

**PA 664-01 (course #30898): Program Evaluation
Winter 2014 (Tuesdays)**

Professor: Salvatore Alaimo

Email: alaimos@gvsu.edu

250C DeVos Center

Office hours:

E-mail preferences:

Class hours: 6:00 - 8:50 p.m.

Location: EC512

Wednesdays, 3:00am–5:00 p.m. or by appointment

Please mention **PA-664** in the subject line of your e-mails.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The increasing call for accountability and competition for resources has given the demonstration of the effectiveness of programs more importance, prominence and attention within the United States nonprofit sector. It has become a major focus for nonprofit leaders, funders, accrediting organizations, board members, individual donors, the media and scholars, and it is clear the demand for program evaluation is growing. A byproduct of this demand is the increasing use of program evaluation as a management tool and component of organizational performance measurement.

Nonprofit managers and leaders are faced with the challenge of responding to the *external pull* from funders, government agencies, accrediting bodies and other stakeholders while developing an intrinsically motivated *internal push* to build long-term capacity to evaluate their programs. This course will tap into the evolution of evaluation capacity building (ECB) to discuss its role in nonprofit management. It will draw from leadership, organizational behavior, organizational culture, and organizational learning; incorporate a multi-stakeholder approach for a holistic perspective of who participates in ECB; provide the nuts and bolts for ECB tasks and responsibilities; and incorporate evaluability assessments at both organizational and programmatic levels.

This course will also draw from the leading scholars in evaluation to establish a foundation of knowledge in program evaluation. Instruction in program evaluation will be provided within the context of nonprofit organizations, however many concepts apply to health and government settings. Important components of program evaluation will be covered including program theory, the use of logic models, the development of an evaluation plan, and the use of evaluation information.

This course is built on the assumption that students learn more if they are actively engaged with the material. Assignments and discussions allow students to test knowledge, formulate ideas and strategies, respond to management dilemmas, and get immediate feedback from classmates and the instructor.

Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of this course, students will:

- Gain knowledge in the evolving concept of evaluation capacity building (ECB), its role in nonprofit management and be able to help build capacity for program evaluation in a nonprofit organization

- Gain knowledge in the contextual factors that impact ECB, and recommended steps for effectively confronting and managing them
- Conduct evaluability assessments at both organizational and programmatic levels
- Develop a working knowledge of how to evaluate a nonprofit program including –
 - Developing the program’s theory and logic model
 - Developing an evaluation plan
 - Understanding the various available evaluation tools and methods available
 - Using evaluation results

Readings

There are two required texts for this course:

Compton, D.W., Baizerman, M. & Stockdill, S.H., (eds.), (2002). *The Art, Craft and Science of Evaluation Capacity Building. New Directions for Evaluation 93.* ISBN# 0-7879-6299-6 (Also available through Jossey-Bass and Amazon.com)

Wholey, J.S., Hatry, H.P., & Newcomer, K.E. (eds.), (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd Edition.* ISBN: 978-0-470-52247-9 (Also available through Jossey-Bass and Amazon.com)

- A. There are additional, required readings for the course available in Electronic Course Reserves marked E Reserves), E-books, or journal articles marked LIBRARY. I reserve the right to make changes in your reading assignments during the semester. Such changes will largely be prompted by any new developments in the sector and the needs of the class.

GRADING

Grades will be assigned on the basis of the weights below:

NO EXTRA CREDIT

Term Paper	25%
Midterm Exam	25%
Case Papers (2)	20%
Class Participation	15%
Term Paper Presentation	15%

A	93 – 100
A-	90 – 92
B+	87 – 89
B	83 – 86
B-	80 – 82
C+	77 – 79
C	73 – 76
C-	70 – 72
D+	65 – 69
D	60 – 64
F	<60

These grades reflect an evaluation of the accuracy, depth, and quality of expression within your work. Although a grade is not a precise measure, each carries a meaning: An "A" is reserved for the very best student work. It means that the student has exceeded expectations for the assignment in all aspects-accuracy and depth of response as well as quality of expression.

- An "A-" means the student exceeded expectations in most aspects but not all.
- A "B+" or "B" indicates that, while accurate and adequate in depth and quality of expression, the assignment could still be significantly improved.
- Grades of "B-," "C+," or "C" indicate that the student has met expectations for undergraduate work in the course, but that the work is generally undistinguished in its accuracy, depth, *and/or* quality of expression.
- Grades of "C-," "D," or "F" indicate that the student's work is below expectations for the course and serious deficiencies exist.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

ALL ASSIGNMENTS ARE DUE BY 6:00PM AND MUST BE SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH SAFE ASSIGN AS WELL AS TURNED IN AS A HARD COPY.

In addition to the readings assigned each week, you will be responsible for the following requirements for this course:

Term paper (25 points)

Students must write a 15-page, double-spaced term paper (not counting bibliography or title page) with one (1) inch margins on the evaluation capacity of a nonprofit organization or government agency (or program) in which they have an interest. The organization must be picked by January 21 and **cannot** be one in which you are employed. Papers must include:

- Why it was founded / mission / history of the organization
- Major sources of support – funding, volunteers, etc.
- Programs and service delivery methods (how and why it serves its clients/consumers in its particular way)
- Organizational Evaluability Assessment including an analysis of -
 - Leadership
 - Organizational culture
 - Organizational learning
 - Political environment
 - Resources
 - Structures
 - Current work done, if any, in program evaluation
- Program Evaluability Assessment
- An evaluation plan for one of the organization's programs based on your assessments and how you would evaluate that program including -
 - Program theory
 - Logic model
 - Evaluation framework
 - Data collection tools and methods

- Data analysis
- Conclusions - What you feel are the major issues facing the organization in developing capacity for program evaluation, and effectively and efficiently evaluating their programs
- Your recommendations to maximize ECB and improve any efforts made to evaluate their programs

Various tools, instruments, and approaches for conducting evaluability assessments and evaluating programs will be discussed in class such as interviews, reviews of documents, site visits, surveys, focus groups, etc. and a combination thereof. You are free to use those you feel will be most effective for helping you write a thorough paper given your organization, situation and context.

You will notice we will occasionally discuss your term paper organizations in class and such discussions will serve as building blocks to help you think critically about your organization and paper. The paper should be written as if it will be given to the board of directors and executive director of the organization as an outside evaluator's view and analysis of the organization, its ECB and overall readiness for program evaluation. Spelling errors, grammatical mistakes, typographical errors, etc. will lead to a reduced grade. Your paper should be cohesive, well structured, logically flow and be easy to understand. Therefore, fulfilling the content requirements alone will not be enough, and poorly written or sloppy papers will be graded lower regardless of content.

All references must be cited in the body of the paper and in a bibliography using APA style. You may reference some of the course readings; however you must incorporate **at least half** of all your resources from those other than course readings. The use of other resources is factored into your grade (see useful resources section at end of syllabus; you're not limited to this list). You are strongly encouraged to visit the Steelcase Library in Building A of the DeVos Center and take advantage of the resources available there and through the library's online databases which will undoubtedly enhance the quality of your paper. **Ashley Rosener** is the library liaison for the School of Public and Nonprofit Administration and Health Administration and she is available to help you with the specific aspects of your work. She can be reached at **rosenera@gvsu.edu** or **(616) 331-5937**.

PAPERS ARE DUE APRIL 15. LATE PAPERS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

Term paper presentation (15 points)

Students must develop and present a PowerPoint presentation on the findings of their term paper on April 15 or 22***. You will have 15 minutes to concisely, yet thoroughly present your information and 5 minutes for questions from the instructor and fellow students. The content guide for your term paper is recommended as the same guide for your presentation. Be mindful of the time allotment and be sure to allow enough time (more if necessary) for the more important components of your presentation which are your conclusions and recommendations. You are free and encouraged to use additional materials, if available, about your organization and its ECB and/or program evaluation efforts to enhance your presentation such as program brochures, evaluation reports, etc.

***We will draw names on March 18 to see who presents on 4/15 and 4/22.

Midterm Exam (25 points)

The mid-term exam will be taken in a computer lab on February 25 and will cover course content from 1/7-2/18. The format will be predominantly essay questions. Successful answers require a grasp of concepts covered in class as well as thoughtful application of concepts to management issues and scenarios. Students will have the entire period to take the exam, however it should require approximately 2 hours.

Case Papers – 2 (20 points)

Cases are included in the course in order to illustrate ECB and program evaluation situations and allow students to apply course concepts to them. Students submitting a case paper for grading will prepare a four (4) page typed double-spaced analysis. Case papers are worth 10 points each and are due the class session in which the case is to be discussed. **Late papers will not be accepted.** Please note that the questions to answer for a particular case paper are included in the syllabus. This means that any questions included as part of the written case material are **not** the questions to be used for the case papers.

A high quality paper will show excellent understanding of course ideas and the case as well as the correct application of appropriate frameworks and tools to analyze the case. The discussion should first set the context for the case and then move forward while balancing being theoretical and descriptive when appropriate. What determines a high quality paper is the appropriate application of concepts from the class readings/discussions to the case under consideration. It will offer a clear, direct response to the questions assigned to be answered in the paper and include a concise and compelling justification of the writer's position(s). Students may choose which two (2) of the three (3) cases we will analyze to submit papers for grading. However, **all students** should read all three cases and be prepared to discuss each case in class. In each case discussion, students will break out into groups to identify the main issues in the case, analyze problems the organization in the case is experiencing, and make suggestions for addressing the current problems and avoiding similar problems in the future.

For a helpful guide on case analysis developed by the Writing Center, see http://www.gvsu.edu/cms3/assets/C7078FCF-E2C3-F3DD-7F8E1630561E3F3E/health_admin_case_analysis_revised_gg.pdf

Class Participation and Discussion (15 points)

I expect you to come to class fully prepared to discuss the assigned readings. The School of Public and Nonprofit Administration and Grand Valley State University values the role of participation and active engagement by students in the learning process. Moreover, we believe, a prerequisite for learning is that students should attend class regularly, participate fully when called upon, and have command of the assigned readings at the scheduled time. Students will have opportunities to participate individually and in group discussions. Those who prepare, attend classes and engage

in discussions will learn the most and contribute to the learning experience of their fellow classmates. The extent to which a student serves as a resource and the quality of the student's contribution to class discussions (including case discussions) will determine the student's participation grade. I do ask students about the reading assignments, so you will avoid embarrassing yourself by keeping up on the reading. Attendance will be taken at each class session. Attendance in class is necessary but not sufficient for a good class participation grade. Class participation, attendance and conscientiousness will be based on your the following: (a) oral participation in class (based on your ability to express yourself clearly, to hear and understand what others say, to synthesize the thoughts of others to form new insights or questions, and to disagree constructively); (b) cooperation in building a stimulating and supportive intellectual atmosphere in class; and, (c) attendance. **More than three (3) absences will result in a failing grade.**

COURSE SCHEDULE

NOTE: This syllabus serves as a "guide" and may change due to needs of the class and developments in the sector
Guest speakers will be announced in advance.

WEEK 1

January 7

Review of the syllabus
Class introductions / discussion
Basic understanding of program evaluation

- Class exercise

Purpose of Evaluation

- Mark, M.M., Henry, G.T., & Julnes, G. (2000). Defining Evaluation Purposes. *Evaluation: An Integrated Framework for Understanding, Guiding, and Improving Public and Nonprofit Policies and Programs* (pp. 49-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. E RESERVES

January 10

100% TUITION REFUND DEADLINE

WEEK 2

January 14

Understanding program evaluation

- Festen, M. & Philbin, M. (2007). Commonly Used terms and Their Definitions / Types of Evaluation. *Level Best: How Small and Grassroots Nonprofits can Tackle Evaluation and Talk Results* pp. 109-113. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. E RESERVES
- Chen, H.T. (2005). Fundamentals for Practicing Program Evaluation. *Practical Program Evaluation* (pp. 3-12). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. E RESERVES
- Thomas, J.C. (2005). Outcome Assessment and Program Evaluation. In R.D. Herman & Associates (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and*

Management (pp. 391-416). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons. E RESERVES

WEEK 3

January 21

ORGANIZATIONS FOR TERM PAPERS DUE – You will bring your term paper organization’s mission statement for discussion in class.

Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB)

- Stockdill, S.H., Baizerman, M. & Compton, D.W. (2002). Toward a Definition of the ECB Process: A Conversation with the ECB Literature. In Compton, D.W., Baizerman, M. & Stockdill, S.H., (eds.), pp. 7-25. *The Art, Craft and Science of Evaluation Capacity Building. New Directions for Evaluation 93*.
- Milstein, B., Chapel, T.J., Wetterhall, S.F., & Cotton, D.A. (2002). Building Capacity for Program Evaluation at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. In Compton, D.W., Baizerman, M. & Stockdill, S.H., (eds.), pp. 27- 46. *The Art, Craft and Science of Evaluation Capacity Building. New Directions for Evaluation 93*.
- Baizerman, M., Compton, D.W., & Stockdill, S.H. (2002). New Directions for ECB. In Compton, D.W., Baizerman, M. & Stockdill, S.H., (eds.), pp. 109-119. *The Art, Craft and Science of Evaluation Capacity Building. New Directions for Evaluation 93*.
- Compton, D.W., & Baizerman, M. (2007). Defining Evaluation Capacity Building. *American Journal of Evaluation 28* (1), pp. 118-119. LIBRARY

WEEK 4

January 28

Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB)

- Preskill, H. & Boyle, S. (2008). A Multidisciplinary Model of Evaluation Capacity Building. *American Journal of Evaluation 29* (4), pp. 443-459. LIBRARY

CASE 1 - Compton, D.W., Glover-Kudon, R., Smith, I.E., & Avery, M.E. (2002). Ongoing Capacity Building in the American Cancer Society (ACS) 1995-2001. In Compton, D.W., Baizerman, M. & Stockdill, S.H., (eds.), pp. 47- 61. *The Art, Craft and Science of Evaluation Capacity Building. New Directions for Evaluation 93*.

CASE PAPER QUESTIONS:

- ACS was 87 years old at the time it decided to formally engage in program evaluation establishing its evaluation unit. Even though its mission statement says they’re “dedicated to eliminating cancer as a major health problem by preventing cancer, saving lives, and diminishing suffering from cancer through research, education, advocacy and service” what factors could have contributed to the organization taking so long to formally engage in program evaluation?

- What were the major external forces driving ACS's move towards evaluating its programs? Are they analogous and relevant to today's nonprofit organizations? If so, how?
- Are there potential hazards to an organization's ECB efforts solely being driven by external stakeholders? If so, what are they and why? What can nonprofit managers and leaders do to effectively manage and balance external demands?
- Discuss several aspects of this case that are covered in Preskill & Boyle's article on their Multidisciplinary Model for ECB.
- The case talks about the lessons learned by the practitioners. What did you learn from this case that you feel is applicable to your term paper organization or other nonprofit organizations?

January 31 75% tuition refund deadline

WEEK 5

February 4

Organizational Culture, Learning and Leadership

- Schein, E.H. (1996). Leadership and Organizational Culture. In Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M. & Beckhard, R., eds. *The Leader of the Future* pp. 59-69. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. E RESERVES
- Alaimo, S. P. (2008). Nonprofits and evaluation: Managing expectations from the leader's perspective. In J. G. Carman & K. A. Fredericks (Eds.), *Nonprofits and Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*, 119, 73-92. LIBRARY

Organizational Learning

- Argyris, C., & Schon, D.A. (1996). What Is an Organization That It May Learn? *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice (2nd Edition)* pp. 3-29. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. E RESERVES
- Preskill, H. & Torres, R.T. (1999). Evaluative Inquiry Learning Processes. *Evaluative Inquiry for Learning in Organizations* pp. 51-69. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. E RESERVES

WEEK 6

February 11

Stakeholder Engagement/Roles

- Bryson, J. M. & Patton, M.Q. (2010). Analyzing and Engaging Stakeholders. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd edition* (pp. 30-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2004). CDC Evaluation Working Group: Summary of the Framework for Program Evaluation (pp. 1-2). <http://www.cdc.gov/eval/materials/frameworksummary.PDF>
- Fetterman, D. M. (2005). The Principles of Empowerment Evaluation. In D.M, Fetterman & A. Wandersman

(Eds.), *Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice* (pp. 27-41). New York: The Guilford Press. E RESERVES

CASE 2 - Skolits, G.J. & Boser, J.A. (2008). Using an Evaluation Hotline to promote Stakeholder Involvement. *American Journal of Evaluation* 29 (1), pp. 58-70. LIBRARY

CASE PAPER QUESTIONS:

- What principles for stakeholder involvement and engagement from our readings were used in this case?
- The hotline, while a good source of information, proved to be limiting in the overall data collection necessary for a more effective evaluation. What other methods of data collection would you use to compliment the hotline information?
- Did politics among the stakeholders and in their relationships play a major part in this case? Why or why not?
- What can you take from this case, if anything, to get ideas for stakeholder involvement and engagement for your term paper organization? How would you apply those ideas?

WEEK 7
February 18

Guest speakers - Cynthia C. Phillips, Ph.D. and Lisa Wyatt Knowlton , Ed.D. of Phillips Wyatt Knowlton, Inc.

Program Theory / Logic Models

- Patton, M.Q. (1997). The Program's Theory of Action. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. pp. 215-238. E RESERVES
- McLaughlin, J. A. & Jordan , G.B. (2010). Using Logic Models. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd edition* (pp. 55-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

We will have a logic model development session in the second half of our class. Bring your draft of your logic model or an existing one from your paper's organization with your organization's mission statement.

WEEK 8
February 25

Midterm Exam

WEEK 9

NO CLASSES – SPRING BREAK

March 7

DROP DEADLINE - GRADE W

WEEK 10

March 11

Program Evaluation – Tools, Methods and Approaches

- Hatry, H.P. (2010). Using Agency Records. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 2nd edition* (pp. 243-261). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Hatry, H.P. (2010). Collecting Data in the Field. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 2nd edition* (pp. 321-346). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

WEEK 11

March 18

Program Evaluation – Tools, Methods and Approaches

- Newcomer, K.E. & Triplett, T. (2010). Using Surveys. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd edition* (pp. 262-297). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Newcomer, K.E. & Conger, D. (2010). Using Statistics in Evaluation. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd edition* (pp. 454-492). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Discussion about term papers / scheduling of presentations

WEEK 12

March 25

Program Evaluation – Tools, Methods and Approaches

- Adams, W.C. (2010). Conducting Semi-Structured Interviews. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd edition* (pp. 365-377). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Krueger, R.A. & Casey, M.A. (2010). Focus Group Interviewing. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd edition* (pp. 378-403). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

WEEK 13

April 1

Data analysis

- Rogers, P.J. & Goodrick, D. (2010). Qualitative Data Analysis. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd edition* (pp. 429-453). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

We will engage in an exercise of coding qualitative data in the second half of our class.

WEEK 14

April 8

Use of Evaluation Results

- Grob, G.F. (2010). Providing Recommendations, Suggestions, and Options for Improvement. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical*

Program Evaluation, 3rd edition (pp. 581-593). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

CASE 3 - Campbell, M.S. Patton, M.Q. & Patrizi, P. (2005). Evaluation of the Central Valley Partnership of the James Irvine Foundation. *New Directions for Evaluation* 105, pp. 39-54.

LIBRARY

CASE PAPER QUESTIONS:

- What were the values that drove the CVP initiative? What was the connection between these values and the intended outcomes?
- Characterize McGarvey's role in this initiative. What was the relationship between McGarvey and the grantees as the partnership unfolded?
- How did the evaluator's role change in the second phase of the initiative?
- What were the tensions revealed in this case and were they related to the program, the evaluation or both? Is there the potential for these types of tensions in your term paper organization? If so, why and what are they? If no, why not? What lessons did you take away from this case? What stands out in your mind? How do these lessons relate to your term paper organization, if at all?
- H.P. Hatry, J.H. Wholey, & K.E. Newcomer (2010). Evaluation Challenges, Issues, and Trends. In J.H. Wholey, H.P. Hatry & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 3rd edition* (pp. 668-679). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

WEEK 15

April 15

TERM PAPERS DUE

Term paper presentations

WEEK 16

April 22

Remaining term paper presentations

Class reflection on course

(Last day of Class)

POLICIES

Electronic Devices

Laptops and I-Pads used **exclusively for taking class notes** are the only permitted electronic devices in class. The use of other electronic devices (cell phones, I-Pods, Blackberries, etc.) **is not permitted in class**. We meet twice a week for a total of two and a half hours. We must make the most of that time, stay focused, not distract others, and respect the commitment made by whoever has paid for your tuition. If it

is discovered that any laptop or I-Pad is being used for purposes other than taking class notes, all use of such devices will be suspended for the rest of the semester.

Communication via Blackboard

Aside from individual student appointments and conversations in class, our main mode of communication will be through blackboard. We will use Blackboard to access the syllabus, course materials, and communicate with each other. Your success in this class will, in part, depend on your ability to navigate the features of Blackboard. You can go to <http://gvsu.edu/it/learn/blackboard-9-9-student-handouts-36.htm> for online tutorials that will help you learn how to use blackboard. If you ever need help you may contact the Computing and Technology Support Help Desk at 616-331-2101 or helpdesk@gvsu.edu.

Late Policy

If you miss class you will miss much of the learning. Therefore, if you attend and participate meaningfully in all classes you will earn the full 15 points for participating and learning. One (1) point will be deducted for each class you miss unless you have a documented medical or other emergency. More than three (3) absences will result in a failing grade. Late assignments will not be accepted without prior arrangement with me. Assignments received after the due date, only with prior approval from me, will be downgraded up to one full letter grade per day (24-hour period). If you cannot attend class on a due date, it is your responsibility to turn in the assignment in advance.

Makeup exams will be only be provided if:

1. Students have made arrangements prior to the exam date with me subject to my approval. - **Or**
2. Students incur an emergency the date of the exam and documentation of that emergency is provided to me and subject to my approval.

Makeup exams will be different from the regularly scheduled exams. Students failing to show up for a makeup exam as scheduled will receive a zero (0) for that exam.

Writing Center

Part of your grades on written assignments will be allocated to writing clarity and grammatical accuracy. You have permission (and encouragement) to take your assignments or any other writings to the Writing Center for assistance before turning them in for credit. The walk-in hours and locations for the Writing Center can be accessed at: <http://www.gvsu.edu/wc/hours-locations-30.htm>

Format of Submissions

Here are a few requirements and guidelines for your written assignments:

- a) Be sure to give a clear title/heading to your assignment and mention the name of your group against the title. So, it will look like this: *Assignment #1: Mission Statement of Nonprofit X.*

- b) Begin your assignment stating the objective of your paper and also state, briefly, how you shall achieve this objective (the methods used which could be group discussion, internet search, library research and so on). What this section does is that it serves as an introduction and informs the reader (i.e., me) what to expect, in what order, and how you arrived at your conclusions. This is what is typically referred to as a "roadmap."
- c) Have page numbers as footers.
- d) Give full citation at the end of the paper. All citations in the text of your paper must state the last name of the author, the year of publication and the page number. Use APA referencing style or provide a sample if you are following the guidelines of journals in your research area. Be thorough, precise and consistent with your citations. In the event that you cite a website, mention the name of the organization and the year in which this was published and then cite the web link at the very end in your reference section. So, if it is something that you downloaded from the site of the American Red Cross and the end of the webpage states 2006, you must cite it this way: (American Red Cross, 2006) and then go to the end of your document and mention the full citation:
[American Red Cross. \(2006\). Web-link: http://www.redcross.org accessed on September 14, 2009.](http://www.redcross.org)
- e) Divide your paper into clear sections. Section headings are called sub-headings. This allows the reader to navigate through your paper knowing how you are thinking and, in essence, gives order and clarity to your paper, especially if you are addressing two or three different aspects in one paper. Make sure that your paper flows well; that there are no abrupt changes in direction. Should you change direction, warn the reader before you move on to a new section using a sentence or two and then add a section heading.
- f) Maintain 12-size font and double spacing in your submissions. All written assignments should be typed and double spaced with 1 inch margins. Please use 12-size font in all your written submissions.
- g) You will submit an electronic copy of each written assignment using Turnitin on Blackboard before its deadline **AND** will turn in a hard copy on the day of class when the assignment is due.

Students with Disabilities and Special Needs

If there is any student in this class who has special needs because of a learning, physical, or other disability, please contact me or the Disability Support Services (DSS) at 331-2490. You may choose to email me or call me to discuss your needs. Please try and do so within the first two weeks of class.

Academic Honesty (GVSU Catalog)

The principles of truth and honesty are recognized as fundamental to a community of teachers and scholars. This means that all academic work will be done by the student to whom it is assigned without unauthorized aid of any kind. More specifically –

- No student shall knowingly procure, provide or accept any materials which contain questions or answers to any examination or assignment.
- No student shall complete, in part or in total, any examination or assignment for another person.
- No student shall allow any examination or assignment to be completed, in part or total, by another person.
- No student shall submit work that has been previously graded, or is being submitted concurrently to more than one course, without specific authorization from the instructor of the class to which the student wishes to submit it.
- No student shall knowingly plagiarize or copy the work of another person and submit it as his/her own. **Offering the work of someone else as one's own is plagiarism.** Any ideas or material taken from another source for either written or oral presentation must be fully acknowledged. The language or ideas taken from another may range from isolated formulas, sentences, or paragraphs to entire articles copied from the Internet, books, periodicals, speeches, or from the writings of other students. The offering of materials assembled or collected by others in the form of projects or collections without acknowledgement also is considered plagiarism. In short, any student who fails to give credit in written or oral work for the ideas or materials that have been taken from another is guilty of plagiarism.

I take the GVSU's honor code seriously and will strictly enforce it in this class. Any assignment found to have been plagiarized will automatically receive an F. Further actions may be taken at my discretion.

In turn, you may expect that I shall treat you with the dignity and respect that such a system implies. If you are unfamiliar with the Honor Code, please consult the GVSU Graduate Bulletin and the (GVSU Student Code of Conduct) for further information. Giving or receiving unauthorized assistance on assignments, plagiarism, and falsification are all violations of the honor code.

Consultation

I encourage students to consult me at any point during the course. You are encouraged to meet me during my office hours (see above) or email me. I respond to my e-mail typically within 24 hours and sometimes sooner. When you email me, please be sure to include the course number (PA664) in the subject of the email or else, the likelihood of me responding quickly is less.

SOME POTENTIALLY USEFUL RESOURCES FOR THE COURSE

You are not limited to these resources and please feel free to suggest other resources that you may discover. You may bring these to the attention of the class.

Journals

Nonprofit Sector and Evaluation journals

American Journal of Evaluation

Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation

Evaluation and Program Planning

Foundation Review

New Directions for Evaluation

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly

Nonprofit Management and Leadership

Organizational Sociology and Management journals

Academy of Management Journal

Academy of Management Review

American Sociological Review

Administrative Science Quarterly

American Journal of Sociology

Periodicals

Nonprofit Quarterly

NonProfit Times

Philanthropy News Digest - <http://foundationcenter.org/pnd>

Websites

American Evaluation Association - <http://www.eval.org/>

CDC Evaluation Working Group - <http://www.cdc.gov/eval/resources.htm>

On-line Evaluation Resource Library - <http://oerl.sri.com/>

Academic Research Centers

Claremont Graduate School's Institute of Organizational and Program Evaluation Research - <http://www.cgu.edu/pages/506.asp>

Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership -

<http://www.npgoodpractice.org/>

University of Wisconsin Extension -

<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/index.html>

Western Michigan University's Evaluation Center - <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/>

Independent Research

Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action -

<http://www.arnova.org>

Urban Institute - <http://www.urban.org/center/cnp/Projects/outcomeindicators.cfm>