning the necessary knowledge and skills to conducting evaluations properly.

The secondary focus of our evaluation is to determine how effective the course materials are for the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course. We are focusing on how well the students learn the required skills and knowledge (objectives) in this course. We are also interested in the quality of the course content to determine the effectiveness and compatibility of the course to the IDD&E Department.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of our evaluation is so the instructor can determine how well the students learn the necessary procedures for conducting evaluations, and the effectiveness of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation course is for the IDD&E Department.

### **Client**

The client for our evaluation is the instructor for the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course in the IDD&E Department.

### **Audiences**

The audiences for our evaluation are:

- The instructor of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course in the IDD&E Department.
- The Chair of the IDD&E Department.
- The Dean of the School of Education at Syracuse University.
- The students who currently enrolled in the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course.

### **Stakeholders**

- Potential students who are planning on taking the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course.
- Other instructors in the IDD&E Department.

**Contextual Factors**

1. The semesters the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course is offered. Due to the different length of semesters of the Spring and MayMester, the course is taught differently. Due to this, we are only going to be focusing our evaluation on the class offered in the spring semester.
2. The instructor of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course may feel threatened when questioned about the teaching style of the course. To avoid this, we need to remind the instructor our evaluation is focusing on the value the course has for the students and the program, and not his teaching ability.
3. Students who have taken the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course may give bias opinions, depending on the grade they received in the class. So, to ensure this does not occur, we will assure the students that their opinions will be kept anonymous.

### Question Summary

<u>Evaluation Questions</u>	<u>Sub-Questions</u>	<u>Audience</u>	<u>Importance</u>
<p>1. How necessary and integrated is this course within the other courses offered in the IDD&amp;E Department?</p>	<p>a. Do the other professors in the program coordinate their information with this course?</p> <p>b. Are there other courses dedicated to evaluation or is this the only one?</p> <p>c. Is there a certain order in which students are required to take these classes in the degree program?</p>	<p>1. The Course Instructor</p> <p>2. Students – Current/Future</p> <p>3. The Dean of the School of Education</p> <p>4. The Chair of the IDD&amp;E Department</p>	<p>It is important to know if the material being taught in this course is related to the rest of the IDD&amp;E Department. If the instructors are working together to connect the material, the students will get a better understanding of the program as they progress through it.</p>
<p>2. Are the correct numbers, of the right kind of students enrolling?</p>	<p>a. What degree programs are the students affiliated with?</p> <p>b. Are these students required to take this course, or are they taking it as an elective?</p> <p>c. Does the number of students have an impact on the way the class operates?</p> <p>d. Does the degree program of the students have an impact on the way the class operates?</p>	<p>1. The Course Instructor</p> <p>2. Students – Current/Future</p> <p>3. The Dean of the School of Education</p> <p>4. The Chair of the IDD&amp;E Department</p>	<p>This is important to know because the number of students could alter how the class operates. It is also important to see what majors the students are coming from and why they are interested in taking this course. If enrollment is down, does the IDD&amp;E department replace the course with something that will attract more students?</p>

<u>Evaluation Questions</u>	<u>Sub-Questions</u>	<u>Audience</u>	<u>Importance</u>
3. What is the quality of the instructional materials?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Are the books in this course up to date on the knowledge being taught?</li> <li>b. Are the PowerPoints changing every few years based on new findings or is the material still staying the same?</li> <li>c. Is the technology in the classroom up to date for the instructor's lectures?</li> <li>d. How well do the instructional materials help students learn the objectives of the course?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Course Instructor</li> <li>2. The Dean of the School of Education</li> <li>3. The Chair of the IDD&amp;E Department</li> </ul>	<p>This question is important especially with a class that has been taught for so long. If the instructor does not have the most up to date material then the students are wasting their time taking the course. They need knowledge that will help them in the job field upon graduation.</p>
4. How well does the instructor teach the course?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What instructional methods does the instructor use?</li> <li>b. Is the course interactive?</li> <li>c. Does the instructor have clear goals and objectives, and clearly communicates them?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Course Instructor</li> <li>2. The Dean of the School of Education</li> <li>3. The Chair of the IDD&amp;E Department</li> </ul>	<p>This question is important because it touches the aspect of the instructor and how efficient he is in his teachings. This will break down his methods with the sub questions. It is also good because it shows the plan being enforced to the students and how he is going to meet the goals and objectives of this course.</p>

<u>Evaluation Questions</u>	<u>Sub-Questions</u>	<u>Audience</u>	<u>Importance</u>
<p>5. How well do the students learn the required skills and knowledge (objectives) in this course?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Do the students have prior knowledge through the IDD&amp;E program?</li> <li>b. How well do students perform on quizzes &amp; assignments throughout the semester?</li> <li>c. How well do the quizzes and assignments encourage learning and help students understand the material?</li> <li>d. What grades do they receive at the end?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Course Instructor</li> <li>2. The Dean of the School of Education</li> <li>3. The Chair of the IDD&amp;E Department</li> </ol>	<p>This question is important because it shows the instructor how well the students retain and understand the knowledge and skills required for this course. By answering the sub questions, you can break it up into categories based on experience in the program to students who are taking classes for the first time. This will ultimately show the results of the course and where students stack up at the end of it.</p>



### Question Procedure Matrix

Information Collection Procedure	1. How necessary and integrated is this course within the other courses offered in the IDD&E Department? a. Coordinate with other professors? b. Any other evaluation course? c. Order of the courses?	2. Are the correct numbers, of the right kind of students enrolling? a. Student demographics? b. Required or elective course? c. Influence of the number of students? d. Influence of the degree program?	3. What is the quality of the instructional materials? a. Are the books up to date? b. Are the PowerPoints up to date? c. Is the technology in the classroom up to date? d. How well are the instructional materials?	4. How well does the instructor teach the course? a. What instructional methods are used? b. Is the course interactive? c. Goals, objectives, and clear communication?	5. How well do the students learn the required skills and knowledge (objectives) in this course? a. Prior knowledge? b. Students performance? c. Student motivation? d. Student grades?
Classroom Observation				x	
Interview with the course instructor	x	x (c, d)	x	x	x (c)
Interview with the Chair of the IDD&E Department	x				
Interview with the students who currently enrolled in the course			x (c, d)	x	x (a, c)
Questionnaire with the students who currently enrolled in the course		x (a, b)	x (c, d)	x	x (a, c)
Records analysis (syllabus, quiz scores, assignments, etc.)		x (a, b)	x (a, b)	x (c)	x (a, b, d)

### Procedure Summary

	<b>Procedure</b>	<b>Evaluation Questions Addressed</b>	<b>Schedule for Collection</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Sampling</b>
A	Classroom Observation	4	3 times throughout the semester (February 14, March 14 and April 11, and each time one class period)	All students who currently enrolled in the course and the course instructor	All students who currently enrolled in the course and the course instructor
B	Interview with the course instructor	1, 2c, 2d, 3, 4, 5c	May 1-4, 2018 (one day in that week depending on the schedule of the instructor)	The course instructor	The course instructor
C	Interview with the Chair of the IDD&E Department	1	May 1-4, 2018 (one day in that week depending on the schedule of the chair)	The Chair of the IDD&E Department	The IDD&E Department Chair
D	Interview with the students who currently enrolled to the course	3c, 3d, 4, 5a, 5c	May 7-11, 2018	All students who currently enrolled in the course	All students who currently enrolled in the course
E	Questionnaire with the students who currently enrolled to the course	2a, 2b,3c, 3d, 4, 5a, 5c	May 7-11, 2018	All students who currently enrolled in the course	All students who currently enrolled in the course
F	Records analysis	2a, 2b,3a, 3b,4c, 5a, 5b, 5d	May 14-18, 2018	All students who currently enrolled in the course and the course instructor	All students who currently enrolled in the course and the course instructor

### Analysis and Interpretation Plan

Evaluation Question	Collection Procedure	Analysis Procedure	Evaluation Criteria	Procedure for Making Judgment
<p>1. How necessary and integrated is this course within the other courses offered in the IDD&amp;E Department?</p> <p>a. Do the other professors in the program coordinate their information with this course?</p> <p>b. Are there other courses dedicated to evaluation or is this the only one?</p> <p>c. Is there a certain order in which students are required to take these classes in the degree program?</p>	<p>B. Interview with the course instructor</p> <p>C. Interview with The Chair of the IDD&amp;E Department</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Code the responses of the instructor and the IDD&amp;E Department Chair to interview questions; gather similar codes into categories.</li> <li>• Compare the responses of the instructor and the IDD&amp;E Department Chair to interview questions about how integrated is this course within the IDD&amp;E program. Code the frequency of their responses to conduct comparison.</li> </ul>	<p>100% alignment is expected due to the concise structure of the IDD&amp;E Department and the offered courses in the department.</p>	<p>Results will be presented to the client in the form of a written report. Discrepancies will be noted. The client makes a judgment based on data.</p>

Evaluation Question	Collection Procedure	Analysis Procedure	Evaluation Criteria	Procedure for Making Judgment
<p>2. Are the correct numbers, of the right kind of students enrolling?</p> <p>a. What degree programs are the students affiliated with?</p> <p>b. Are these students required to take this course, or are they taking it as an elective?</p> <p>c. Does the number of students have an impact on the way the class operates?</p> <p>d. Does the degree program of the students have an impact on the way the class operates?</p>	<p>B. Interview with the course instructor</p> <p>E. Questionnaire with the students who currently enrolled in the course</p> <p>F. Records analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tally students’ responses on the questionnaire. Block students by academic information (degree program, graduate degree -Master’s or Ph.D., etc.); conduct descriptive statistics to summarize and describe data.</li> <li>• Records will be analyzed to determine course objectives and the course schedule, the number of students enrolled to the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course in spring 2018, the degree programs and the enrolled degree of students.</li> <li>• Compare students’ questionnaire responses on academic information with the records analysis.</li> <li>• Compare the instructor’s responses to interview questions with the records analysis.</li> </ul>	<p>These findings will be used as baseline demographic information.</p> <p>There should be no discrepancy between the objectives and the way class operates (i.e. schedule of the course).</p> <p>Course objectives and the way class operates should also be aligned with the instructor’s perception of the practice.</p>	<p>Students’ academic information results will be presented to the client in the form of a written report with accompanying graphics and tables.</p> <p>Findings of the way class operate will be summarized and reported, with major discrepancies noted.</p>

Evaluation Question	Collection Procedure	Analysis Procedure	Evaluation Criteria	Procedure for Making Judgment
<p>3. What is the quality of the instructional materials?</p> <p>a. Are the books in this course up to date on the knowledge being taught?</p> <p>b. Are the PowerPoints changing every few years based on new findings or is the material still staying the same?</p> <p>c. Is the technology in the classroom up to date for the instructor's lectures?</p> <p>d. How well do the instructional materials help students learn the objectives of the course?</p>	<p>B. Interview with the course instructor</p> <p>D. Interview with the students who currently enrolled in the course</p> <p>E. Questionnaire with the students who currently enrolled in the course</p> <p>F. Records analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare the questionnaire results on - the effectiveness of technology in the classroom</li> <li>- the feasibility and the utility of instructional materials with the students' and the instructor's responses.</li> <li>• Compare instructor responses on the update of the instructional materials with records analysis.</li> </ul>	<p>At least 75% of the enrolled students should express a positive attitude towards the propriety of technology in the classroom.</p> <p>At least 75% of the enrolled students should express a positive attitude towards the feasibility and the utility of instructional materials.</p> <p>100% alignment is expected between the records analysis on the update of the instructional materials and the instructor's perspective of the practice.</p>	<p>Findings of the quality of instructional materials will be summarized and reported, with major discrepancies noted.</p>

Evaluation Question	Collection Procedure	Analysis Procedure	Evaluation Criteria	Procedure for Making Judgment
<p>4. How well does the instructor teach the course?</p> <p>a. What instructional methods does the instructor use?</p> <p>b. Is the course interactive?</p> <p>c. Does the instructor have clear goals and objectives, and clearly communicates them?</p>	<p>A. Classroom Observation</p> <p>B. Interview with the course instructor</p> <p>D. Interview with the students who currently enrolled in the course</p> <p>E. Questionnaire with the students who currently enrolled in the course</p> <p>F. Records analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare the questionnaire results on                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the used instructional methods</li> <li>- how interactive the course is</li> </ul> </li> <li>• how motivated the instructor is to teach the course is</li> </ul> <p>with observation notes, as well as the students' and the instructor's responses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare the questionnaire results on the clarity of the goals and objectives with observation notes, as well as the records analysis, and the students' and the instructor's responses.</li> </ul>	<p>There should be no discrepancy between observation notes, student and instructor responses on the used instructional methods, how interactive the course is, and the clear communication of goals and objectives of the course.</p>	<p>Analysis of the questionnaire and interview data in comparison to records analysis and observation notes will be presented in a written report with an explanation.</p> <p>Discrepancies will be noted. The client makes a judgment based on data.</p>

Evaluation Question	Collection Procedure	Analysis Procedure	Evaluation Criteria	Procedure for Making Judgment
<p>5. How well do the students learn the required skills and knowledge (objectives) in this course?</p> <p>a. Do they have prior knowledge through the IDD&amp;E program?</p> <p>b. How well do students perform on quizzes and assignments through the semester?</p> <p>c. How well do the quizzes and assignments encourage learning and help students understand the material?</p> <p>d. What grades do they receive at the end?</p>	<p>E. Questionnaire with the students who currently enrolled in the course</p> <p>D. Interview with the students who currently enrolled in the course</p> <p>B. Interview with the course instructor</p> <p>F. Records analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tally students' quiz and assignment grades, as well as their final grades of the course; conduct descriptive statistics to summarize and describe data.</li> <li>• Compare students' grades on quizzes and assignments with their final grades.</li> <li>• Compare the questionnaire results on how well the quizzes and assignments encourage learning with the students' and the instructor's responses.</li> </ul>	<p>At least 75% of the enrolled students should express that the quizzes and assignments encourage learning, and help them learn the required skills and knowledge (objectives) in this course.</p>	<p>Analysis of students' grades will be presented in a written report with explanation and major discrepancies noted.</p> <p>Findings of how well quizzes and assignments encourage learning will be summarized and reported.</p> <p>The client makes a judgment based on data.</p>

### Reporting Summary

The evaluation of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course is being conducted in Spring of 2018. For this report to be successfully completed in time for the Instructor to review and determine what needs to be done, we must have this done by summer 2018. We will be finished with the report in June 2018. For that to be accomplished, the reporting summary is planning out each event necessary for the evaluation.

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date/Frequency</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Nature/Scope of Content</b>	<b>Audience</b>
Initial meeting with the course instructor and the Chair of the IDD&E Department	January 8	Meeting in department office	Discuss evaluation plan	The course instructor The Chair of the IDD&E Department The Dean of School of Education
Meeting with the course instructor to finalize evaluation plan	January 16	Meet in Instructor's office	Finalize plan for evaluation plan	The course instructor
Student awareness meeting	February 7	In class	Talk to students about being evaluated.	The course instructor The students who currently enrolled in the course
Mid-semester report	March 22	Interview, meeting	Request of records analysis (enrollment data, course description, etc.)	The Chair of the IDD&E Department The course instructor
Draft Final Report	May 25	Meeting, Draft non-technical report	Include audiences on data. Discuss data and possible revisions	The course instructor The Chair of the IDD&E Department The Dean of School of Education
Final Report	June 29	Executive Summary, Final Technical Report	Present data, conclusions, interpretation, recommendations	The course instructor The Chair of the IDD&E Department The Dean of School of Education



### Management Plan: Personnel

To successfully evaluate the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course the following management plan has been proposed. The evaluation team will consist of: Evaluator 1 (Project Manager), Evaluator 2 (Data Analyst), Evaluator 3 (Interviewer), Evaluator 4 (Instrumentation Designer and Records Analyst), Evaluator 5 (Clerical and Organizational Specialist). The times listed below represent the evaluation plan in days and that is saying that they are working the standard 8 hour days.

Evaluation Work Plan	Person Responsible	January '18	February '18	March '18	April '18	May '18	June '18
<b><u>A. Design the Evaluation</u></b>							
- Initial meeting with the course instructor and the Chair of the IDD&E Department	- Evaluator 1	.1 (1/8)					
- Develop focus of evaluation	- Evaluator 1	.5 (1/8 – 1/11)					
- Draft evaluation questions	- Evaluator 4	.5 (1/8 – 1/11)					
- Review / Revise questions	- Evaluator 1	.5(1/12)					
	- Evaluator 4	.5(1/12)					
- Meeting with the course instructor to finalize plan	- Evaluator 1	.25 (1/16)					
	- Evaluator 2	.25 (1/16)					
	- Evaluator 3	.25 (1/16)					
	- Evaluator 4	.25 (1/16)					
- Create copies of final plan	- Evaluator 5	.25 (1/16)					
<b><u>B. Develop Procedures and Instruments</u></b>							
- Create master schedule based on final plan	- Evaluator 1	.5 (1/22)					
- Develop questions for student interviews	- Evaluator 4	1 (1/22 – 1/24)					
- Review / Revise interview	- Evaluator 1	.25 (1/25)					
	- Evaluator 4	.25 (1/25)					
- Meet with the students who currently enrolled in the course and the course instructor (Student Awareness meeting)	- Evaluator 1		.25 (2/7)				
- Schedule interviews	- Evaluator 5		1 (2/7 – 2/9)				
- Schedule meeting with the Chair of the IDD&E Department and the course instructor	- Evaluator 5		.25 (2/12)				

<p><b><u>C. Information Collection</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Observe classes</li> <li>- Interview the currently enrolled students of the Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course</li> <li>- Meet with the Chair of the IDD&amp;E Department / the course instructor</li> <li>- Interview with the Chair of the IDD&amp;E Department</li> <li>- Conduct record analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluator 2</li> <li>- Evaluator 3</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> <li>- Evaluator 4</li> <li>- Evaluator 2</li> </ul>		<p>2 (2/14; 2/21; 2/28; 3/7)</p>	<p>4 (3/5 – 3/8)</p> <p>1 (3/22)</p> <p>1 (3/22)</p> <p>2 (3/22 – 3/23)</p>			
<p><b><u>D. Analyze Information</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analyze records</li> <li>- Review and sort interview data</li> <li>- Review analysis of records and interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluator 4</li> <li>- Evaluator 2</li> <li>- Evaluator 3</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> </ul>			<p>1 (3/29)</p>	<p>2 (4/2 -4/5)</p> <p>2 (4/2 -4/5)</p> <p>1 (4/9- 4/10)</p>		
<p><b><u>E. Reports</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Progress updates</li> <li>- Initial Report</li> <li>- Preliminary information release</li> <li>- Final report preparation draft</li> <li>- Meeting with client to review initial draft of the final report</li> <li>- Revisions of Final Report</li> <li>- Printing and binding of Final Reports</li> <li>- Final report presentation</li> <li>- Final report released</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> <li>- Evaluator 2</li> <li>- Evaluator 3</li> <li>- Evaluator 4</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> <li>- Evaluator 5</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> <li>- Evaluator 1</li> </ul>		<p>.1 (2/9)</p> <p>.1 (2/9)</p> <p>.1 (2/9)</p> <p>.1 (2/9)</p>	<p>.1 (3/22)</p> <p>.1 (3/22)</p> <p>.1 (3/22)</p> <p>.1 (3/22)</p>	<p>.1 (4/18)</p> <p>.1 (4/18)</p> <p>.1 (4/18)</p> <p>.1 (4/18)</p> <p>1 (4/23-4/24)</p>	<p>.5 (5/1)</p> <p>1 (5/7 - 5/11)</p> <p>.5 (5/25)</p>	<p>1 (6/4 – 6/5)</p> <p>.5 (6/8)</p> <p>.5 (6/27)</p> <p>.5 (6/29)</p>

## **Evaluation Budget**

<b><u>Personnel</u></b>	<b><u>Cost</u></b>
Evaluator 1 – Project Manager, 9.65 days @ \$180/day =	\$ 1737
Evaluator 2 – Data Analyst, 6.55 days @ \$160/day =	\$ 1048
Evaluator 3 – Interviewer, 6.55 days @ \$150/day =	\$ 982.5
Evaluator 4 – Records Analyst/Instrumentation Designer, 4.8 days @ \$160/day =	\$ 768
Evaluator 5 – Clerical Aide, 2 days @ \$100/day =	\$ 200
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 4735.5</b>

### **Materials and Supplies**

Photocopy/Print costs for daily research : (Including Questionnaires, Faculty Meeting Report, Initial Report, Data collection, Progress Updates Draft Final Report, Etc.)	\$ 50
Printing costs for final report: (hard copies prepared for: Department Chair (1), Instructor (1), Dean (1), evaluators (5), archive (1), press (1), Digital copies available)	
10 reports @ 25 pages each x \$0.1 per page =	\$ 25
10 binders @ \$5 each =	\$ 50
10 sets of tab dividers @ \$5 per set =	\$ 50
1 notepad for interviews @ \$10 each =	\$ 10
Pens and Highlighters	\$ 10
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 195</b>

---

<b>Total Budget for Evaluation</b>	<b>\$ 4930.5</b>
------------------------------------	------------------

## Meta-Evaluation Summary

### **A. Standards have been well provided for in the evaluation.**

#### *(1) P1 Responsive and Inclusive Orientation*

“Evaluations should be responsive to stakeholders and their communities” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 105). The client of this evaluation is the instructor of the course being evaluated, and the evaluators are the students who are taking the course. Therefore, majority of the stakeholders are involved in decisions about the purposes, questions, and the design of the evaluation. “They recognize the opportunity to participate as both a right and responsibility” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 115). Besides, as the client of the evaluation is the instructor of the course, responsiveness and inclusiveness are highly provided throughout the evaluation planning process by keeping his knowledge, ideas, and needs into consideration.

#### *(2) F2 Practical Procedures*

“Evaluation procedures should be practical and responsive to the way program operates” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 87). For implementing this standard, Yarbrough and his colleagues (2011) suggests reviewing related program goals, budget documents and program reports in order to learn about the program and its context to be able to select procedures that are responsive to the contextual factors. Each evaluator in this evaluation had a chance to review another evaluation plan, all of which is designed for the same course but for different clients and accordingly this evaluation plan is reviewed by other evaluators. Procedures of this evaluation plan is revised regarding the feedbacks from the instructor and other evaluators, and the information gathered from other evaluation plans. Therefore, it can be said that this standard has been well provided in this evaluation.

#### *(3) A5 Information Management*

“Evaluations should employ systematic information collection, review, verification, and storage methods” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 193). This standard focuses on the methods used to ensure accurate information selection, balance, collection, and storage. The client, who is an expert in educational evaluation, supervised the evaluators to guide them to consider the potential sources of information, and provided detailed feedback for all parts of this evaluation. As the evaluation procedures involve in all aspects of data selection, including deciding what information will be collected, how and when it will be collected, how it will be analyzed, how results are prepared and reported, it can be said that this standard is well provided in this evaluation.

**B. Standards which are applicable and not yet well provided for in the evaluation.***(1) F4 Resource Use*

“Evaluations should use resources effectively and efficiently” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 99). Achieving a balance in effective and efficient resource use requires planning, good problem-solving, and monitoring. All of the important costs of this evaluation including human resources and materials are identified. The budget of this evaluation is determined as \$5,000 including the expected costs for the personnel, materials, and supplies in the budget plan. Then the budget plan is discussed with the client so that different views of benefits and costs may be revealed. As we have a proposal for planned expenses that has been discussed with the client, it can be said that this standard is applicable. However, even for experienced evaluators and in well-planned evaluations “the right balance of efficiency and effectiveness may be hard to achieve” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 99). Therefore, it can also be said that effective and efficient resource use has not yet well provided for this evaluation as there is a risk for ineffective and/or inefficient resource use during implementation.

*(2) U2 Attention to Stakeholders*

“Evaluations should devote attention to the full range of individuals and groups invested in the program or affected by the evaluation” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 23). The client, audiences and stakeholders of this evaluation has been determined, and meeting with the client and audiences are planned. Throughout evaluation planning, the procedures have been discussed with the client. Therefore, it can be said that this standard is applicable in this evaluation. However, we did not plan meeting with each stakeholder. For example, we did not plan a meeting with the other instructors in IDD&E Department. As the content and the continuity of the course may be important for them, we may need to keep their interests in mind as well. Their interests may be similar to the IDD&E Department Chair’s interest but it can still be said that this standard has not yet well provided in this evaluation.

*(3) P6 Conflicts of Interest*

“Evaluations should openly and honestly identify and address real or perceived conflicts of interests that may compromise the evaluation” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 145). Evaluators and stakeholders may have different perceptions and opinions about the occurrence and severity of the conflicts of interests. In this evaluation, evaluators should be especially alert for conflicts of interests of the instructor and the students. The conflicts of interests are going to be openly and productively discussed throughout the evaluation process. Therefore, it can be said that this standard is applicable but not yet been provided.

**C. Standards considered not applicable or marginally applicable.***(1) E3 External Metaevaluation*

The budget of this evaluation is limited to \$5,000. According to this evaluation, the budget is going to be used for the personnel, materials and supplies. The personnel that is planned to be involved in this evaluation are internal evaluators, who lets us keep the budget within the limits and create value for reflective practice informed by documentation. Therefore, having an external metaevaluator would not be feasible for budget limitation and for practical procedures (Yarbrough et al., 2011).

*(2) P2 Formal Agreement*

“Evaluation agreements should be negotiated to make obligations explicit and take into account the needs, expectations, and cultural contexts of clients and other stakeholders” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 119). The client of this evaluation is the instructor of the course that is being evaluated and the evaluators are the students who are taking this course. Although the purpose, resource use and the procedures are clearly defined by discussing with the client, the formal evaluation agreement has not been provided and it is not applicable.

*(3) A1 Justified Conclusions and Decisions*

This standard is relevant to both planning and execution stages of applied research (Hedrick et al., 1993). However, this evaluation mostly focuses on the planning stage. Although the information for analyzing and reporting information is provided in the evaluation plan, the implementation is planned for next year. The instructor is the client but he is retiring and other audiences are going to take decision about the continuity of the course. Therefore, we cannot “assume that the conditions and factors will not change much from the time of information collection to the time for decision making” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 167). Besides, findings and conclusions that are accurate from the evaluation team’s perspective may not result in accurate conclusions and decisions by stakeholders (Yarbrough et al., 2011).

## References

- Yarbrough, D.B., Shulha, L.M., Hopson, R.K., Caruthers, F.A. (2011). *The Program Evaluation Standards*. 3rd ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. ISBN 978-1-4129-8908-4 (P).
- Smith, N. L. (2017). IDE/EDA 641 Course Reader. The Copy Center.
- Smith, N. L. (2017). Techniques in Educational Evaluation [Syllabus]. Syracuse, NY: Instructional Design, Development and Evaluation, Syracuse University.