

9/6/2011

**PA 871—PUBLIC PROGRAM EVALUATION**  
La Follette School of Public Affairs  
Fall 2011

Wed 3:30PM - 5:25PM Social Science 5231

*Professor*

Karen C. Holden  
4407 William Sewell Social Science Bld  
PHONE: 263-9283

E-MAIL: [kcholden@wisc.edu](mailto:kcholden@wisc.edu)

Office Hours: T 2:00 – 3:00 or by appointment (best to check)

**Prerequisites:** Grad status & Pub Affairs 818 or equivalent and some background in public policy.

Students with disabilities who foresee the need for accommodation or those with known conflicts with any course session should see me during the first two weeks of classes.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

This course studies strategies for evaluating the efficacy of public programs. Classical study of statistics generally takes the data as given and focuses on inferences that can be made from a given data set. In contrast, this course will spend a substantial amount of time studying *how* to effectively design program evaluations, including the collection of statistics, and how to interpret quantitative results. Major issues examined are:

- reasons for and uses of public program evaluation activities.
- relationship between program theory and evaluation design.
- statistical techniques, including importance of statistical power and effect size, in evaluation research.
- relative advantages of experimental and quasi-experimental designs.
- understanding limits to causal inference.

There are many good books on program evaluation in general and for specific fields. There is a large literature scattered in specific evaluation as well as “field” journals. Look for the literature relevant to your interests. A lot of program evaluations are available as program reports from policy shops such as MDRC, Urban Institute, Abt Associates.

**Textbooks:**

*Required:*

Shadish, Cook and Campbell (2002). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference. Houghton Mifflin. (henceforth SCC)

Available on line:

Judy L. Baker, (2000) Evaluating the Impact of Development Projects on Poverty: Handbook for Practitioners, World Bank. Available on line at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTISPM/Resources/handbook.pdf> (henceforth JLB)

Nearly all of the other required readings are available on line and the class web site.

*Highly recommended* for those who will be working on or with evaluations:

Langbein and Felbinger (2006). Public Program Evaluation: A Statistical Guide. M.E. Sharpe

Mark Lipsey (1990). Design Sensitivity: Statistical Power for Experimental Research. Sage.

Richard Berk and Peter H. Rossi. (latest edition) Thinking About Program Evaluation. Sage Publication.  
Sage University Papers: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. (Very useful series to look at for methods)

*Evaluation associations:*

American Evaluation Association is “an international professional association of evaluators devoted to the application and exploration of program evaluation, personnel evaluation, technology, and many other forms of evaluation.” <http://www.eval.org/> It sponsors two publications:

New Directions for Evaluation. A quarterly sourcebook series which publishes empirical, methodological, and theoretical works on all aspects of evaluation. Each issue of the journal is devoted to a single topic. See series titles at: <http://www.josseybass.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-155510.html>

American Journal of Evaluation, is the official refereed journal of the American Evaluation Association and publishes papers about the methods, theory, practice, and findings of evaluation. Published four times a year. <http://aje.sagepub.com/>

The International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation is “a loose alliance of regional and national evaluation organizations from around the world that collaborate to: build evaluation leadership and capacity in developing countries, foster the cross-fertilisation of evaluation theory and practice around the world, address international challenges in evaluation, and assist the evaluation profession to take a more global approach to contributing to the identification and solution of world problems. (<http://ioce.net/index.shtml>)

9/6/2011

Check out the Campbell Collaborative at <http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/> and

Other international evaluation societies at: <http://www.policy-evaluation.org/>

**Course Requirements and Grading:** This is a rough guide to the weighting of the work in this course. Grades reflect overall performance and, though not given arbitrarily, A's are given to individuals who evidence comprehension, participation, cooperation, and good writing.

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Reading questions and discussion              | 10% |
| 2. Group project: program evaluation design/plan |     |
| a. Incremental paper parts (4 at 5% each)        | 20% |
| b. Final paper                                   | 30% |
| 3. Evaluation critique (2 at 20% each)           | 40% |

#### ***Class Participation (including item 1)***

Class participation is important to the student's own learning experience as well as that of other students. Thus, class participation is encouraged, required, and rewarded. Your attendance is expected as is your participation in class discussions.

The size of the class means that much of the work will be done in pairs or groups—but just like policy work! There are several small and large group collaborative assignments.

First, each student will have responsibility for working with one other student in constructing a reading guide to an assigned reading. The reading guide is expected to very briefly summarize the key purpose of the study followed by key questions for class discussion and clarification. Questions should be sent to the class no later than noon the Monday prior to class (earlier if possible). These are to be sent to the class email list (which includes me) at: [pubaffr871-1-f11@lists.wisc.edu](mailto:pubaffr871-1-f11@lists.wisc.edu)

The guide is designed both to assist readers in identifying key design issues and decision and to pose questions about aspects of the evaluation that are difficult to understand, either conceptually (e.g., "why is this important?") or technically (e.g., "I don't understand what defines...or how this process resolves ...issue.").

Readings have been selected from a large but varied evaluation literature. If there are particular areas or articles you would like to have the class read and discuss, I am open to suggested substitutions or searches for specific program articles. Readings have been selected to illustrate methodological issues and application evaluation to particular areas.

#### ***Group Evaluation project (Item 2)***

The presumption is that students in this course are interested in thinking about and applying their analytical skills to an actual program evaluation. A large part of the course requires your applying program evaluation principles to a project which can be either the design of an evaluation or critique of a large-scale evaluation. Students must work in groups on projects. Projects will be chosen during the first weeks of class. I have identified projects with state or local agencies. Students may propose their own either because they are associated with a program through work or study—but they still must work with other students. The project may be one that has one or several completed evaluations, a program that some agency would like evaluated, and/or an area in which you are curious about an evaluation. The project is partly design, partly critique of the ability to conduct an evaluation using alternative designs. The paper will be constructed out of several assignments (item 1a) handed in during the semester, critiqued, and revised as they are put together for a final product (item 1c). That means your paper will touch on most areas discussed in this course: program goals and theory, expected effect size, pros and cons of random assignment and one or more specific quasi-experimental designs.

**By September 23** everyone must have emailed me their top three choices with reasons for choosing those. I will want a description of why any of these projects would be something you want to work on—specific skills, area of concentration, or simple curiosity. Because this is a large class, I would ask you to list your top three choices among available projects or your own selection. Note that ALL projects must be worked on by 3-5 individuals even if of your own selection. In the real world that is how evaluation happens. The group project work will progress through the "Group Evaluation Project Assignments." These are short (no more than 5 pages) addressing a particular design or analysis issue. .

#### ***Homework assignments (Item 3)***

You will be given an article or evaluation report to critique, using the concepts you have learned up to that point in the course. Questions will include ones on design, analysis and conclusions. You may discuss the assignment with others in the class. The final written critique must be your own work.

COURSE OUTLINE AND READINGS (subject to change, except for work due dates).

1. September 7—*Introduction: Course overview, program evaluation introduction, organizations*
  - a. *Guiding Principles for Evaluators* at <http://www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciples.asp>
  - b. Michael Bamberger, "The Evaluation of International Development Programs: A View From the Front," *American Journal of Evaluation* 21 (1), 2000: [http://www.stes-apes.med.ulg.ac.be/Documents\\_electroniques/EVA/EVA-PROG/ELE%20EVA-PROG%207530.pdf](http://www.stes-apes.med.ulg.ac.be/Documents_electroniques/EVA/EVA-PROG/ELE%20EVA-PROG%207530.pdf)
2. September 14- *Evaluation Design: when to start and stop an evaluation*  
SCC, Chapter 1 (pp 1-26); JLB: Chapter 1 & 2
  - a. "Risks and Benefits of Estrogen Plus Progestin in Healthy Postmenopausal Women Principal Results From the Women's Health Initiative Randomized Controlled Trial," by Writing Group for the Women's Health Initiative Investigator *Journals of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 288, No. 3, July 17, 2002, p. 321-333. Found at: <http://jama.ama-assn.org/content/288/3/321.full.pdf+html>
  - b. Richard King et al. *Final Report on a Formative Evaluation of the First Year of a Project from for Neighborhood Aftercare: A School-Based After Care Program*. <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cerm/Neighborhood.pdf>
  - c. Karen Holden and Arthur Reynolds. "Process evaluation for state welfare reforms" *FOCUS*, Vol. 18:3, Spring 1997. <http://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc183.pdf#page=48>

9/6/2011

DUE SEPTEMBER 12 : email information on background (e.g., degree program, year), relevant experience, areas of program interests, potential (type of or areas of) specific project interest.

3. September 21: *Causal Inference: Validity: correlation versus causation, causality and the "missing counterfactual", treatment effects, types of program evaluations, performance evaluation and measurement*  
SCC, Chapter 2 & 3;
  - a. Mark Lipsey. (1996) "Key Issues in Intervention Research." *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 29:298-302  
[http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0274\(199604\)29:4%3C298::AID-AJIM4%3E3.0.CO;2-L/pdf](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0274(199604)29:4%3C298::AID-AJIM4%3E3.0.CO;2-L/pdf)
  - b. Paul W. Holland. 1986. Statistics and Causal Inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 81, No. 396: pp. 945-960.  
<http://kisi.deu.edu.tr/sedef.akangor/Microeconomic%20Theory%201%20Fallm2009/holland.pdf>
  - c. \*James Kemple (2008). "Career Academies: Long-term impacts on Labor Market Outcomes, Educational Attainment, and Transitions to Adulthood." <http://www.mdrc.org/publications/482/full.pdf>
  - d. \*William N. Evans, Matthew C. Farrelly and Edward Montgomery. "Do Workplace Smoking Bans Reduce Smoking?" *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 89, No. 4 (Sep., 1999), pp. 728-747 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/117157>

DUE: September 23 by 3:00 p.m.: Send (1) selection of project and (2) preferred paper discussion to me at: [kcholden@wisc.edu](mailto:kcholden@wisc.edu)

4. September 28– *Impact Assessment: Experimental Design: When randomized assignment is feasible, types of randomized experimental designs, basic statistical methodology, threats to validity and solutions, attrition*  
SSC. Chapters 8, 10 (pp. 323-340)
  - a. \*Robert A. Moffitt 2004. "The Role of Randomized Field Trials in Social Science Research: A Perspective from Evaluations of Reforms of Social Welfare Programs" *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 47 No. 5, January 2004 506-540).  
[http://www.econ.jhu.edu/People/Moffitt/yale\\_isps.pdf](http://www.econ.jhu.edu/People/Moffitt/yale_isps.pdf)
  - b. \* L. A. Gennetian and V. Knox. "The effects of a Minnesota Welfare Reform Program on marital stability six years later." *Population Research and Policy Review* 23: 567–593, 2004 <http://www.springerlink.com/content/gp2377645451g374/fulltext.pdf> Full Project Report: Lisa A. Gennetian 2003 The Long-Term Effects of the Minnesota Family Investment Program on Marriage and Divorce Among Two-Parent Families MDRC <http://www.mdrc.org/publications/357/full.pdf>
  - c. \*Esther Duflo, W. Gale, J. Liebman, P. Orszag and E. Saez. 2006. Saving Incentives for Low and Middle-Income Families: Evidence from a Field Experiment with H&R Block. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, November 2006: 1311 – 1346: [http://elsa.berkeley.edu/~saez/duflo-gale-liebman-orszag-saezQJE06block\\_small](http://elsa.berkeley.edu/~saez/duflo-gale-liebman-orszag-saezQJE06block_small).  
Full report at: [http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/papers/2005/05saving\\_duflo/20050509galeorszag.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/papers/2005/05saving_duflo/20050509galeorszag.pdf)
  - d. \*Gregory Mills et al. 2005. Effects of Individual Development Accounts on Household Saving behavior: Evidence from a Controlled Experiment. [http://emlab.berkeley.edu/users/webfac/auerbach/e231\\_sp05/gale.pdf#search=abt%20associates%20ADD%20evaluation](http://emlab.berkeley.edu/users/webfac/auerbach/e231_sp05/gale.pdf#search=abt%20associates%20ADD%20evaluation)
  - e. \* Susan W. Parker and Graciela M. Teruel (2005) "Randomization and Social Program Evaluation: The Case of Progresa" *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2005 599: 199 <http://ann.sagepub.com/content/599/1/199.full.pdf+html>
5. October 5: *Randomized Experimental Designs: Standards of experimentation on human subjects*  
Visitor: Lillian Larson, Director of Education and Social& Behavioral Sciences IRB, Office of Research Services, READINGS: SCC Chapter 9
  - a. Readings on IRB Guidelines and HIPAA Privacy Rules TBA:
  - b. There is a short summary of the IRB-relevance of HIPAA at <http://www.wisc.edu/hipaa/ResearchGuide/overview.html>
  - c. Reread: *Guiding Principles for Evaluators* at <http://www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciples.asp>
  - d. \*Borman, G. (2002) Experiments for Educational Evaluation and Improvement. *Peabody Journal of Education*. 77(4):7-27 At: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/1493216.pdf?acceptTC=true>
  - e. Heckman, James and Jeffrey Smith. 1995. "Assessing the Case for Social Experiments." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9(2): 85-110. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/2138168.pdf>
  - f. Duflo, Esther and Michael Kremer. 2003. Use of Randomization in the Evaluation of Development Effectiveness. Paper prepared for the World Bank Operations Evaluation Department (OED) Conference on Evaluation and Development Effectiveness, Washington, DC. At: <http://econ-www.mit.edu/files/765>
6. October 12: – *Finishing up on RFE and beginning Quasi-Experimental Designs for Causal Inference*  
SSC Chapter 4 (103-134);
  - a. \*Gary King et al. (2007) "A "Politically Robust" Experimental Design for Public Policy Evaluation, with Application to the Mexican Universal Health Insurance Program." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 26(3):479-506. <http://gking.harvard.edu/files/spd.pdf>
  - b. \*Christopher D. Maxwell, Joel H. Garner, and Jeffrey A. Fagan 2001 "The Effects of Arrest on Intimate Partner Violence: New Evidence From the Spouse Assault Replication Program." *National Institutes of Justice, Research In Brief* URL: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/188199.pdf>
  - c. \*Heckman, J.J., Moon, S.H., Pinto, R., and Savelyev, P.A. and A. Yavitz. 2010. The rate of return to the HighScope Perry Preschool Program. *Journal of Public Economics* 94 (1-2): 114-128 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047272709001418>

DUE OCTOBER 12: Group Project Assignment #1

7. October 19: – Karen FASTER: how to write effective evaluation reports  
*Quasi-Experimental Designs for Causal Inference*  
A cookbook of designs: time-series and cross-section designs, designs with and without pretest observations, threats to validity and solutions  
SSC chapter 5 (135-170); chapter 6;
  - a. \*Howard Bloom. *Building a Convincing Test of a Public Housing Employment Program Using Non-experimental Methods: Planning for the Jobs-Plus Demonstration*. MDRC working paper. <http://www.mdrc.org/publications/78/full.pdf>
  - b. Gene V Glass. 1997. Interrupted Time Series Quasi-Experiments. <http://www.gvglass.info/papers/tsx.pdf>
  - c. Ferdinando Regalia (1999). Poverty & Inequality Technical Notes, "Impact Evaluation Methods for Social Programs." Inter-American Development Bank, Technical Note 2 (<http://www.iadb.org/sds/doc/TechNote2.pdf>)
8. October 26: Non-Experimental Designs  
Basic regression model: assumptions and inference, implementing useful controls, regression discontinuity designs, interpreting non-experimental results

9/6/2011

SCC Chapter 7;

- a. \*Ted Joyce and Cristina Yunzal (2007). "Does Greater Exposure to WIC Affect Maternal Behavior and Improve Infant Health? Evidence from the Pregnancy Nutrition Surveillance System." Institute for Research on Poverty Discussion Paper no. 1323-07. accessible at: <http://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/dps/pdfs/dp132307.pdf>
  - b. \*David N. Figlio. 1995. "The effect of drinking age laws and alcohol-related crashes: Time-series evidence from Wisconsin." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Volume 14, Issue 4: 555-566. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781444307399.ch18/pdf>
  - c. \*Jens Ludwig & Douglas L Miller. 2007. Does Head Start Improve Children's Life Chances? Evidence from a Regression Discontinuity Design. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(1), pages 159-208. <http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/122/1/159.full.pdf+html>
9. November 2: Strategies for increasing Power
- a. Lipsey, Mark W. 1998. Design Sensitivity: Statistical Power for Applied Experimental Research. Pp. 39-68 in *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*, L. Bickman and D.J. Rog, eds. Thousand Oaks: Sage. ([http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cerm/Design\\_Sens.pdf](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cerm/Design_Sens.pdf))
  - b. Gerring, John. 2004. What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for? *American Political Science Review*, 98, pp 341-354. <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&fid=228448&jid=PSR&volumeId=98&issueId=02&aid=228446>
  - c. Ambert, A-M., Adler, P. A., Adler, P., & Detzner, D. F. (1995). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57(4): 879-893. <http://qhr.sagepub.com/content/11/4/522.full.pdf+html>

DUE: November 2 Group Project Assignment #2

10. November 9 & 16: (division by week TBA)
- SCC Chapter 6&7 and pp. 64-82; JLB: Chapter 3 (skim 4 more closely if interested in development program evaluation)
- a. \*Elizabeth Ty Wilde and Robinson Hollister (2007) How close is close enough? Evaluating propensity score matching using data from a class size reduction experiment. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 2007, vol. 26, issue 3, pages 455-477
  - b. Ravallion, Martin. 2001. "The Mystery of the Vanishing Benefits: An Introduction to Impact Evaluation." *World Bank Economic Review* 15(1): 115-140. (<http://wber.oxfordjournals.org/content/15/1/115.full.pdf>)
  - c. Martin Ravallion (2007) "Evaluating Anti-Poverty Programs." *Handbook of Development Economics Volume 4*, Pages 3787-3846 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1573447107040594>
  - d. \*Rachel E. Dunifon and Lori Kowaleski-Jones (2004). "Exploring the Influence of the National School Lunch Program on Children." Institute for Research on Poverty Discussion Paper <http://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/dps/pdfs/dp127704.pdf>
  - e. \*Shaohua Chen and Martin Ravallion (2005). "Hidden Impact? Ex-Post Evaluation of an Anti-Poverty Program." Washington D.C.: Development Research Group, World Bank. [http://econ.worldbank.org/files/26554\\_wps3049.pdf](http://econ.worldbank.org/files/26554_wps3049.pdf)
  - f. E. Gershoff, J. L. Aber, J. Brown, S. Pedersen, S. Jones; 2003 "Changing Children's Trajectories of Development: Two-Year Evidence for the Effectiveness of a School-based Approach to Violence Prevention." New York: National Center for Children in Poverty. [http://www.nccp.org/publications/pdf/text\\_554.pdf](http://www.nccp.org/publications/pdf/text_554.pdf)

DUE November 9: Evaluation Critique #1.

11. November 23-30—Meta-analysis (Division of reading TBA)
- SCC Chapters 12 and 13;
- a. Mark W. Lipsey. 1997. "What Can You Build with Thousands of Bricks? Musings on the Cumulation of Knowledge in Program Evaluation." *New Directions for Evaluation*, 1997, 76, 7-24. [http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cerm/Thousand\\_bricks.pdf](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cerm/Thousand_bricks.pdf)
  - a. Sandra Jo Wilson and Mark W. Lipsey, 2007. "School-Based Interventions for Aggressive and Disruptive Behavior: Update of a Meta-Analysis." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 2007;33(2S) 0749-3797 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S074937970700236X>
  - b. Mark W. Lipsey. Re: Unsolved problems and unfinished business. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 2001, 22(3), 325-328. [http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cerm/AJE\\_Future.pdf](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cerm/AJE_Future.pdf)
  - c. \*Borman, G.D., & D'Agostino, J.V. (1996). Title I and student achievement: A meta-analysis of federal evaluation results. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18, 309-326.
  - d. \*Jerome V. D'Agostino and Judith A. Murphy, A Meta-Analysis of Reading Recovery in United States Schools *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 2004; 26; 23 <http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/26/1/23>
  - e. \*David Greenberg, Andreas Cebulla, & Stacey Bouche, 2006. Report on a Meta-Analysis of Welfare-to-Work Programs Institute for Research on Poverty Discussion Paper no. 1312-05 Accessed at: <http://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/dps/pdfs/dp131205.pdf>
  - f. \* Puerto, Olga S Labor Market Impact on Youth: A metaanalysis of the Youth Employment Inventory. [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLM/Resources/390041-1188243960961/YEI\\_MetaAnalysis\\_rev0711.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLM/Resources/390041-1188243960961/YEI_MetaAnalysis_rev0711.pdf)
  - g. \* Thomas Clasen. Interventions to improve water quality for preventing diarrhoea: systematic review and meta-analysis *BMJ* 2007;334:782 <http://www.bmj.com/content/334/7597/782.full.pdf>
  - h. Card, David, Jochen Kluge, and Andrea Weber. 2010. "Active Labor Market Policy Evaluations: A Meta-Analysis." *The Economic Journal* Volume 120, Issue 548, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2010.02387.x/pdf>
  - i. Metaevaluation Standard Statements of the JCSEE at: <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc/>

DUE: November 23: Group Project Assignment #3 (feedback provided November 28)

12. November 30: DUE: Group Project Assignment #4
13. December 7 and 14 (last class) Project reports:

DUE: December 9: Evaluation Critique #2

14. **December 15** -- Final Paper Due

9/6/2011

\*\*\*\*\*

SUMMARY OF CLASSES DATES

COURSE OUTLINE AND READINGS (subject to change, except for work due dates).

September 7—*Introduction: Course overview, program evaluation introduction, organizations*

September 14— *Evaluation Design: when to start and stop an evaluation*

DUE SEPTEMBER 12 : email information on background (e.g., degree program, year), relevant experience, areas of program interests, potential (type of or areas of) specific project interest.

September 21: *Causal Inference: Validity: correlation versus causation, causality and the “missing counterfactual”, treatment effects, types of program evaluations, performance evaluation and measurement*

DUE: September 23 by 3:00 p.m.: Send (1) selection of project and (2) preferred paper discussion to me at: [kcholden@wisc.edu](mailto:kcholden@wisc.edu)

September 28— *Impact Assessment: Experimental Design: When randomized assignment is feasible, types of randomized experimental designs, basic statistical methodology, threats to validity and solutions, attrition*

October 5: *Randomized Experimental Designs: Standards of experimentation on human subjects*

October 12: – *Finishing up on RFE and beginning Quasi-Experimental Designs for Causal Inference*

DUE OCTOBER 12: Group Project Assignment #1

October 19: – *How to write effective evaluation reports and more about evaluation*

October 26: *Non-Experimental Designs*

November 2: *Strategies for increasing Power*

DUE: November 2 Group Project Assignment #2

November 9 & 16: *Continuing with non-experimental designs*

DUE November 9: Evaluation Critique #1.

November 23-30—*Meta-analysis*

DUE: November 23: Group Project Assignment #3

DUE: November 30: Group Project Assignment #4

December 7 and 14 (last class) Project reports:

DUE: December 9: Evaluation Critique #2

December 16 -- Final Paper Due