University of Redlands
School of Education

Location Address   *Mailing Address*
University Hall North   *1200 East Colton Avenue*
On Brockton Avenue   *P.O. Box 3080*
Between University Street & Grove Street   *Redlands, CA 92373*
Phone   *Fax*
(909) 748-8064   *(909) 335-5204*

COURSE SYLLABUS

Course: **EDUC 670**
Credits: 3
Course Title: Program Administration and Evaluation
Term: Educ. Spring, 2017
Sections: **ED 15**
Days/Times: Tuesday/5:30–8:30 pm
Location: Hall of Letters 111

Faculty: Ross E. Mitchell, Ph.D.
Office: University Hall North 116
Phone: **(**909) 748-8819   Home: (909) 389-0309   *Text: 909-486-2762*
E-mail: *ross_mitchell@redlands.edu*

Catalog Course Description

Emphasis on the theoretical and practical perspectives of management and evaluation of programs and program design. Introduction to organizational theory and management, team learning in a school environment, and curricular programming. Application of work required in a program proposal, including design, implementation, and evaluation strategies. Fieldwork required.

Goals and Objectives

Students will be able to:
1. Work with others to identify diverse student and school needs and develop a comprehensive data-based school growth plan. (CAPE 7)
2. Develop a collaborative, ongoing process of monitoring and revise the growth plan based on student outcomes. (Partial CAPE 9)
3. Understand the complex interaction of the school's systems. (Partial CAPE 13)
4. Communicate with the diverse school community about schoolwide outcomes data and improvement goals. (CAPE 15)
5. Understand local state, and federal laws, regulations, and guidelines. (Partial CAPE 19)

Required Readings

Books

Owen, J. M. (2006). *Program evaluation: Forms and approaches* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Skrla, L., McKenzie, K. B., & Scheurich, J. J. (2009). *Using equity audits to create equitable and excellent schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Articles

Cooper, C. W., & Christie, C. A. (2005). Evaluating parent empowerment: A look at the potential of social justice evaluation in education. *Teachers College Record, 107*(10), 2248–2274.

Cosner, S. (2012). Leading the ongoing development of collaborative data practices: Advancing a schema for diagnosis and intervention. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 11*(1), 26–65.

Murray, J. (2013). Critical issues facing school leaders concerning data-informed decision-making. *School Leadership & Management, 33*(2), 169–177.

Webpages/documents

Accrediting Commission for Schools, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. (2017). ACS WASC/CDE 2017 edition self-study school report template [Word Doc and Google Drive (Docs) templates]. Available at http://www.acswasc.org/schools/public-california/

California Department of Education. (2014, February). *Single Plan for Student Achievement, Part I: A guide for developing the Single Plan for Student Achievement.* Retrieved from http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/le/documents/templatespsa1.doc

California Department of Education. (2015, October 21). Schoolwide programs: Authorized programs and targeted assistance schools under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/rt/

The Education Trust-West. (n.d.). Data equity walk toolkit. [Links to a set of documents] Available at https://west.edtrust.org/data-equity-walk-toolkit/

———. (2015, December). The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015: What it means for equity and accountability in California. *Equity Alert.* Available at http://west.edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/11/Every-Student-Succeeds-Act-Implications-for-CA-FINAL-PDF.pdf

Fortner, C. K., Faust-Berryman, A., & Keehn, G. T. (2014). Atlanta Public Schools equity audit report. Atlanta, GA: Atlanta Public Schools. Available at http://www.atlantapublicschools.us/Page/41606

Partners for Each and Every Child. (2016, January). The Every Student Succeeds Act: Implications for California and equity – backgrounder. Berkeley, CA: The Opportunity Institute. Available at http://partnersforeachandeverychild.org/ESSA%20in%20CA%20Webinar%20Backgrounder_1.11.16.pdf

Recommended Readings († for strongly)

†Accrediting Commission for Schools, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. (2017). *Focus on learning joint ACS WASC/CDE process guide: ACS WASC/California Department of Education edition for all California public schools, including charter schools* (2017 ACS WASC ed.). Burlingame, CA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.acswasc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/ACS-WASC-CDE-CHARTER-FOL-2017-Edition.pdf

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

†Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L., Grunow, A. & Paul LeMahieu, P. (2015). *Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing.

†Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jason, M. H. (2008). *Evaluating programs to increase student achievement* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Johnson, R. S., & La Salle, R. A. (2010). *Data strategies to uncover and eliminate hidden inequalities: The wallpaper effect.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2016). The Delphi technique: An untapped approach of participatory research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 19*(2), 143–160.

Koretz, D. (2008). *Measuring up: What educational testing really tells us.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Majchrzak, A., & Markus, M. L. (2014). *Methods for policy research: Taking socially responsible action.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

McKenzie, K. B., & Skrla, L. (2011). *Using equity audits in the classroom to reach and teach all students.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

†McLaughlin, M., & London, R. A. (Eds.). (2013). *From data to action: A community approach to improving youth outcomes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Mertens, D. M. (2008). *Transformative research and evaluation.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Mitchell, R. E., & Romero, L. S. (2015). Responsibility at the core of public education: Students, teachers, and the curriculum. In D. E. Mitchell & R. K. Ream (Eds.), *Professional responsibility: The fundamental issue in education and health care reform* (pp. 11–37). New York, NY: Springer.

Pawson, R. (2003). Nothing as practical as a good theory. *Evaluation, 9*(4), 471–490.

Weiss, M. J., Bloom, H. S., & Brock, T. (2014). A conceptual framework for studying the sources of variation in program effects. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 33*(3), 778–808. DOI:10.1002/pam.21760

Students Assessment

Summary of Assessments	
Assignment	Points
1. Program Inventory & Description	10
2. Fieldwork Proposal	10
3. WASC Evaluation	20
4. Master Schedule	10
5. Program Evaluation (Fieldwork)	20
6. Fieldwork Reflection	10
7. Participation and Attendance	20
Total:	100

Evaluation of your work will be based on the following criteria:

A/4.0: Assignment is complete, on time, thorough, well edited, and exceeds stated course requirements. All written work shows superior graduate level quality in expression, *attention to detail,* evidence of originality, organization, reflection, and *demonstration of concepts mastered*

in class. All discussions demonstrate *careful* preparation for class, and thoughtful contributions as an individual and group member.

A-/3.7: Assignment is complete, *on time, thorough, well* edited, and *exceeds* stated course requirements. All written work shows *superior* graduate level quality in expression, *evidence of originality,* organization, and reflection. All discussions demonstrate preparation for class, and thoughtful contributions as an individual and group member.

B+/3.3: Assignment is complete, edited, and at least meet all stated course requirements. All written work shows graduate level quality in *expression,* organization, and reflection. All discussions demonstrate preparation for class, and *thoughtful* contributions as an individual and group member.

B/3.0: Assignment is complete, edited, and at least meet *all* stated course requirements. All written work shows *graduate level quality* in organization and reflection. All discussions demonstrate *preparation* for class, and *contributions* as an individual and group member.

> *Note:* **It is important to realize that overall course grades below 3.0 indicate a problem. The cumulative grade point average must remain at 3.0 or higher, so grades lower than this can affect the student's degree and/or credential receipt.**

B-/2.7: Assignment is complete, *edited,* and *meet most stated course requirements.* Written work is *slightly* below graduate level quality. Preparations for class and contributions as an individual and group member are slightly below an acceptable level.

> - **Student should arrange a conference with the professor.**
> *Note:* **For an overall course grade of 2.7, the student should arrange conferences with the professor and advisor to discuss grade performance.**

C+/2.3: Assignment is complete and *some meets most stated course requirements.* Written work is below expected graduate level quality. *Preparation* for class and *contributions* as an individual and group member is slightly below an acceptable level.

> - **Student should arrange a conference with the professor.**
> *Note:* **For an overall course grade of 2.3, the student should arrange conferences with the professor; and a conference with the advisor is <u>required</u>.**

C/2.0: *Assignment is complete* but does not meet stated course requirements. *Written work* is well below expected graduate level quality.

> - **A meeting with the professor <u>must</u> be arranged.**
> *Note:* **For an overall course grade of 2.0, a meeting with the professor must be arranged; and a meeting with the advisor is <u>required</u>. The professor will notify the advisor of the grade.**

D/1.7 and F 1.3 – 0.0: Assignment is not met.

> - **A meeting with the professor <u>must</u> be arranged.**
> *Note:* **Overall course grades below 2.0 are not acceptable for credit toward a degree or credential.**
> **A conference with the advisor is <u>required</u> and a plan to correct the problems that led to the grade will be developed. Further unacceptable grades could lead to the students being dropped from the program. The professor will notify the advisor of the grade**.

<u>Academic Honesty</u>

All students are expected to demonstrate integrity and honesty in completion of class assignments. Students must give credit to appropriate sources utilized in their work. Plagiarism, as well as cheating, can result in dismissal from the University. Lesser

sanctions may be imposed, including a failing grade for the assignment or a failing grade for the course.

(For complete text see pp. 17–24 of the 2016–2018 University of Redlands Catalog)

Attendance Policy

Quality class participation and a contribution to the community of learners are critical components and requirements in all courses, and students are expected to attend all class sessions. Emergencies can arise and students need to make important and difficult choices. Students are always responsible for informing the instructor of an absence (in advance, unless that is impossible) and making up all required class assignments and activities in a manner approved by the instructor. Any student who misses more than two sessions of this course may be dropped and required to retake the course. To prevent being dropped upon the third absence, you must submit a written petition to continue to your instructor.

Communication Technology Policy

Students must:
(1) check their University of Redlands e-mail account at least weekly, preferably daily, and use it exclusively in all correspondence with their professors and U of R staff;
(2) visit Moodle at least weekly to check for announcements, assignments, and information.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

I am happy to provide accommodations to students with disabilities. Please contact the University of Redlands Disability Services office to set up these arrangements. Disability Services can be reached by telephone at 909-748-8108 (FAX: 909-335-5296) or e-mail at *amy_wilms@redlands.edu* (Amy Wilms, Assistant Dean of Academics and Student Life) or *carole_weeks@redlands.edu* (Carole Weeks, Administrative Secretary, Disability Services). Disability Services has a highly trained staff that has the experience and expertise to assist students with a wide range of disabilities.

Assignments, Presentations, and Facilitation

All assignments should be approached with professionalism as a foundation. Material is to be typed; no hand-written assignments will be accepted. Oral presentations will be graded on the basis of content as well as delivery. If you need help with effective presentation skills please feel free to seek my assistance. Learning to communicate well is an important quality to develop as an administrator.

Late Work

Any work that is turned in late will automatically earn one half a letter grade less, unless prior approval has been granted (i.e. a 4.0 would become an 3.7, etc.) All late work must be pre-approved. If an incomplete grade for the course is requested (for an extenuating circumstance) a written plan defining requirements and specifying new deadlines will need to be developed and signed by the student and the instructor.

Topic Outline, Readings and Activities (Subject to Change)

Week	Date (2017)	Topic/Activity	Assignments (to be completed by the start of class)
1	Jan 10	• Orientation • Equity • Evaluation domains • Programs to administer • Application to ○ Fieldwork proposal	*In class:* Read and discuss Education-Trust West (2015) and Partners for Each and Every Child (2016); Discuss Skrla, McKenzie, and Scheurich (2009), chap. 1; Review and discuss CDE Program Categories document
2	Jan 17	• The Ws of evaluation • The Ps of evaluation • Application to ○ Fieldwork proposal	Owen (2006), chaps. 1–3; Skrla, McKenzie, and Scheurich (2009), chap. 2 *Bring:* Written list of programs at your site
3	Jan 24	• Getting started and doing evaluation • Administrative vs. other data for analysis • Analysis methods • Equity audits • Application to ○ Fieldwork	Owen (2006), chaps. 4–5; Skrla, McKenzie, and Scheurich (2009), chap. 3 *Bring:* Completed fieldwork proposal *In class:* Review and discuss Fortner, Faust-Berryman, and Keehn (2014); Complete subset of "Data Equity Walk" slides for your school site
4	Jan 31	• Making use of evaluation findings • Being responsible for evaluations • How teachers fit into the picture • Application to ○ Fieldwork	Owen (2006), chaps. 6–7; California Department of Education (2015); Skrla, McKenzie, and Scheurich (2009), chap. 4 *In class:* Review and discuss California Department of Education (2014)
5	Feb 7	• Proactive evaluation • Data-informed decision making • Application to ○ Fieldwork • Needs assessment • Accreditation	Murray (2013); Owen (2006), chap. 9; Accrediting Commission for Schools, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (2017) *Bring:* WASC documentation
6	Feb 14	• Clarificative evaluation • Relating processes to outcomes • Application to ○ Fieldwork	Owen (2006), chap. 10; Skrla, McKenzie, and Scheurich (2009), chaps. 5–7 *Bring:* Fieldwork materials for discussion and development
7	Feb 21	• Interactive evaluation • Leading for equity • Application to ○ Fieldwork	Owen (2006), chap. 11; Skrla, McKenzie, and Scheurich (2009), chaps. 8–9 *In class:* Develop WASC evaluation
8	Feb 28	• Monitoring evaluation • The core of public education and educational equity • Application to ○ Fieldwork	Owen (2006), chap. 12; Skrla, McKenzie, and Scheurich (2009), chaps. 10–12 *Bring:* WASC evaluation

9	Mar 7	• Impact evaluation • Framing practice, where evaluation is but a part • Application to o Fieldwork	Bolman and Deal (2013), chap. 1; Cooper and Christie (2005); Owen (2006), chap. 13 *In class:* Building an equity audit
10	Mar 14	• Change leadership • Collaborative data-use leadership • Application to o Fieldwork	Bolman and Deal (2013), chap. 18; Cosner (2012); *Bring:* Fieldwork materials for discussion and development
11	Mar 21	• ***Federal compliance*** • Ethical dimensions to evaluation and leadership • Application to o Fieldwork report	Bolman and Deal (2013), chap. 19; Owen (2006), Chapter 8 *Bring:* Federal compliance documents
12	Mar 28	• Reflections and Connections • Application to o Fieldwork report • Course evaluation	*Bring:* Fieldwork report for discussion and possible further development