

**SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
PUBP 713 POLICY AND PROGRAM EVALUATION**

SPRING 2007

Prof. David Armor
Finley 201B
Email: darmor@gmu.edu

Monday 4:30-7:10 pm

Office Hours: Arlington Mon 2-4; Fairfax Tues/Wed 1-4
Finley: 703-993-2260

Arlington 335

Home office: 540-937-3581

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The purpose of policy and program evaluation is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of public policies and programs through the evaluation process. As such, evaluation can be seen as a major tool for policy decisions. This course examines the many facets of the evaluation process: types of evaluations, the range of evaluation strategies, specific methodologies for evaluation, and the issue of values and maintaining objectivity. The lectures and readings include both theoretical and methodological issues, with an emphasis on evaluation designs and case studies of actual program evaluations in a variety of policy areas.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The course requirements include class discussions of readings, two midterm exams, and a paper (12-15 pages). Students are also required to make two presentations: one summarizing and critiquing an assigned evaluation study, and one presenting an outline of their paper. The topic of the final paper is the student's choice, but it must be a critical analysis of a policy or program evaluation of some type going beyond the class readings.

The final grade will be based on the following weights given to each requirement as follows:

Class discussions and presentations	30%
Midterm exams	40% (20% each)
Final paper	30%

REQUIRED BOOKS

Rossi, Peter H., Mark W. Lipsey, and Howard E. Freeman, *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*, 7th edition, Thousand Oaks, CA:, Sage Publications, 2004

(Note that the book must be the 7th edition)

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966

Other required readings will be selected book chapters and journal articles, including evaluation case studies. Most of these will be made available to the class on a CD-ROM.

OTHER COURSE POLICIES: see page 6

LECTURE TOPICS & READINGS

Week 1 Jan 22 COURSE INTRODUCTION; THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Purpose of the course; review of requirements; expectations for papers and exams; and introduction to the evaluation process.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al, Chapter 1: Overview of Program Evaluation

Cochran, Charles L., *Public Policy: Perspectives and Choices*, Chapter 2 (Methods & Models for Policy Analysis)

Week 2 Jan 29 THE POLITICAL & SOCIAL CONTEXT OF EVALUATION

Evaluation takes place in political and social environments which help shape and guide the evaluation process, with both positive and negative influences.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al., Chapter 12: The Social Context of Evaluation

Chelimsky, Eleanor, and William R. Shadish (eds.), *Evaluation for the 21st Century: A Handbook*, chapter 3 (The Political Environment of Evaluation)

Week 3 Feb 5 USES OF EVALUATION; CONCEPTUALIZING AN EVALUATION

Types of evaluations; limits of evaluation; tailoring evaluations; resources available for the evaluation; policy issues and questions to be addressed; constraints.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al., chapters 2 and 3: Tailoring Evaluations; Identifying Issues and Questions

Chelimsky, Eleanor, and William R. Shadish (eds.), *Evaluation for the 21st Century: A Handbook*, Chapter 1 (The coming transformations in evaluation) and Chapter 2 (Lessons Learned in Evaluation over the Past 25 Years)

Week 4 Feb 12 INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH DESIGNS

Evaluation studies can utilize a great variety of quantitative and qualitative techniques, often both, depending on the specific aims of the evaluation. The range of research designs and a description of major techniques used in evaluation research are reviewed and explained.

Required readings:

Campbell and Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research* (1966) (selected sections)

Greenberg, David, and Philip Robins. "The Changing Role of Social Experiments in Policy Analysis." *Evaluation Studies Review Annual*, edited by Linda H. Aiken and Barbara H. Kehrer, 19-48. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1985.

Week 5 Feb 19 REVIEW OF STATISTICAL ISSUES IN EVALUATION

Quantitative evaluations rely on statistical techniques and analysis; this section is a refresher review of the major statistics used in program evaluations.

Required readings:

Handout provided by Prof. Armor

Review PUBP 704 statistics textbook or any comparable graduate-level statistics text as needed

Week 6 Feb 26 PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM THEORY

Before a program can be evaluated, its objectives must be clearly articulated, including its theoretical assumptions. Lack of clear objectives is a major barrier to good evaluations, since many governmental programs in the United States lack a clear purpose or a clear rationale.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al., chapters 4 and 5: Need for a Program; Assessing Program Theory

Poulin, Mary E., Philip W. Harris, and Peter R. Jones. "The Significance of Definitions of Success in Program Evaluation." *Evaluation Review* 24, no. 5 (2000): 516-36.

Birckmayer, Johanna D., and Carol Hirschon Weiss. "Theory-Based Evaluation in Practice." *Evaluation Review* 24, no. 4 (2000): 407-31.

FIRST MIDTERM

Week 7 Mar 5 PROCESS EVALUATION AND PROGRAM MONITORING

The extent of a program's impact can be affected by how well it is implemented. Evaluating the adequacy of a program's implementation is called "process" evaluation, and a process evaluation often includes program monitoring.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al., chapters 6 and 7: Assessing and Monitoring Program Process; Measuring and Monitoring Program Outcomes

Forsetlund, Louise, et al, "Many a Slip between Cup and Lip: Process Evaluation of a Program to Promote and Support Evidence-Based Public Health Practice." *Evaluation Review* 27, no. 2 (2003): 179-209.

Wholey, Joseph S., and Harry P. Hatry. "The Case for Performance Monitoring." *Public Administration Review* 52, no. 6 (1992): 604-10.

Armor, David J., et al, *Alcoholism and Treatment*, New York: Wiley (1978) chapter 4: 78-112

Week 8 March 12 SPRING RECESS

Weeks 9 March 19 EVALUATING PROGRAM IMPACT I

The heart of program evaluation is “impact assessment,” which investigates whether the policy or program is having the desired effect. Impact assessment employs a range of research designs, the most rigorous of which is randomized field experiments.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al., chapter 8: Assessing program impact: randomized field experiments

Health Policy: National Health Insurance Experiment

Newhouse, Joseph P., "Some Interim Results from a Controlled Trial of Cost Sharing in Health Insurance." *Evaluation Studies Review Annual*, edited by Linda H. Aiken and Barbara H. Kehrer, 49-80. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1985.

Brook, Robert H., et al, "The Effect of Coinsurance on the Health of Adults: Results from the Rand Health Insurance Experiment." *Evaluation Studies Review Annual*, edited by Linda H. Aiken and Barbara H. Kehrer, 81-118. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1985.

Week 10 March 26 EVALUATING PROGRAM IMPACT II

Required readings:

Welfare Policy: Negative Income Tax Experiment

Skidmore, Felicity. "Overview of the Seattle-Denver Income Maintenance Experiment Final Report." *Evaluation Studies Review Annual*, edited by Linda H. Aiken and Barbara H. Kehrer, 297-326. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1985.

Education Policy: Tennessee Star Study of Class Size

Finn, Jeremy D. and Charles M. Achilles, Tennessee’s Class Size Study: Findings, Implications, Misconceptions, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 21(2): 97-109 (1999)

Hanushek, Eric, “Some Findings from an Independent Investigation of the Tennessee STAR Experiment,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 21(2): 143-163 (1999)

Week 11 April 2 EVALUATING PROGRAM IMPACT III

Randomized experiments are very costly and not feasible for some programs; alternative research designs, especially quasi-experimental designs, are common.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al., chapter 9 (Assessing program impact: alternative designs)

Military Manpower Policy: Enlistment Bonus Experiment

Segal, David R. "Chapter 2: Changes in United States Military Manpower Policy." In *Recruiting for Uncle Sam: Citizenship and Military Manpower Policy*, 17-44. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1989.

Polich, J. Michael, James N. Dertouzos, and S. James Press. *The Enlistment Bonus Experiment*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1986.

Week 12 April 9 EVALUATING PROGRAM IMPACT IV

Required readings:

Drug Abuse Policy: Effectiveness of the DARE Prevention Program

Clayton, Richard R., et al, "Effectiveness of Project DARE," *Preventive Medicine* 25:307-318 (1996)

Civil Rights Policy: Impact of School Busing

Armor, David J. "The Evidence on Busing." *The Great School Bus Controversy*, edited by Nicolaus Mills, 81-122. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973.

Armor, David J. "Chapter 1: Desegregation Policy and the Law." In *Forced Justice: School Desegregation and the Law*, 17-58. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

SECOND MIDTERM EXAM

Week 13 April 16 EVALUATING PROGRAM IMPACT V

Additional issues in assessing program effects: variations in program effects, conditional effects, meta analyses, etc.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al., chapter 10 (Detecting, Interpreting, and analyzing program effects)

Transportation Policy: Airline Deregulation

Kahn, Alfred E. "Surprises of Airline Deregulation." *The American Economic Review* 78, no. 2: Papers and Proceedings of the One-Hundredth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (1988): 316-22.

Oum, Tae Hoon, and Chanyun Yu. "A Productivity Comparison of the World's Major Airlines." *Journal of Air Transport Management* 2, no. 3/4 (1995): 181-95.

Trade Policy: Patent Protection

Lanjouw, Jean O. "New Pills for Poor People? Empirical Evidence after Gatt." *World Development* 29, no. 2 (2001): 265-89.

Mental Health Policy: Meta-analysis of Therapy Outcomes

Lipsey, Mark W., and David B. Wilson. "The Efficacy of Psychological, Educational, and Behavioral Treatment: Confirmation from Meta-Analysis." *American Psychologist* 48, no. 12 (1993): 1181-1209.

Week 14 April 23 EVALUATING PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS

Whereas impact assessment is particularly important for new programs whose value is not yet established, cost-benefit analysis can be important for programs in full-scale deployment.

Required readings:

Rossi, et al., chapter 11 (Measuring efficiency)

Levin, Henry, "Cost Effectiveness and Educational Policy," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 10(1):51-69 (1988)

Loeb, Peter D., and Benjamin Gilad. "The Efficacy and Cost-Effectiveness of Vehicle Inspection: A State Specific Analysis Using Time Series Data." *Evaluation Studies Review Annual: Volume 10*, edited by Linda H. Aiken and Barbara H. Kehrer, 479-98. Beverly Hills, CA, 1985.

Klein, Stephen P., Harry M. Bohannon, Robert M. Bell, Judith A. Disney, Craig B. Foch, and Richard C. Graves. "The Cost and Effectiveness of School-Based Preventive Dental Care." *Evaluation Studies Review Annual: Volume 10*, edited by Linda H. Aiken and Barbara H. Kehrer, 182-200. Beverly Hills, CA, 1985.

Session 15 April 30 STUDENT PRESENTATIONS OF DRAFT PAPERS

ADDITIONAL COURSE POLICIES

Outstanding papers: I will consider nominating the very best papers in this course for publication in *New Voices in Public Policy*. *New Voices* is a student- and faculty-reviewed journal that shares SPP's finest student work with the rest of the world.

Special needs of students: If you are a student with a disability and you need academic accommodations, please see me and contact the Disability Resource Center (DRC) at 993-2474. All academic accommodations must be arranged through the DRC.

SPP policy on plagiarism: The profession of scholarship and the intellectual life of a university as well as the field of public policy inquiry depend fundamentally on a foundation of trust. Thus any act of plagiarism strikes at the heart of the meaning of the university and the purpose of the School of Public Policy. It constitutes a serious breach of professional ethics and it is unacceptable.

Plagiarism is the use of another's words or ideas presented as one's own. It includes, among other things, the use of specific words, ideas, or frameworks that are the product of another's work. Honesty and thoroughness in citing sources is essential to professional accountability and personal responsibility. Appropriate citation is necessary so that arguments, evidence, and claims can be critically examined.

Plagiarism is wrong because of the injustice it does to the person whose ideas are stolen. But it is also wrong because it constitutes lying to one's professional colleagues. From a prudential perspective, it is shortsighted and self-defeating, and it can ruin a professional career.

The faculty of the School of Public Policy takes plagiarism seriously and has adopted a zero tolerance policy. Any plagiarized assignment will receive an automatic grade of "F." This may lead to failure for the course, resulting in dismissal from the University. This dismissal will be noted on the student's transcript. For foreign students who are on a university-sponsored visa (eg. F-1, J-1 or J-2), dismissal also results in the revocation of their visa.

To help enforce the SPP policy on plagiarism, all written work submitted in partial fulfillment of course or degree requirements must be available in electronic form so that it can be compared with electronic databases, as well as submitted to commercial services to which the School subscribes. Faculty may at any time submit student's work without prior permission from the student. Individual instructors may require that written work be submitted in electronic as well as printed form. The SPP policy on plagiarism is supplementary to the George Mason University Honor Code; it is not intended to replace it or substitute for it.