

**SPEA V562: Public Program Evaluation
Spring Semester 2014**

Time:	MW 2:30 – 3:45 p.m.	Professor:	Ashlyn Aiko Nelson
Location:	PV 276 (SPEA)	Office:	SPEA 410D
Office Hours:	MW 10-11 a.m. MW 1-2 p.m. or by appointment	Email:	ashlyn@indiana.edu
		Phone:	(812) 855-5971
		T.A.:	Samantha Brady
		T.A. Email:	bradysa@indiana.edu
		T.A. Office Hours:	via email appointment

Course Description and Objectives

This master’s level course is designed to provide students with a working knowledge of applied policy analysis methods for public program evaluation. This course is intended to prepare students to be fluent in the basic application of program evaluation tools, and to be informed consumers of program evaluation research.

Broadly, policy analysis can be grouped into two categories: *ex ante* analysis, used to analyze policy problems generally and provide recommendations prior to implementation, and *ex post* analysis, used to evaluate the effectiveness of policies after implementation. This course focuses on *ex post* analysis and complements topics covered in other courses on *ex ante* analysis, such as forecasting, return on investment/net present value analysis, cost-benefit analysis, decision analysis, risk assessment, impact assessment, and political feasibility analysis.

This course provides a basic background in approaches to program evaluation, and discusses both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods for program evaluation. The bulk of the course will focus on a variety of empirical approaches to program evaluation, and on causal inference methods in particular. Students will receive training in a variety of experimental and quasi-experimental research methods used by researchers and policy analysts to assess whether public and nonprofit programs are having the intended effects. We will discuss how to address analytical issues that may arise, including sampling issues and selection bias. We also will consider how analyses can be adapted to reflect policy analysis challenges, including issues with the *policy process* (such as a lack of program implementation fidelity) and issues with the *policy outcomes* (such as the emergence of unintended consequences).

In program evaluation, the presentation of the analysis can be as important as the analysis itself. For a policy analysis to have an impact, it must be articulated and presented clearly and reflect due regard for its intended audience. In many ways, the medium is the message in policy analysis, so this course is in some ways a “boot camp” in policy writing and presentation. We will discuss the appropriate structure, tone, style, and presentation of policy analyses for a variety of audiences (e.g., nonprofits, academic institutions, foundations, government agencies) and formats (e.g., client presentations, nonpartisan memos, academic journal articles, editorial articles). Throughout the course, we will examine how to appropriately frame and build persuasive policy recommendations using the analytical tools we discuss.

Prerequisites

There are no formal prerequisites for this course. That said, this course is most appropriate for either first year MPA students in their second semester of study, or second year MPA students. I designed this course with the assumption that students have a basic background in descriptive and inferential statistics (including reading and interpreting bivariate and multivariate regressions) and research methods more generally. I also assume that students are able to use data to produce descriptive and inferential statistics using a standard statistical analysis computer program (e.g., SPSS, Stata, SAS, R, TSP, Minitab, Matlab, R). In other words, I will assume students have mastered concepts covered in V506 and have a basic

conceptual knowledge of topics covered in V507 (e.g., multiple regression and regression with limited dependent variables).

Required Texts

1. Murnane, R.J., & Willett, J.B. (2011). *Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
2. Pirog, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management Classics Series: Social experimentation, program evaluation, and public policy*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. **(Referred to in this syllabus as SEPEPP).**

All articles in the Pirog textbook are available online—free of charge—on the Wiley Interscience website: <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/bookhome/122336247>

Note that to access the SEPEPP articles, you need to be logged into IUCAT. Please try accessing the articles online via an IU computer first, before sending an email to the TA or instructor about not being able to access the articles.

Purchasing the Pirog text is optional due to the availability of articles online; however, many of you may find purchasing the text to be more cost-effective than printing each article. Due to the heavy reliance on assigned readings, I highly recommend selecting an option that will allow you to annotate and highlight text at will.

Assigned readings that are not included in the required texts will be made available via Oncourse.

For each quantitative study or evaluation assigned to read, you are expected to be able to answer the following 11 questions:

1. What was the primary research question(s)?
2. What is the research design?
3. What data were gathered?
4. Were the measures used reliable and valid?
5. What statistical approaches were used by the authors?
6. Were the methods well-suited to the question asked and data available?
7. What threats to the internal validity were discussed by the authors and how did the authors handle these threats?
8. Did you feel that there were other threats to the internal validity of the study that the authors failed to take into consideration?
9. How would you assess the external validity of the article?
10. What were the authors' conclusions?
11. How robust were the authors' conclusions to changes in the specification of the model? In other words, did alternative analyses conducted by authors produce similar (or dissimilar) results?

Grading

Final grades will be calculated as follows. Each course element will be weighted out of a total of 100 points. The course is not graded on a curve, although individual grade elements may be weighted on a curve depending on class performance.

Class preparation and participation	10%
Midterm exam #1	15%
Midterm exam #2	15%
Evaluation Critique	15%

Team-based evaluation project 45%

- Request for proposal/statement of work (5%)
- Evaluation proposal (20%)
- Evaluation proposal review (10%)
- Final presentation (5%)
- Peer-evaluation of contribution to group project (5%)

Critical due dates for course deliverables are as follows:

Single-authored assignments:

February 26th: Midterm 1 (in-class)

March 26th: Due date for evaluation critique

April 14th: Midterm 2 (in-class)

Team-based project assignment:

January 15th: Assignment orientation

January 29th: Due date for topic selection

February 3rd: Due date for rough draft of RFP/SOW (to be brought to class)

February 5th: Due date for request for proposal/statement of work

April 9th: Due date for evaluation proposal

April 18th: Due date for evaluation proposal review and presentations

April 21st, 23rd, 28th, and 30th: Evaluation presentations

Course Assignments and Final Project

There will be three single-authored written assignments: a three-page evaluation critique; and two (2) midterm examinations. In addition, all students are required to take part in a team-based assignment that involves the development of a written request for proposal (RFP) to conduct a rigorous evaluation of a current policy or program, a written response to RFP in the form of an evaluation proposal, and the review/scoring of a proposal. This is a role-playing exercise designed to simulate the tasks and responsibilities frequently associated with program evaluation and policy research, while providing an opportunity to apply the concepts and research design strategies frequently found in program evaluation.

Course Policies and Expectations

Academic Dishonesty. This class has a zero tolerance policy for academic dishonesty, including cheating and plagiarism. In this era of information exchange, the effects of academic dishonesty can permanently damage your professional reputation; the wide availability of information on the internet also makes plagiarism extremely easy to detect. If caught, you will not only receive a zero on your assignment and an F for the course, but you will face possible expulsion from the class and from Indiana University. Students are expected to adhere to IU's Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, available online at: <http://www.iu.edu/~code/>

I run all assignments through Turnitin.com, a plagiarism detection software. This software allows me to quickly and efficiently identify potential plagiarism cases. Students may access the software themselves to learn how it works and to review their assignments to ensure they avoid being flagged for plagiarism.

Academic dishonesty also includes improper citation of resources, as well as citation omission. For a guide to proper citation, please refer to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, or see: <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/TeachingLib/Guides/Internet/Style.html>

As a rule of thumb, when in doubt, cite the source! There is, however, much more to avoiding plagiarism than just citing a reference. To help you recognize plagiarism, the IU Writing Center has prepared a helpful guide: Plagiarism: What it is and how to recognize and avoid it. You can find it online at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets.shtml>. This is one of the few documents that actually gives you examples of what constitutes plagiarism and strategies for avoiding it. Carefully review this document and use it as a guide as you complete your assignments (in every course).

Here are some tips on how to avoid inadvertent plagiarism from Ralph Brower at Florida State University:

1. If you take material that is not yours, from any source whatsoever, and copy it into assignments for this class, you must provide a footnote, endnote, or parenthetical reference to the source of material.
2. Any material that quotes verbatim from other sources must be enclosed in quotation marks and its source attributed as noted in rule #1 above. See the *APA Style Manual* for guidance.
3. Material not taken verbatim from a text but paraphrased also must be attributed.

(Thanks to M. Pirog for allowing me to plagiarize her plagiarism guidelines.)

Attendance. Class preparation and participation are very important for success in this course – in fact, preparation and participation constitute 10 percent of your grade. You should only take this course if you are willing to attend each class and view this class as an opportunity to expand your skill set. I expect that students abide by professional norms and standards by alerting me **in advance** of class if they are unable to attend, and that students arrive on time. An absence is excused if the student emails the instructor **in advance** of the class meeting and only in the case of illness, documented emergencies, and unavoidable conflict due to official university obligations. Absences reported after missing the class are unexcused unless documentation is provided. A percentage point will be deducted from the class preparation and participation grade for each unexcused absence. Students who are unable to attend class are expected to obtain class materials and notes from classmates, not the T.A. or instructor. Missing class is not an excuse for turning in late assignments.

Assignment Policy. Assignments in this class consist of required readings and written assignments. Readings assigned on a particular date in the course schedule must be completed *before* the class meeting. All writing and group assignments are due *via email* to **both the professor and T.A.** at the specified time on the specified due date. If you must miss class or show up late to class, the due date and time still apply.

All written assignments must be submitted in Microsoft Word, using Times New Roman font and 1-inch margins. As is the norm in many policy briefs, documents should be single-spaced with a hard-line return after each paragraph. All sources must be cited using APA format. Guides to APA formatting and style can be found online at <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/> and at <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/TeachingLib/Guides/Internet/Style.html>

Failure to adhere to these style and formatting guidelines for assignments will result in a 5 percentage point deduction in the final grade.

Late assignments will not be accepted, except in the case of a **documented** emergency. Late assignments disrupt my ability to grade quickly and return graded assignments to students. Technical difficulties and job interviews are not excuses for missed assignments, classes, or tests; please plan ahead and call UITS for support in advance of the deadline if technical difficulties arise.

You may request an extension for an assignment or exam only in cases of illness or family emergency. Such extension requests must be made via email *before* the assignment due date/test

date. If you miss an assignment or test due to illness, you must provide a note from a doctor written on letterhead with the doctor's name, signature and telephone number. The doctor must be local unless you are out of state, in which case a doctor in your location is acceptable. Doctors located in foreign countries who are not proximate and who could not have observed your health first-hand cannot provide an acceptable medical excuse. A doctor's note fitting the above criteria is the only way to make up a missed assignment due to illness.

If you miss an assignment or test due to a family emergency, you must notify me via email before the assignment due date/test date. In addition, you must provide a written explanation of the nature of the emergency, the dates on which you were away from school, where you stayed during those dates, the telephone number of the person with whom you stayed, and the name and telephone number of the officiating party (funeral director, minister, rabbi, etc.) in the case of a death, and the name of the treating doctor in the case of a family member's serious illness. I understand that providing this information may be a burden on you at a particularly difficult and sensitive time. Unfortunately, we have found that assignment deadlines and particularly tests have led to unexplained epidemics of illnesses and family deaths.

Class Participation. As mentioned above, class preparation and participation are very important for success in this course; preparation and participation constitute 10 percent of the final grade. Students are expected to attend class, arrive on time, complete assigned readings, and to contribute to class activities through active participation and involvement. When there is active communication in the class, everyone benefits tremendously. Class discussions are not an empty exercise to gain points but an effort to teach students how to engage in respectful and high level discussions. Students should come to class ready to engage me, their classmates, the material, and their abilities with enthusiasm. This is best achieved through thorough review of the materials covered in the previous class and careful preparation of the assigned materials.

Note that while that preparation and participation grade will be penalized for poor attendance (see above attendance policy), attendance \neq participation. Showing up to class without any meaningful contribution to class discussion does not provide the T.A. or instructor with any indication of student preparedness for the course, or allow them to gauge how students approach the problems.

V562 can be a large class, but you will have regular opportunities to contribute to high-quality class discussion. The V562 lectures often rely on student elicitation methods and use team-based problem solving approaches to think through problems. I pose many questions directly to the class, and each of you is welcome to respond. You also may demonstrate your preparation for class by taking notes on the assigned readings so you are prepared with questions and responses to questions throughout the lecture. You may provide examples of the program evaluation methods we've used in class, or critique the way they've been used in popular media or policy reports. And you may discuss how the techniques might be applied in your current, former, or future careers. You also may email me with course-relevant materials, or discuss these topics with me during office hours.

Please also note that class participation grades are based on quality (not quantity!) of participation in discussions and group activities and on overall contribution to a positive, productive learning environment. As an example, requests for assignment extensions or questions/comments clearly reflecting that the assigned class readings have not been completed do not constitute quality class participation.

The below rubric may be used as a rough guide for gauging your final class participation grade. Note that additional points will be deducted for unexcused absences (please see above attendance policy) and for disruptive in-class behavior (e.g., web surfing, sleeping, leaving class for large chunks of time, texting, side conversations, or excessive questioning that derails the lecture). Similarly, additional points may be

added for exceptional engagement in course materials that is made evident outside of class (e.g., via instructor email exchange or office hour discussions).

95 – 100%	Student attends all classes (except those due to excused absences; see above attendance policy), is attentive during lecture, and participates in in-class group activities. When appropriate, student contributes to thoughtful class discussions that advance the class discussion, and asks useful clarifying questions.
90 – 95%	Student attends all classes (except those due to excused absences; see above attendance policy), is attentive during lecture, and participates in in-class group activities. Student contributes to some high-quality in-class discussion.
85 – 90%	Student attends almost all classes (except those due to excused absences; see above attendance policy), is usually attentive during lecture, and participates in in-class group activities. Student rarely contributes to in-class discussion, or asks questions of a procedural nature only (e.g., due date/deadline clarifications rather than substantive contributions).
80 – 85%	Student attends almost all classes (except those due to excused absences; see above attendance policy) but sometimes appears inattentive or to display disruptive in-class behavior (e.g., web surfing, sleeping, leaving class for large chunks of time, leaving class frequently to purchase food, texting, side conversations, or excessive questioning that derails the lecture) and/or does not appear to engage in in-class group activities. Contributions to class discussion are sparse and either procedural in nature, reflect at a basic level that assigned readings have not been completed, and/or are distracting to the course mission.
Below 80%	Student participation and preparation exhibits major deficiencies as evidenced by one or more of the following behaviors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive absences • Strong pattern of inattention and/or disruptive in-class behavior • Sparse in-class contributions and/or participation that reflects assignments were not completed

Course Structure. This class will combine lecture, PowerPoint presentations, multimedia, and group activities. PowerPoint lectures for some classes will be made available online but generally will not be available until after the lecture is administered.

Electronic Devices. Please turn off your cell phones, mp3 players, and other such devices before entering class. I also discourage you from using your laptops during class. While some people like using them for note-taking purposes, most of the note-taking you will do in this class is best suited to pen and paper. Having a laptop open in front of you may tempt you to use web surfing, email, and instant messaging programs which are inappropriate during class and distracting to me, you, and your fellow classmates.

Email. Questions can be directed to me or the T.A. via email. Please begin the subject line with "V562". Please allow sufficient time for responses before assignment deadlines; as a general rule, urgent assignment questions sent within 24 hours of an assignment deadline do not allow sufficient time for a response. **Please, do not email me using the Oncourse email system. These emails are often prone to technical problems and do not allow me to keep a cohesive archive of student emails in one place.**

Incompletes. SPEA policy states that incomplete grades are only considered if at least 80% of the coursework has been completed and a student is physically unable to complete the remainder.

Netiquette. Students are expected to abide by professional standards in all written and spoken communications, including email, web-based and other electronic communications. I will not respond to emails without a subject line or appropriate salutation. For a guide to respectful electronic communications, please see: <http://www.albion.com/netiquette/corerules.html>

Oncourse. This course is administered online via Oncourse. It is your responsibility as a graduate student to check your Oncourse accounts daily during the week—just as you would check your email—for important announcements and course updates. I will use Oncourse to post updates, clarifications, additional resources, some class notes, and the like. If you do not check Oncourse regularly, you will certainly miss important updates. Failure to log in and check Oncourse is not an excuse for being unaware of changes in course requirements.

Scheduling Conflicts. If you have any scheduling conflicts on course dates that correspond to course exams/presentations, you must notify me by January 30th so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Arrangements can be made for accommodation of religious observances and other reasons.

Special Needs. Students with special needs should notify me immediately so that appropriate accommodations can be made to ensure academic success. **Students with chronic conditions (e.g., illness, disability, extenuating personal or family circumstances) that may require special accommodations must notify me in writing by January 30th.** In the case of chronic illness, you must provide a doctor's note written on letterhead with the doctor's name, signature and telephone number. Excuses for chronic conditions will not be granted if documentation is not provided before the January 30th deadline.

Students needing accommodations because of disability will need to register with Adaptive Educational Services and complete the appropriate forms issued by AES before accommodations will be given. The AES office is located in Herman B. Wells Library Room 101 and they may be reached by calling (812) 856-4112. For more information, please see: <http://www.indiana.edu/~iuadapts/>

University Resources

- Academic Support: For general academic support, contact the Student Academic Center at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~sac>
- Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS): http://healthcenter.indiana.edu/caps_what.html
- Course website: <https://oncourse.iu.edu/portal>
- Indiana University Library Website: <http://www.libraries.iub.edu/>
- Technical Support: Contact University Information Technology Services (UITS) via email at ithelp@iu.edu or by phone at (812) 855-6789. UITS also offers a number of tutorials for computer programs, including Excel and SPSS: http://ittraining.iu.edu/workshops/workshop_groups.aspx
For a complete list of UITS services, see: <http://uits.iu.edu/page/amgy>
- Writing Tutorial Services: <http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/>

Disclaimer

This syllabus is subject to change and may be amended throughout the course to reflect any changes deemed necessary by the instructor.

SPEA V562: Public Program Evaluation

Course Outline

Class	Date	Topics, Readings, and Assignments
Unit 1: The Basics of Evaluation		
1	January 13 th (M)	Topics: What is program evaluation? Course introduction and syllabus discussion
2	January 15 th (W)	Topics: Purchasing evaluations; Assignment orientation; Student introductions Required Readings: Nathan, R.P. (Ed.). (2008). Can government-sponsored evaluations be independent? <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> , 27(4), 926-944. (Oncourse)
3	January 20 th (M)	No Class: Martin Luther King, Jr. Day
4	January 22 nd (W)	Topics: Basics of program evaluation design; Program impact theory and logic models; Specifying outcome measures Required Readings: Bingham, R.D., & Felbinger, C.L. (2002). <i>Evaluation in practice: A methodological approach</i> . New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapter 1. (Oncourse) Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). <i>Evaluation: A systematic approach</i> (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapter 5. (Oncourse)
5	January 27 th (M)	Topics: Process evaluation Required Readings: Scheirer, M.A. (2004). Designing and using process evaluation. In J.S. Wholey, H.P. Hatry, & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> . (pp. 40-68). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (Oncourse) Green, E. (March 2, 2010). Building a better teacher. <i>New York Times</i> . Available online at: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/07/magazine/07Teachers-t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
6	January 29 th (W)	Topics: Performance measurement Required Readings: Bingham, R.D., & Felbinger, C.L. (2002). <i>Evaluation in practice: A methodological approach</i> . New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapter 4. (Oncourse) Barnow, B.S. (2000). Exploring the relationship between performance management and program impact: A case study of the Job Training

		Partnership Act. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> , 19(1), 118-141. (SEPEPP pp. 468-490) Assignments: Due date for topic selection – team-based assignment
7	February 3 rd (M)	Topics: Policy analysis writing workshop Required Readings: Read the APA Formatting and Style Guide, including all subsections (1-23) accessed via the below link: http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/ Supplemental Recommended Readings: Silvia, P.J. (2007). <i>How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing</i> . Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Assignments: Bring 10 hard copies of RFP/SOW draft to class
8	February 5 th (W)	Topics: Introduction to experimental vs. non-experimental evaluation designs. Required Readings: Bingham, R.D., & Felbinger, C.L. (2002). <i>Evaluation in practice: A methodological approach</i> . New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapter 2. (Oncourse) Murnane, R.J., & Willett, J.B. (2011). <i>Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research</i> . New York: Oxford University Press. Chapters 3-5. Assignments: Due date for SOW/RFP
9	February 10 th (M)	Topics: Experimental design using random assignment Required Readings: Nathan, R.P., & Hollister, R.G. (2008). Point/Counterpoint: The role of random assignment in social policy research. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> , 27(2) 2008, 401-415. (SEPEPP pp. 15-36) Pirog, M.A. (Ed.). (2009). The role of random assignment in social policy research. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> , 28(1), 164-181. (Oncourse) Supplemental Recommended Readings (advanced): Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (1979). <i>Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings</i> . Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. Chapter 8. (Oncourse)
10	February 12 th (W)	Topics: Conducting randomized experiments; Examples of experimental design; ITT vs. TOT Required Readings: List, J.A. (2011). Why economists should conduct field experiments and 14 tips for pulling one off. <i>Journal of Economic Perspectives</i> 25(3), 3-16.

		<p>Available online at: http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdf/10.1257/jep.25.3.3</p> <p>Ludwig, J., Kling, J.R., & Mullainathan, S. (2011). Mechanism experiments and policy evaluations. <i>Journal of Economic Perspectives</i> 25(3), 17-38. Available online at: http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdf/10.1257/jep.25.3.17</p> <p>NBER. <i>A summary overview of Moving to Opportunity: A random assignment housing mobility study in five U.S. cities.</i> Available online at: http://www.nber.org/mtopublic/MTO%20Overview%20Summary.pdf</p>
11	February 17 th (M)	<p>Topics: Natural experiments; Exogeneity vs. Endogeneity</p> <p>Required Readings: Murnane, R.J., & Willett, J.B. (2011). <i>Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research.</i> New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 8, pp. 135-141.</p>
12	February 19 th (W)	<p>Topics: Fixed effects estimation</p> <p>Required Readings: Murnane, R.J., & Willett, J.B. (2011). <i>Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research.</i> New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 7, pp. 107-134.</p>
13	February 24 th (M)	<p>Topics: Examples of evaluations using fixed effects; Midterm 1 review</p> <p>Required Readings: Albalade, D. (2008). Lowering blood alcohol content levels to save lives: The European experience. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 27(1), 20-39. (SEPEPP pp. 205-224)</p>
14	February 26 th (W)	In-class Midterm 1
Unit 2: Collecting Data for Evaluation		
15	March 3 rd (M)	<p>Topics: Ethics and Human Subjects</p> <p>Required Readings: Nathan, R.P. (2005). The ethics of federal social program evaluation. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 24(4), 823-824. (SEPEPP p. 491)</p> <p>Blustein, J. (2005). Toward a more public discussion of the ethics of federal social program evaluation. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 24(4), 824-846. (SEPEPP pp. 492-512)</p> <p>Barnow, B.S. (2005). The ethics of federal social program evaluation: A response to Jan Blustein. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 24(4), 846-848. (SEPEPP p. 513)</p> <p>Rolston, H. (2005). To learn or not to learn. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 24(4), 848-849. (SEPEPP pp. 514-515)</p>

		<p>Schochet, P.Z. (2005). Comments on Dr. Blustein’s paper, Toward a more public discussion of the ethics of federal social program evaluation. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 24(4), 849-850. (SEPEPP p. 516)</p> <p>Blustein, J. (2005). Jan Blustein’s Response. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 24(4), 851-852. (SEPEPP pp. 517-518)</p> <p>Curry, D. (2001, September 7). Court condemns Hopkins-approved study that exposed children to lead dust. <i>The Chronicle of Higher Education</i>, p. A32. (Oncourse)</p> <p>Kahn, J.P., & Mastroianni, A. (2002, February 15). Doing research well by doing right. <i>The Chronicle of Higher Education</i>, p. B24. (Oncourse)</p> <p>Brody, W.R. (2002, March 15). Research on children and lead [Letter to the editor]. <i>The Chronicle of Higher Education</i>, p. B18. (Oncourse)</p> <p>Protection of Human Subjects in Research at IU: http://www.indiana.edu/~rcr/files/hspt.pdf</p> <p>After reading the manual, please test your knowledge: https://www.indiana.edu/~rcr/</p>
16	March 5 th (W)	<p>Topics: Qualitative (e.g., observational, focus group, and ethnographic) data vs. Quantitative (e.g. administrative) data</p> <p>Required Readings: Greiner, J.M. (2004). Trained observer ratings. In J.S. Wholey, H.P. Hatry, & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i>. (pp. 211-256). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (Oncourse)</p> <p>Krueger, R.A., & Casey, M.A. (1994). <i>Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research</i> (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Chapter 2. (Oncourse)</p> <p>Salo, M.T., & Campanelli, P.C. (1991). Ethnographic methods in the development of census procedures for enumerating the homeless. <i>Urban Anthropology</i>, 20(2), 127-140. (Oncourse)</p> <p>Hatry, H.P. (2004). Using agency records. In J.S. Wholey, H.P. Hatry, & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i>. (pp. 396-411). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (Oncourse)</p>
17	March 10 th (M)	<p>Topics: Survey design and data collection</p> <p>Required Readings: Langbein, L.I., & Felbinger, C.L. (2006). <i>Public program evaluation: A statistical guide</i>. London: M.E. Sharpe. Chapter 8. (Oncourse)</p> <p>Fowler Jr., F.J., & Cosenza, C. (2008). Writing effective questions. In E.D. de Leeuw, J.J. Hox, & D.A. Dillman (Eds.), <i>International Handbook of</i></p>

		<i>Survey Methodology</i> . (pp. 136-160). Lawrence Erlbaum. (Oncourse)
18	March 12 th (W)	Topics: Sampling and power analysis Required Readings: Murnane, R.J., & Willett, J.B. (2011). <i>Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research</i> . New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 6.
19	March 17 th (M)	No Class: Spring Recess
20	March 19 th (W)	No Class: Spring Recess
21	March 24 th (M)	Topics: In-class power analysis workshop Assignments: Bring laptop to class if you have one (Unfortunately, Macs are not compatible with the software we will use. Please bring a PC laptop if you have one.)
Unit 3: Quasi-Experimental Methods		
22	March 26 th (W)	Topics: Difference-in-differences Required Readings: Murnane, R.J., & Willett, J.B. (2011). <i>Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research</i> . New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 8, pp. 141-164. Dynarski, S.M. (2003). Does aid matter? Measuring the effect of student aid on college attendance and completion. <i>The American Economic Review</i> . 3(1):279-288. (Oncourse) Assignment: Evaluation Critique due
23	March 31 st (M)	Topics: Regression discontinuity design Required Readings: Murnane, R.J., & Willett, J.B. (2011). <i>Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research</i> . New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 9, pp. 165-202. Niu, S.X., & Tienda, M. (2010). The impact of the Texas top 10% law on college enrollment: A regression discontinuity approach. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i> , 29(1), 84-110. (Oncourse)
24	April 2 nd (W)	Topics: Instrumental variables Required Readings: Murnane, R.J., & Willett, J.B. (2011). <i>Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research</i> . New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 10. Angrist, J.D., & Evans, W.N. (1998). Children and their parents' labor supply: Evidence from exogenous variation in family size. <i>The American Economic Review</i> , 88(3), 450-477. (Oncourse)
25	April 7 th (M)	Topics: Propensity score matching

		<p>Required Readings: Dehejia, R.H., & Wahba, S. (2002). Propensity score matching methods for non-experimental causal studies. <i>The Review of Economics and Statistics</i>, 84(1), 151-161. (Oncourse)</p> <p>Wilde, E.T., & Hollister, R. (2007). How close is close enough? Evaluating propensity score matching using data from a class size reduction experiment. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 26(3), 455-477. (SEPEPP pp. 65-91)</p>
26	April 9 th (W)	<p>Topics: How well do quasi-experimental methods perform? Midterm 2 review</p> <p>Required Readings: Cook, T.D., Shadish, W.R., & Wong, V.C. (2008). Three conditions under which experiments and observational studies produce comparable causal estimates: New findings from within-study comparisons. <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 27(4), 724-750. (SEPEPP pp. 92-118)</p> <p>Greenberg, D.H., Michalopoulos, C., & Robins, P.K. (2006). Do experimental and nonexperimental evaluations give different answers about the effectiveness of government-funded training programs? <i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>, 25(3), 523-552. (SEPEPP pp. 37-64)</p> <p>Assignments: Evaluation proposal due</p>
27	April 14 th (M)	In-class Midterm 2
28	April 16 th (W)	Class wrap-up, work/study session
	April 18 th (F)	Assignments: Evaluation proposal review and presentations due
29	April 21 st (M)	Final in-class presentations
30	April 23 rd (W)	Final in-class presentations
31	April 28 th (M)	Final in-class presentations
32	April 30 th (W)	Final in-class presentations