**Doctor of Education in Instructional Leadership**
**Department of Education and Educational Psychology**
**ED805: Research and Evaluation in Education (3 SH)**
**Course Syllabus: Spring 2012**

**Professor:**       Dr. Karen Burke, CSJ

**Time:**        Thursday 5:00-7:00 PM, and one Saturday session

**Classroom:**      134a

**Phone:**        917-353-5135

**Office Hours:**     Go to http://eddofficehours.pbworks.com/ to schedule an appointment;
to avoid conflicts, please make all appointments 24 hours in advance.

**E-Mail:**        Burkek@wcsu.edu or KBurke105@msn.com

**WestConn Information and School Cancellations**: Check WestConn's homepage
(www.wcsu.edu). You can locate WestConn's Academic Calendar at this site. Also, on the
homepage, go to the weather alert section to find out about any cancellations. You can also call
203.837.9377.

**Course Description:** The purpose of this course is to introduce theories and models of
evaluation as applied to educational programs.  The course will provide graduate students with
the necessary skills to conceptualize an evaluation design, select appropriate techniques, and
conduct an evaluation within the infrastructure of an educational institution.

**Prerequisites:** Acceptance into the Doctor of Education in Instructional Leadership Program.
ED804: Learning, Cognition, and Teaching; ED860: Quantitative Methods Applied to Educational
Research; ED861: Qualitative Methods Applied to Educational Research; ED865: Introduction to
Educational Research Designs

**Texts:**
American Psychological Association. (2009). *Publication manual of the American psychological
       association (6th ed.).* Washington, DC: Author.

Posavac, E. J., & Carey, R. G. (2003 or 2006). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies.*
       Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

**Organization of the Course:** This course will be structured around a core of material from
reading assignments, class lectures, and class activities.  At any time throughout the course,
your questions or observations are welcome.  Please feel free to call, make an appointment, or
contact me by phone or e-mail.

**Selected Bibliographical References:** A bibliography has been provided that includes references pertinent to a variety of constructs, theories, and issues related to instruction, leadership, education, psychology, and research.

**Americans With Disabilities Act:** The Education and Educational Psychology Department does not discriminate on the basis of disability as regards any program or activity covered by federal or state laws and regulations. It is each student's responsibility to inform the Disability Resource Specialist, (203.837.8946), and the course instructor of any disabling condition that requires modification.

**Conceptual Framework for the Program:**
Graduate students will demonstrate expertise in the following areas.
**Expertise in content knowledge** -Candidates and graduate students will demonstrate expertise in content knowledge.
**Diversity** -Candidates and graduate students will demonstrate the ability to plan, develop, and adjust services that meet the needs of diverse learners.
**Unity** -Candidates and graduate students will demonstrate the ability to work jointly, cooperatively and collaboratively with learners, peers, educational professionals, parents, and other community members.
**Classroom and school leadership** -Candidates and graduate students will demonstrate the ability to provide organization, leadership, direction, and management in their provision of professional services to learners and clients.
**Attitudes** -Candidates and graduate students will demonstrate professional dispositions that are consistent with this Conceptual Framework and in accord with professional, state and institutional standards.
**Technology** -Candidates and graduate students will demonstrate the ability to integrate a variety of relevant technologies into their professional practice.
**Organize knowledge and facilitate learning (Pedagogy)** -Candidates and graduate students will demonstrate the ability to use relevant pedagogic skills, educational psychology and knowledge in the planning, development, delivery, and assessment of professional services in support of relevant educational and professional goals.
**Reflective Practitioner** -Candidates and graduate students will demonstrate the ability and motivation to develop and incorporate improvements into their professional practice based upon their interpretation and use of relevant data and insights.

**Course Competencies:** The course objectives integrate standards from;

1. NCATE (National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education)
   http://www.ncate.org/Portals/0/documents/Standards/NCATE%20Standards%202008.pdf
2. Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards
   http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/educatorstandards/ccl-csls.pdf

3. The Code of Professional Responsibilities for Administrators
   http://www.state.ct.us/sde/DTL/t-a/ct_standards_tll.htm
4. The standards for the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) by the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC)
   http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zRZI73R0nOQ%3D&tabid=676

Copies of these standards are available online from each organization, from the course professor, or from the Department of Education and Educational Psychology. Additional professional standards include those developed by the NBPTS (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards) and those for individual content areas.

The **Program Objectives** of WestConn's Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership are varied and vital to the professional development of classroom educators and improved student achievement. The program is designed to:

1. Prepare PK-12 educators to assume roles of leadership in the conceptualization, initiation, assessment and redesign of initiatives for classrooms, schools, and districts.
2. Prepare PK-12 educators to conduct meaningful site-based inquiry pertaining to student achievement, program assessment and other measures of educational success.
3. Prepare PK-12 educators to develop and implement innovative curricula that focus on excellence and equity in education.
4. Prepare PK-12 educators to implement school-wide and district-wide professional development activities utilizing applied research, instructional technology and best practices in PK-12 schools.
5. Prepare PK-12 educators to implement school-wide and district-wide professional development activities consistent with emerging national standards as articulated by relevant professional specialty associations. (Spring, 2001, rev. 02/07/07)

**Course Objectives:** After completion of this course, the candidate will:

1. Describe the history of educational evaluation and define the uses of comprehensive program evaluation techniques.
2. Conceptualize a research evaluation design by choosing a relevant question and integrating a research and an evaluation model.
3. Develop and present a proposal for an evaluation.
4. Develop, administer, and interpret results from an evaluation tool.
5. Conduct an evaluation in an educational environment and complete a report of the results.
6. Develop an evaluation that is sensitive to the learning needs of a diverse group of students and appropriately interpret the results of the evaluation.

| Course Objective | Course Project/ Activity | Course Outcomes | Program Objective | Conceptual Framework | CT School Leadership Standards | ELCC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-3 | Program evaluation proposal | Develop a proposal for a program evaluation | #1, 2, 4 | Diversity, Unity, Classroom and school leadership, Attitudes, Technology, Organize knowledge and facilitate learning | 1- Vision, Mission, and Goals; 2- Teaching and Learning; 3- Organizational Systems and Safety | |
| 4 | An evaluation tool | Develop an instrument to be used in a program evaluation | #1, 2, 4 | Classroom and school leadership, Organize knowledge and facilitate learning | 5- Ethics and Integrity | |
| 5-6 | A written program evaluation and a brief presentation | Initiate and present a report of a program evaluation | #1, 2, 4 | Diversity, Unity, Classroom and school leadership, Attitudes, Technology, Organize knowledge and facilitate learning, Reflective practitioner | 1- Vision, Mission, and Goals; 2- Teaching and Learning; 3- Organizational Systems and Safety; 4- Families and Stakeholders; 5- Ethics and Integrity; 6- The Education System | 3b. 3.1, 3.2 |

**Assessment:**
The lectures and activities will be provided based on the assumption that you have read the assigned reading prior to attending the associated class. Student knowledge will be assessed through the following assignments:

| | |
|---|---|
| Evaluation Tool | 20% |
| Written Proposal | 40% |
| Final Evaluation Presentation | 40% |
| Total | 100% |

**Assignment One: Evaluation Tool 20%**

You will develop a tool to use in your proposed evaluation OR report on a valid and reliable instrument. This may be an interview schedule, a survey, a checklist, or any type of instrument that you require. This instrument must include the following:
- title (include complete APA citation)
- complete directions
- complete and thorough validity and reliability information if you are not developing your own instrument
- purpose
- description of the use to be made of the results
- appropriate items and, if necessary, applicable choices of responses
- permission form and accompanying letter that can be used for the IRB process
- type of sample appropriate for the instrument: (grade level or ages, gender, special subgroups)
- pilot data of 3 to 5 completed forms
- explanation of how you think the instrument worked and any plans for revision

**Assignment Two: Written Proposal (midterm) 40%**

Provide a written proposal for your evaluation project. You will briefly share your evaluation plan with classmates. Your proposal must include the following elements using APA format:

- Purpose: statement of purpose of this evaluation proposal
- Rationale: describe the reason for completing an evaluation in the chosen area
- Definition of key terms
- Research Question(s) and Hypotheses
- Review of literature to support the study
- Methodology: description of your methodology including the (a) evaluation design, (b) hypotheses, (c) subjects; (d) instrumentation, and (e) form of analysis
- Limitations to the study: internal and external validity

- IRB form (completed)

**Assignment Three: Final Project 40%**

1. Conduct the evaluation proposed in your midterm project.
2. Submit a completed proposal including any changes required from your midterm proposal draft.
3. Present a 10-minute PowerPoint presentation. The presentation should include:
   a. an evaluation of the educational program
   b. a report of the findings from the evaluation project
   c. conclusions based on your evaluation
   d. recommendations based on your evaluation

In addition to each of the areas listed above, your final project will be evaluated based on the:
- organization of ideas
- originality of the topic
- the degree to which the content addresses the research question
- clarity of the written report
- preparation of the presentation
- style of the presentation

**Assignment Rubrics**

| Assignment One: Evaluation Tool 20% | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Possible Score (20)** | **Actual Score** | **Revisions** |
| (a) a title of the assessment tool<br>　0= The component is not evident.<br>　1= All information is present. | 1 | | |
| (b) complete directions for using the assessment<br>　0= The component is not evident.<br>　　1= All information is present. | 1 | | |
| (b) a purpose for the assessment<br>　0= The component is not evident.<br>　　1= All information is present. | 1 | | |
| (c) a description of the use to be made of the results of the assessment<br>　0= The component is not evident.<br>　　1= All information is present. | 1 | | |
| (d) appropriate items and, if necessary, applicable choices of responses **(researcher-created instrument)**<br>　0=The items are not present.<br>　1=The items do not accurately relate to the topic, | 4 | | |

| Assignment One: Evaluation Tool 20% | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Criteria | Possible Score (20) | Actual Score | Revisions |
| proofreading is required throughout the instrument, the response format is not appropriate, and the formatting is not appealing throughout the document.<br>2=Only some of the items accurately relate to the topic, many items require proofreading, the response format is only appropriate for some of the items, the formatting is somewhat appropriate.<br>3=Most of the items relate to the topic, most do not require proofreading, the response format is appropriate for most of the items, most of the formatting is appealing.<br>4=All items accurately relate to the topic and are grammatically correct, the response format for all items makes sense, and the formatting of the survey is appealing. | | | |
| (d) validity and reliability of the instrument **(published instrument)**<br>  0= The component is not evident.<br>  1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>  2= Information is present, but is not presented in a clear manner.<br>  3= All information is present, the flow of writing could be improved.<br>  4= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | 4 | | |
| (e) a cover letter or permission form with accompanying letter that can be used for the IRB process<br>  0=Not evident<br>  1=Not completed on time<br>  2=Completed, but with many errors<br>  3=Completed, but with some errors<br>  4=Completed, no errors | 4 | | |
| (f) pilot data of 3 to 5 completed assessment forms<br>  0= The component is not evident.<br>  1= Basic information is present, but some | 2 | | |

| Assignment One: Evaluation Tool 20% | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Possible Score (20)** | **Actual Score** | **Revisions** |
|     information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>  2= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | | | |
| (g) an explanation of how you think the instrument worked and any plans for revision<br>  0= The component is not evident.<br>  1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>  2= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | 2 | | |
| Grammar/Syntax/APA<br>  1=The errors are so distracting that it is difficult to focus on the content.<br>  2=Many errors are present, but the content is understandable.<br>  3=Some errors are present.<br>  4=There are so few errors, making the document easy to read and understand. | 4 | | |

| Assignment Two: Proposal 40% | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Possible Score (40)** | **Actual Score** | **Revisions** |
| **Statement of purpose** for this evaluation proposal<br>  0= The component is not evident.<br>  1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>  2= Information is present, but is not presented in a clear manner.<br>  3= All information is present, the flow of writing could be improved.<br>  4= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | 4 | | |
| A **rationale** describing the reason for completing an evaluation in the chosen area.<br>  0= The component is not evident.<br>  1= Basic information is present, but some | 4 | | |

| Assignment Two: Proposal 40% | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Criteria | Possible Score (40) | Actual Score | Revisions |
| information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>2= Information is present, but is not presented in a clear manner.<br>3= All information is present, the flow of writing could be improved.<br>4= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | | | |
| A **research question** or questions.<br>0= The component is not evident.<br>1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>2= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | 2 | | |
| **Definition of terms**.<br>0= The component is not evident.<br>1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>2= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | 2 | | |
| **Review of Literature** to support the evaluation.<br>0= The component is not evident.<br>1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>2= Information is present, but is not presented in a clear manner.<br>3= All information is present, the flow of writing could be improved.<br>4= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | 4 | | |
| Description of your **methodology** including the evaluation design, setting and subjects, instrumentation, and form of analysis. (4 points for each of the 4 components)<br>0= The component is not evident.<br>1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the | 16 | | |

| Assignment Two: Proposal 40% | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Possible Score (40)** | **Actual Score** | **Revisions** |
| topic.<br>2= Information is present, but is not presented in a clear manner.<br>3= All information is present, the flow of writing could be improved.<br>4= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | | | |
| **Limitations** to the study.<br>0= The component is not evident.<br>1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>2= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | 2 | | |
| Completed **IRB** form<br>0= The component is not included.<br>1= Basic information is present, but some information is left out or is not related to the topic.<br>2= All information is present, the writing flows well and information relates to all the components. | 2 | | |
| **Grammar/Syntax/APA**<br>1=The errors are so distracting that it is difficult to focus on the content.<br>2=Many errors are present, but the content is understandable.<br>3=Some errors are present.<br>4=There are so few errors, making the document easy to read and understand. | 4 | | |

**Program Evaluation Presentation Feedback Form Scale**

| **Assignment Three: Program Evaluation Presentation (40)** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Above Average** | **Average** | **Below Average** |
| 1. Clarity of the presenter's purpose/ objectives | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Speaker's knowledge of the topic from supporting literature | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Instrumentation | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

| Assignment Three: Program Evaluation Presentation (40) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Above Average** | **Average** | **Below Average** |
| 4. Explanation of evaluation design | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Explanation of (potential) use to be made of the results | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. Conclusions from this project | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. Recommendations (What should have been done differently? Next steps?) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. Organization of the presentation | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. Use of time when making the presentations | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. Opportunity for questions and discussion | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Suggestion to improve this presentation. | | | | |
| Suggestion to improve this evaluation project. | | | | |

| Critical Elements | Unacceptable (1 point) | Acceptable (2 points) | Target (3 points) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Standard 3: Ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems.** | | | |
| **3.1 Monitoring and evaluation of school management and operational systems (Professional Skills).** | Candidate *does not demonstrate* the ability to: (a) **identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school; (b) develop long-range plans for the school; (c) project long-term resources needs;** or **(d) use technology manage school operational systems.** Or Candidate may only do one of the above. | Candidate *demonstrates* the ability to do *two* or *three* of the following: (a) **identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school; (b) develop long-range plans for the school; (c) project long-term resources needs;** or **(d) use technology manage school operational systems.** | Candidate *demonstrates* the ability to do *all* of the following: (a) **identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school; (b) develop long-range plans for the school; (c) project long-term resources needs;** and **(d) use technology manage school operational systems.** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **3.2 Efficient use of human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations (Professional Skills).** | Candidate *does not demonstrate* the ability to present recommendations that enable the (a) **projection of long-term resource needs of a school**, and (b**) use of technology to manage school operational systems.** | Candidate *demonstrates* the ability to present recommendations that enable the (a) **projection of long-term resource needs of a school**, and (b**) use of technology to manage school operational systems.** | Candidate *demonstrates* the ability to present **multiple** evidence-based recommendations that enable the (a) **projection of long-term resource needs of a school**, and (b**) use of technology to manage school operational systems.** |

**Bibliography**

**Program Evaluation**

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Gredler, M. E. (1996). *Program evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Popham, W. J. (1993). Educational evaluation. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Posavac, E. J., & Carey, R. G. (2006). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rossi, P., Lipsey, M., & Freeman, H.. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach.* 7th edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, M. L., & Glass, G. V. (1987). *Research and evaluation in the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.


**Educational Research**

Baum, S. M., Gable, R. K., & List, K. (1987). *Chi square, pie charts and me.* Monroe, NY: Trillium.

Borg, W. R. (1981). *Applying educational research: A practical guide for teachers*. New York: Longman.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1996). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1979). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Hopewell, NJ: Houghton Mifflin.

Jaeger, R. M. (1990). *Statistics: A spectator sport* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sprinthall, R. C., Schmutte, G. T., & Sirois, L. (1991). *Understanding educational research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

*Standards for educational and psychological testing*. (1985). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research methods in education: An introduction* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wittrock, M. C. (1986). *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.


**Measurement and Evaluation**

Choate, J. S., Enright, B. E., Miller, L. J., Poteet, J. A., & Rakes, T. A. (1995). *Curriculum-based assessment and programming* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (1989). *Conduct a survey*.  Skill development unit to accompany the story Miss Rumphius. In Journeys (grade 4). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Gronlund, N. E. (1998). *Assessment of student achievement* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hopkins, K. D. (1998). *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

McDaniel, E. (1994). *Understanding educational measurement*. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Oosterhof, A. (1994). *Classroom applications of educational measurement* (2nd ed.). New York: Merrill.

Perrone, V. (1991). *Expanding student assessment*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Popham, J. (1995). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn anad Bacon.

Popham, W. J. (1993). *Educational Evaluation*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Posavac, E. J., & Carey, R. G. (1992). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sax, G. (1989). *Principles of educational and psychological measurement and evaluation*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Smith, M. L., & Glass, G. V. (1987). *Research and evaluation in education and the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Stanley, S. J., & Popham, W. J. (Eds.). (1988). *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Starko, A. J., & Schack, G. D. (1992). *Looking for data in all the right places.* Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

## Qualitative Research

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dobbert, M. L. (1984). *Ethnographic research: Theory and application for modern schools and societies*. New York: Praeger.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.