Department of Political Science
POL7001: Public Policy Research and Evaluation
Rievschl Hall 422A
Mondays, 2:30–5:20
Fall 2012

PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Instructor
Dr. Gwen Arnold
1102 Crosley Tower
513-556-3302 (office)
arnoldgy@ucmail.uc.edu

Office Hours
Mondays, 9–11:30 a.m., or
by appointment

Overview
The course uses a program evaluation lens to examine the theory and practice of policy research. Program evaluation is often characterized as applied social science research. Its principal focus is testing causal hypotheses. Studying the ways in which that testing can occur will prompt us to examine carefully many of the challenges of public policy research design and execution. In addition to design issues, questions of measurement, analysis, and research management are relevant to the practice of public policy research and evaluation, and will receive attention in this course. We also will discuss many techniques by which you may obtain data necessary for public policy research. This course will not teach you the ins and outs of analyzing that data—you can acquire such skills in any methods course—but rather will familiarize you with the kinds of data policy analysts often use and the issues associated with acquiring and employing these data.

Objectives
This course focuses on the contemporary practice of public policy research and evaluation. Competing claims among those who wish to influence the choices of governmental and societal actors are common. Unfortunately, these claims are often made based on limited knowledge and are frequently misused in public life for particularistic ends. Examples of such claims include: "decentralizing forest management does/doesn't help to preserve forest diversity," "exclusionary zoning in suburban America does/doesn't create areas of concentrated poverty in central cities," and "civil service reform has/hasn't improved productivity of federal employees." There is evidence available relevant to each of these claims and counter-claims. Some of the evidence is reasonably well developed, some is based on folk wisdom, and some is based on pure ideology. Your training in this course will help you distinguish the sound evidence and claims from the unsound, enabling you to assess public policy research critically and intelligently. Perhaps more importantly, this course will help you to design and execute credible research of your own.

COURSE DETAILS (ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

Academic integrity
It is your responsibility to understand and comply with the University of Cincinnati Student Code of Conduct, as well as any other documented policies of the department, college, and university related to academic integrity. The Student Code of Conduct describes behavior expected of all University of

Cincinnati students and defines behavior considered misconduct, including cheating, plagiarism, and classroom disruption. The potential sanctions and penalties for misconduct are outlined in the code and will be determined on an individual basis according to the severity of the misconduct. Copies of the code may be obtained from your college office or online at http://www.uc.edu/Trustees/Rules/RuleDetail.asp?ID=184.

All of the work you submit in this course must be your own. Absolutely no cheating or plagiarism (using someone else's words or ideas without proper citation) will be tolerated. Please note that Part (B)(c)(iv) of the Student Code of Conduct indicates that plagiarism includes "submitting one's own previously written or oral work without modification and instructor permission." It may be acceptable for you to re-work substantially a previously constructed research design as your final class assignment, particularly if the design applies to thesis or dissertation work you will be pursuing. However, you must clear this re-working with me first and I must verify that you are indeed making major changes to your previous draft.

Here are some tips on how to avoid inadvertent plagiarism. They were developed by Ralph Brower at Florida State University and provided to me by Ashlyn Nelson of Indiana 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. Consult the *Chicago Manual of Style* or the *APSA Style Manual for Political Science* for guidance.

3. Material not taken verbatim from a text but paraphrased must also be attributed.

More information about plagiarism can be found at http://libraries.uc.edu/help/students/plagiarism.html. If you are uncertain about what constitutes plagiarism or about how to avoid it, please talk with me about these important issues.

Assignments
You will receive additional specific details about the course's assignments as the semester progresses. As noted below, you will submit your assignments to me online, via Blackboard, and I will return them to you electronically.

Reading responses
A reading response should be 1,000–2,000 words and should contain two main elements: a summary of the text and a critique. Sometimes you will respond to empirical articles, while other times you will respond to theoretical readings.

Concerning the empirical articles: By the end of the semester, your reading responses should generally answer the 11 following questions, with the caveat that not all questions will be applicable to all articles. At the start of the semester you will only be able to answer some of these questions because you will not have learned about the concepts central to others. Use your judgment about

which questions you can reasonably be expected to answer at a given point in the semester. If you are unclear on this point, please consult me.

1. What were the primary research question(s)?
2. What was the research design?
3. What data were gathered?
4. Were the measures used reliable and valid?
5. What statistical approaches were used?
6. Were the methods well-suited to the question asked and data available?
7. What threats to the internal validity were discussed and how did the author(s) handle these threats?
8. Did you think that there were other threats to the internal validity of the study that the author(s) failed to take into consideration?
9. What were the conclusions?
10. How robust were the conclusions to changes in the specification of the model?
11. How would you assess the external validity of the article?

Concerning the theoretical readings: You should be able to answer all six questions below in your reading responses at the start of the semester, with the same caveat as above. I do expect that your answers will be more nuanced and well developed by the end of the semester. The fact that the list of questions is shorter for theoretical pieces than empirical ones does not indicate that analyzing theoretical works requires less effort from you. Not infrequently, the arguments and substantiation will be more complex in theoretical pieces.

1. What question(s) did the author(s) address?
2. What were the main arguments?
3. How did the author(s) support each argument?
4. How convincing were the arguments?
5. Are there issues that the author(s) failed to consider when crafting the arguments or addressing the central question(s) more generally?
6. What are the main implications of the reading for theory? For practice? For future research?

<u>Discussion questions</u>
You will develop 2–6 questions about the article(s) or text(s) you analyzed in your reading response. The number of questions will depend on the number of readings for which you are responsible; you will create at least two questions per reading and you will respond to 1–3 readings per week. Class discussion will be guided by your questions. Do not craft factual questions (e.g., "What kind of correlation analysis did the author use?") unless you expect that the answers will not be straight-forward or will in some other way be noteworthy. Rather, produce questions that will cause your classmates to reflect on how the article contributes to their understanding of the theory and practice of public policy research (e.g., "Under what conditions, if any, might you be able to justify a research design with only a post-test and no comparison group?" or "What should you do if the requirements of research ethics and research compliance conflict?" or "What can public policy scholars do to try to increase uptake of their findings by policy actors?").

Measurement critique
You will select a scholarly article describing the results of a research study and use what you have learned about measurement issues in public policy research to evaluate the quality of the study's measurement approaches, both as constructed and as implemented. You will highlight strengths and weaknesses of the study's measurement strategy and suggest improvements that could be made to a similar future study. Your critique will be between 5,000 and 8,000 words.

Research design critique
You will select a scholarly article describing the results of a research study and use what you have learned about research design in public policy research to evaluate the quality of the study's design, both as envisioned and as implemented (if you can discern a difference). You will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the research design and suggest improvements that could be made to a similar future study. Your critique will be between 5,000 and 8,000 words.

Research design
The research design is your most substantial class assignment and it will draw on concepts you learn throughout the course. The design will have two basic parts, one outlining a research proposal and the other justifying that proposal, using rationale grounded in literature and theory discussed in this class and related scholarly works you locate and review independently. You will integrate the two parts to create a coherent, convincing research prospectus.

You will select a public policy issue and research question you plan to study, then use data and literature to emphasize the importance of the proposed research. Next, you will develop hypotheses and explain why they are sensible and why testing them will contribute to theoretical and/or practical knowledge. You will then describe your research design and explain why it is a robust approach that will permit causal inference. After sketching the design, you will explain how you will operationalize the variables central to your hypotheses, why your operationalization is appropriate, and how you will obtain data to construct the variables. Next, you will describe the methods (quantitative, qualitative, or both) that you plan to use to analyze the data and justify your selection. Finally, you will discuss bias, threats to validity, implementation challenges, or any problems you can anticipate plausibly confronting as you pursue this research, and explain how you will address these problems. Your research design will be 8,000–10,000 words.

Assignment	Due date
Reading responses and discussion questions	As scheduled based on rotation developed in the first week of class
Measurement critique	Monday, Oct. 15, 2:30 p.m.
Research design critique	Thursday, Nov. 15, 2:30 p.m.*
Research design	Friday, Dec. 14, 2:30 p.m.

*This due date may be moved to Friday, Nov. 16, or Saturday, Nov. 17, at 2:30 p.m.; see below.

Attendance and participation
Class participation is very important for success in this course; in fact, participation accounts for 10 percent of your grade. You will maximize the participation component of your grade by arriving on time to class, attending each class, and actively contributing during class activities.

When there is active communication in the class, everyone benefits tremendously. Come to class ready to engage me, your classmates, the material, and your abilities with enthusiasm. You are best prepared for such engagement when you thoroughly review the materials covered in the previous class and carefully prepare assigned materials. Please note that while your participation grade will be penalized for poor attendance (see below), attendance is not the same as participation. Showing up to class but failing to contribute meaningfully to discussions does not show me that you are prepared or that you understand the course materials. More importantly, your failure to engage short-changes your peers whose education in part relies on critical dialog with classmates.

You are entitled to two excused absences per semester. An absence is excused if you email me before the class meeting to tell me that you are ill, are facing a documented emergency, or have an unavoidable conflict due to official university obligations. Job interviews and job-related conflicts are not considered excused absences. Absences reported after missing the class are considered unexcused unless documentation is provided. A percentage point will be deducted from your participation grade for each unexcused absence. If you are unable to attend class, please obtain class materials and notes from your classmates. Missing class is not an excuse for turning in late assignments.

Blackboard
Many course readings are posted on Blackboard (http://blackboard.uc.edu). You will be required to post your reading responses and discussion questions on Blackboard. Course updates and announcements may also be posted on Blackboard. It is your responsibility to check Blackboard regularly, and failure to do so is not an excuse for being unaware of course requirements, announcements, and updates. I expect you to submit your course assignments via Blackboard, as Word or PDF files.

Calendar
The calendar below summarizes the important dates of which you should be aware in this course.

Day and date	Event
Monday, Aug. 27	First class
Monday, Sept. 3	Labor Day (no class)
Monday, Sept. 10	Last day to drop the course with no entry to your academic record
Monday, Oct. 15	No class due to Elinor and Vincent Ostrom memorial (class will be rescheduled on a different day this week)

	Measurement critique due at 2:30 p.m.
Monday, Nov. 12	Veteran's Day (no class; a non-mandatory workshop will be scheduled on a different day this week)
Thursday, Nov. 15	Research design critique due at 2:30 p.m.*
Thursday, Nov. 22 – Sunday, Nov. 25	Thanksgiving Break
Friday, Nov. 2	Last day for course withdrawal
Monday, Dec. 3	Last class
Friday, Dec. 14	Research design due at 2:30 p.m.

*This due date may be moved to Friday, Nov. 16, or Saturday, Nov. 17, depending on when the class workshop meets during the week of Nov. 12. I want to ensure that students who attend the workshop have time to revise their research design critiques based on workshop comments.

Classroom civility
I expect you to respect your fellow students and myself and to behave in a professional manner. Failure to meet these standards will affect your participation grade and thus your final course grade. Examples of violations of classroom civility include but are not limited to:

-Arriving late for class
-Reading the paper or doing crosswords or Sudoku in class
-Sleeping in class
-Working on material for another course during class
-Using your computer or other digital devices for purposes other than note-taking
-Failing to silence your phone during class
-Listening to your iPod or other music player during class
-Talking when the instructor or another student is speaking
-Engaging in disruptive behavior such as being excessively noisy

If you engage in such behavior, you may be asked to leave the class. Serious violations of classroom civility will prompt disciplinary action. Information about the disposition of disciplinary action is provided in the University of Cincinnati Student Code of Conduct.

Disclaimer
This syllabus is subject to change at the instructor's discretion.

Drops and withdrawals
Please consult the university's policies concerning dropping or withdrawing from a class to ensure that, if you choose one of these options, you do so by the specified deadlines and in the manner than ensures that your grades and/or financial aid experience the least adverse impact. See http://www.uc.edu/registrar/policies_and_procedures/withdrawal_procedures.html.

Electronic devices

Please turn off your cell phones, music players, and PDAs before class begins. I understand that you may prefer to take notes on a laptop or a tablet. I also understand that it is very tempting to check email or Facebook while you using these devices. I of course would prefer that you not yield to this temptation, but as you are the one responsible for your education, your comprehension of course material, and your participation in the course, it is ultimately your choice. Please be aware, however, that giving your full attention to your instructor and your colleagues during class indicates that you respect their contributions and effort; not paying attention sends the opposite signal. Cultivating the ability to listen carefully and without distraction will serve you well in your future career, and I strongly encourage you to develop this skill.

Format

The course meets weekly. At the end of each class session, we will allocate the readings for the next week among the students such that each student is responsible for 1–3 readings. You will read the assigned texts and craft reading responses and discussion questions per the guidelines noted above. You will email your responses and questions to the whole class (and post them to Blackboard) by 5 p.m. on the Saturday before the Monday class meeting. Please note that responses and critiques can be emailed anytime between the previous Monday's class and the Saturday deadline. The weekend deadline does not mean that you need to do work on the weekend. How you structure your time is up to you.

The course will be dominated by discussion, though I will generally provide an overview of the week's sometimes and offer a more detailed lecture if the topic requires it. You should come to class ready to summarize your reading responses, explain your critiques, and pose your discussion questions.

Grading

Each course element will be weighted out of a total of 100 points. The course is not graded on a curve. No half points will be awarded.

Assignment	Points
Frequency and quality of verbal class participation	15
Timeliness and quality of reading responses and discussion questions	15
Research design critique	20
Measurement critique	20
Research design	30

The grade distribution will be as follows. A+ grades will be awarded only at the instructor's discretion and only for truly exceptional work:

Letter grade and associated point range							
A	94–100 points	B	84–86 points	C	74–76 points	D-	60–64 points
A-	90–93 points	B-	80–83 points	C-	70–73 points	F	<60 points
B+	87–89 points	C+	77–79 points	D+	65–69 points		

Instructor communication
I am more than happy to talk with you about topics related to class or public policy and political science research more generally. Also, please do not hesitate to talk to me if you are having difficulty with the course. The sooner you let me know about challenges you are encountering, the sooner I can help you develop ways to address those challenges and move forward with your learning. You can visit me during office hours or we can set up a separate appointment.

I am happy to review drafts of your major class assignments (the measurement and research design critiques and the research design) as long as you provide them to me in a timely manner. Asking me to review your work does not guarantee that you will get a better grade, but if you carefully address the comments I provide, your work is likely to improve. I will review draft assignments provided to me at least one week before their due date. I will do my best to return them to you with comments within 72 hours, though my turnaround time will depend on how many students take advantage of this opportunity for early feedback. When you provide me your draft, I will do my best to let you know when I expect to be able to provide you with comments.

Email is a good way to get in touch with me, but I am not connected to the internet 24/7. I will respond to your email within 48 hours unless there is a holiday or I am traveling. I often will reply sooner, but can make no guarantees. Please do not wait to email me about an assignment until the night before it is due! When you email, please put the course title and number in the subject line. Also, please sign your name at the end of your email. I understand that you may prefer to use an email service like Gmail rather than your UC account. However, sometimes the names on such accounts do not make the sender immediately apparent (e.g., "bearcatsfan92"). If you do not sign your name on the email, I may not know with whom I'm emailing.

While you are not graded on the content and quality your email communication, I encourage you to craft your emails such that you would be comfortable sending them to an employer or colleague. Email is an important vehicle for professional communication and it is never too soon to establish a habit of writing well-constructed, thoughtful, and grammatically correct emails. This habit will serve you well in your future career.

Late assignments
The deadline for assignment submission is specified above (see "Calendar"). Assignments must be submitted electronically, to Blackboard, as PDF or Word files.

For major assignments (assignments other than reading responses and discussion questions) submitted past the deadline, your grade will be penalized by 25 percent for each late day. The day will be measured on a 24-hour cycle, meaning that if the assignment was due at 5 p.m. on Monday, turning it in anytime between 5:01 Monday and 5:00 Tuesday will result in a 25 percent reduction in

the grade you would have earned. Assignments submitted more than three days after the deadline will not be accepted.

Reading responses and discussion questions are minor assignments. These assignments can only be submitted up to 24 hours after the deadline, and your grade will be penalized by 50 percent for submission during that 24-hour window.

Some exceptions may be made to these policies. Exceptions will not be made for job commitments and technical difficulties (e.g., problems submitting via Blackboard). However, you may request an assignment extension due to an illness or other emergency. Extension requests must be made via email before the assignment due date. Again, requests for extensions may not be made in person. I am often running from class to office hours to meetings and I may not remember that you have made such a request. It is in your best interest to email me your extension request so that you (and I) have documentation of it.

If you are requesting an extension because of an illness, you may be asked to provide a signed, dated note from your doctor written on his or her letterhead. Documentation of an emergency may also be required; please discuss with me the type of documentation that is most appropriate/workable.

Prerequisites
The course assumes you have some familiarity with the basic mechanics of descriptive and inferential statistics and with research methods more generally.

Required texts
Bingham, Richard, and Claire Febinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Chatham House Publishers.
Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. *Making it Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Requirements
You are expected to come to class having read the assigned reading, participate actively in class discussions, and complete written work on time. The reading load averages to 130 pages weekly.

Scheduling conflicts
As noted above, you are allowed two excused absences. Please notify me of your absences as soon as possible and definitely before the day on which it occurs. As noted above, an absence without advance notification is unexcused. Arrangements can be made to accommodate religious observations and for other reasons.

Class will not be held on the Labor Day and Veteran's Day, Sept. 3 and Nov. 12 respectively, because these are university holidays. It also will not be held on Oct. 15 because there will be an Indiana University memorial that day for the late Elinor and Vincent Ostrom. Since the class only meets once a week, losing three of those meetings will make it difficult for us to cover all the topics vital to an assay of public policy research and evaluation methods. Therefore, we will determine as a

class an alternate meeting day and time that works for all or most students. In the week of Oct. 15 and Nov. 12, we will meet on that alternate day/time.

The session that substitutes for the class that would otherwise be held on Veteran's Day <u>will not be mandatory</u>; rather, it will be an opportunity for you to consult with me and your peers about class assignments generally and particularly the research design critique due that week. I do, however, expect you to attend the class which will substitute for the one normally held on Oct. 15. I understand that some students may have conflicts with this alternate session. If that is the case, you must notify me in advance. I will give you a writing assignment that will substitute for attendance that day and help familiarize you with the materials you will be missing.

Some tips
The following pointers can help to you succeed in this course:

1. Question your instructor, your readings, and your peers. True knowledge only comes from an active engagement of the material. Questions in class are welcome. Prolonged class discussions are learning opportunities, not unwanted digressions.

2. Explain the material to yourself. Don't expect the material to seep its way into your head; you must actively carry it in.

Special needs
If you have a disability which may affect your performance in the course, please let me know when the course begins (or as soon as possible if the disability begins during the semester) so that I can work with you to develop appropriate accommodations. Some accommodations may require prior approval from the Disability Services Office, located at 210 University Pavilion (http://www.uc.edu/aess/disability.html).

If unexpected events that may require special accommodations arise during the course of the semester (e.g., personal or family emergencies or health problems), please notify me as soon as possible. You may be required to provide documentation (e.g., a signed, dated doctor's note on the doctor's letterhead or a funeral program). We can discuss documentation options that are workable for your situation.

Style
In written work, please generally follow the guidelines for formatting, grammar, style, and citation in the *Chicago Manual of Style* or the *APSA Style Manual for Political Science*. Your written assignments should be double spaced, printed on 8 x 11 paper with 1 inch margins on all sides. Please use a professionally acceptable 12-point font such as Times New Roman or Garamond.

Technical issues
Assignments must be submitted via Blackboard as PDF or Word files. It is your responsibility to resolve technical difficulties so that they do not prevent you from submitting your work on time. Technical difficulties are not an excuse for late work. I generally advise you to consider Murphy's Law. Always back up your files. Save your work frequently. Re-save drafts of your work with filenames corresponding to the date so that you do not end up revising an outdated draft. Complete

your assignments well before their deadlines so that you have time to address technical problems that may arise when you try to submit your work.

<div style="text-align:center">

READINGS FOR CLASS MEETINGS

</div>

Aug. 27: The scientific method and social sciences
Bobrow, D. B., H. Eulau, M. Landau, C. O. Jones, and R. Axelrod. The place of policy analysis in
      political science: Five perspectives. *American Journal of Political Science* 21 (2): 415–433.
Freedman, D. A. 1991. Statistical models and shoe leather. *Sociological Methodology* 21: 291–313.
Merton, R. K. 1938. Science and the social order. *Philosophy of Science* 5 (3): 321–337.
Platt, J. R. 1964. Strong inference. *Science* 146 (3642): 347–353.
Rossi, P. H. 1999. Half-truths with real consequences: Journalism, research, and public policy.
      Contemporary Sociology 28 (1): 1–5.
Stinchcombe, A. L. 1968. The logic of scientific inference. In *Constructing Social Theories*, ed. A. L.
      Stinchcombe, 15–43. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sept. 3: Labor Day (no class)

Sept. 10: Causal inference in social and behavioral sciences
Lieberson, S. 1985. *Making it Count.* Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapters 1–4 and 9
      (pages 3–87, 174–200).
Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for*
      Generalized Causal Inference. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 1 (pages 1–32).
West, S., and F. Thoemmes. 2010. Cambell's and Rubin's perspectives on causal inference.
      Psychological Methods 15 (1): 18–37

Sept. 17: Process evaluation, program impact theory, and general overview
Allen, J. P., S. Philliber, and N. Hoggson. 1990. School-based prevention of teenage pregnancy and
      school drop-out: Process evaluation of the national replication of the teen outreach program.
      American Journal of Community Psychology 18 (4): 505–524.
Basinga, P., P. J. Gertler, A. Binagwaho, A. L. B. Soucat, J. Sturdy, and C. M. J. Vermeersch. 2011.
      Effect on maternal and child health services in Rwanda of payment to primary health care
      providers for performance: An impact evaluation. *Lancet* 377: 1421–1428.
Bingham, R. D., and C. L. Felbinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*. New
      York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapters 1 and 2 (pages 3–31).
Rossi, P. H., M. W. Lipsey, and H. E. Freeman. 2004. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*, 7th ed.
      Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapter 5 (136–166).
Scheirer, M.A. 2004. Designing and using process evaluation. In *Handbook of Practical Program*
      Evaluation, eds. J.S. Wholey, H.P. Hatry, and K.E. Newcomer, 40–68. San Francisco, CA:
      Jossey-Bass.

Sept. 24: Performance measurement, benchmarking, logic models, and writing policy research
Barnow, B. S. 2000. Exploring the relationship between performance management and program
      impact: A case study of the Job Training Partnership Act. *Journal of Policy Analysis and*
      Management 19 (1): 118–141.

Bevan, G., and R. Hamblin. 2009. Hitting and missing targets by ambulance services for emergency calls: Effects of different systems of performance measurement within the UK. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 172 part 1: 161–190.

Bingham, R. D., and C. L. Felbinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*. New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapter 4 (pages 45–55).

Goeschel, C. A., W. M. Weiss, and P. J. Pronovost. 2012. Using a logic model to design and evaluate quality and patient safety improvement programs. *International Journal for Quality Health Care* 24 (4): 330–337.

Miller, R. L. 2012. Logic models: A useful way to study theories of evaluation practice? *Evaluation and Program Planning,* forthcoming: 1–4.

Norris, F. H., and N. D. Bellamy. 2009. Evaluation of a national effort to reach Hurricane Katrina survivors and evacuees: The crisis counseling assistance and training program. *Administrative Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research* 36 (3): 165–175.

Weidman, D. R. 1007. Writing a better RFP. *Public Administration Review* 37 (6): 714–717.

Oct. 1: Validity I
Bingham, R. D., and C. L. Felbinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*. New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapter 3 (pages 15–31).

Cohen, J. 1994. The world is round (p < .05). *American Psychologist* 49 (12): 997–1003.

Cohen, J. 1990. Things I have learned (so far). *American Psychologist* 45 (12): 1304–1312.

Cortina, J. M., and W. P. Dunlap. 1997. On the logic and purpose of significance testing. *Psychological Methods* 2 (2): 161–172.

Lipsey, M. W. 2000. Statistical conclusion validity for intervention research: A significant (p < .05) problem. In *Validity & Social Experimentation*, ed. L. Bickman, 101-120. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lipsey, M. W., and D. B. Wilson. 1993. The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatment: Confirmation from meta-analysis. *American Psychologist* 48 (12): 1181–1209.

Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 2 (pages 33–63).

Oct. 8: Validity II
Lieberson, S. 1985. *Making it Count.* Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapters 5–8 and 10–11 (pages 88–173, 200–237).

Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 3 (pages 64–104).

Oct. 15 (to be rescheduled): Experimental design
Bingham, R. D., and C. L. Felbinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*. New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapters 5–7 (pages 55–106).

Heckman, J. J., and J. A, Smith. 1995. Assessing the case for social experiments. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9 (2): 85-110.

Nathan, R. P., and R. G. Hollister. 2008. Point/counterpoint: The role of random assignment in social policy research. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 27 (2): 401–415.

Pirog, M. A. 2009. The role of random assignment in social policy research. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 28 (1): 164–181.

Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 8 (pages 246–277).

Solberg, A. 1983. Community post-hospital follow-up services. *Evaluation Review* 7 (1): 96–109.

Oct. 22: Quasi-experimental design I: Lacking a control group or a pretest

Bingham, R. D., and C. L. Felbinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*. New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapters 10 and 11 (pages 137–168).

Liu, H., Z. Hu, X. Li, B. Stanton, S. Narr-King, and H. Yang. 2006. Understanding interrelationships among HIV-related stigma, concern about HIV infection, and intent to disclose HIV serostatus: A pre-test post-test study in a rural area of Eastern China. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs* 20 (2): 133–142.

Lowery, D., and W. E. Lyons. 1989. Governmental fragmentation versus consolidation: Five public-choice myths about how to create informed, involved, and happy citizens. *Public Administration Review* 49 (6): 533–543.

Lesiuk, T. 2005. The effect of music listening on work performance. *Psychology of Music* 33 (2): 173–191.

Peto, R., S. Darby, H. Deo, P. Silcocks, E. Whitley, and R. Doll. 2000. Smoking, smoking cessation, and lung cancer in the U.K. since 1950: Combination of national statistics with two case-control studies. *British Medical Journal* 321: 323–329.

Rouwette, E. A. J. A., J. A. M. Vennix, and C. M. Thijssen. 2000. Group model building: A decision room approach. *Simulation and Gaming* 31: 359–379.

Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 4 (pages 103–134).

Oct. 29: Quasi-experimental design II: Control (comparison) groups and pretests

Bingham, R. D., and C. L. Felbinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*. New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapter 8 (pages 109–122).

Cordray, D. S. 1986. Quasi-experimental analysis: A mixture of methods and judgement:. In *Advances in Quasi-Experimental Design and Analysis: New Directions in Program Evaluation,* ed. W. M. L. Trochim, 9–27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaughan, M., and B. Ponomariov. 2008. Faculty publication productivity, collaboration, and grants velocity: Using curricula vitae to compare center-affiliated and unaffiliated scientists. *Research Evaluation* 17 (2): 103–110.

Grossman, J., and J. P. Tierney. 1993. The fallibility of comparison groups. *Evaluation Review* 17 (5): 556–571.

Quint, J. 1991. Project redirection: Making and measuring a difference. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 14: 75–86.

Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 5 (pages 135–161).

Sherris, J. D., and J. B. Kahle. 1984. The effects of instructional organization and locus of control orientation on meaningful learning in high school biology students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 21 (1): 83–94.

Smith-Jentsch, K., G. E. Campbell, D. M. Milanovich, and A. M. Reynolds. 2001. Measuring teamwork mental models to support training needs assessment, development, and evaluation: Two empirical studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22 (2): 179–194.

Weitlauf, J. C., R. E. Smith, and D. Cervone. 2000. Generalization effects of coping-skills training: Influence of self-defense training on women's efficacy beliefs, assertiveness, and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85 (4): 625–633.

Nov. 5: Quasi-experimental design III: Time series

Bingham, R. D., and C. L. Felbinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*. New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapters 9 and 12 (pages 123–137, 169–179).

Donohue III, J. J., and S. D. Levitt. 2004. Further evidence that legalized abortion lowered crime. *Journal of Human Resources* 39 (Winter): 29–49.

Donohue III, J. J., and S. D. Levitt. 2001. The impact of legalized abortion on crime. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116 (2): 379–420.

Joyce, T. 2004. Did legalized abortion lower crime? *Journal of Human Resources* 39 (Winter): 1–28.

Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 6 (pages 171–205).

Nov. 12: Quasi-experimental design IV: Regression discontinuity and cost analyses

Arrow et al. 1996. Is there a role for benefit-cost analysis in environmental, health, and safety regulation? *Science* 272 (5259): 221–222.

Barnett, P. G. 1999. The cost-effectiveness of methadone maintenance as a health care intervention. *Addiction* 94 (4): 479–488.

Bingham, R. D., and C. L. Felbinger. 2002. *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach*. New York: Seven Bridges Press. Chapters 13 and 14 (pages 179–208).

Haruvy, N. 1997. Agricultural reuse of wastewater: Nationwide cost-benefit analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems, and Environment* 66: 113–119.

Shadish, W. R., T. D. Cook, and D. T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 7 (pages 207–242).

Wong, V. C., T. D. Cook, S. Barnett, and K. Jung. 2008. An effectiveness-based evaluation of five state pre-kindergarten programs. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 27 (1): 122–154.

Nov. 19: Veteran's Day (no class, but an alternate non-mandatory workshop will be offered)

.

Nov. 26: Data collection using direct observation

Adcock, R., and D. Collier. 2001. Measurement validity: A shared standard for qualitative and quantitative research. *American Political Science Review* 95 (3): 529–546.

Burstein, L., H. E. Freeman, K. A. Sirotnik, G. Delandshere, and M. Hollis. 1985. Data collection: The Achilles heel of evaluation research. *Sociological Methods and Research* 14 (1): 65–80.

Geertz, C. 1974. Thick description: Toward an interpretative theory of culture. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books. Chapter 1 (pages 3–30).

LaPiere, R. T. 1934. Attitudes vs. actions. *Social Forces* 13 (2): 230–237.

Mastrofski, S., and R. B. Parks. 1990. Improving observational studies of police. *Criminology* 28 (3): 201–222.

Suttles, G. 1976. Urban ethnography: Situational and normative accounts. *Annual Review of Sociology* 2: 1–18.

Zelditch, M. Jr. 1962. Some methodological problems of field studies. *American Journal of Sociology* 67 (5): 566–576.

Dec. 3: Data collection using unobtrusive measures

Hansen, H. J., S. P. Caudill, and D. J. Boone. 1985. Crisis in drug testing: Results of a CDC blind study. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 253 (16): 2382–2387.

McCleary, R., B. C. Nienstedt, and J. M. Erven. 1982. Uniform crime reports as organizational outcomes: Three time series experiments. *Social Problems* 29 (4): 361–72.

Miller, T. I., and M. A. Miller. 1992. Assessing excellence poorly: The bottom line in local government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 11 (4): 612–623.

Morgan, D. L. 1996. Focus groups. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 129–152.

Schaeffer, N. C., and S. Presser. 2003. The science of asking questions. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 65–88.

Ward, V. M., J. T. Bertrand, and L. F. Brown. 1991. The comparability of focus group and survey results: Three case studies. *Evaluation Review* 15 (2): 266–283.

Webb, E. J., D. T. Campbell, R. D. Schwartz, L. Sechrest, and J. B. Grove 2000. Archives I and II. In *Unobtrusive Measures*, eds. E. J. Webb et al., 53–112. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.