SYLLABUS FOR EVALUATION IN ANTHROPOLOGICAL PRACTICE

ANTH 5700 ☐ University of North Texas

Dr. Susan Squires

SPRING 2018

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Anthropological theory and method are increasingly in demand for evaluations because of the capacity of anthropology to delineate cultural positions of individuals and organizations around key issues of needs assessment, service delivery, equity and justice in the design and implementation of both public and private programs. This will seek to create, define and promulgate a specifically anthropological component to a solid basis of research and method already existing in evaluation.

This course will provide a graduate-level experience in the field of evaluation anthropology, an important area for jobs in practicing and applied anthropology in government and the private sectors. The approach taken will link evaluation and anthropological method and theory, and will address common methodological, logistic and theoretical issues that occur in the course of conducting evaluation projects using holistic, mixed method and qualitative designs.

Course Requirements:

As the requirement for this class, you will work in teams to design, conduct and report a small-scale evaluation. I will work with you to help you define the evaluation and develop a scope that will fit into the time we have available for this project. _All members of your team will receive the same grade for projects_.

The required products for this course are set up so that they are cumulative, that is, you set up the basis for later ones by the quality of your work on earlier ones. Moreover, it is to be expected that these products will change as we discuss them and as we vet each other's projects in class. Don't panic. We will walk through this project step by step.

Grading:

Grades will be assigned as follows:

Teamwork	10%
Timeliness of all products	10%
Participation in course discussion	15%
Completion of written course assignments	15%
Evaluation Project	
• Development of an evaluation problem	10%
• Evaluation plan	15%
• Final evaluation report	25%
TOTAL	100%

The final grade will be the weighted numeric average of the letter grade distributed as above. The university does not allow "+" and "-" grades. _All members of your team will receive the same grade for evaluation projects_.   This is in line with the real-world principle that you can't pass the buck in practice. You rise or fall together.

Teamwork - (10 POINTS). People who don't pull their weight on teams are a big problem in teaching online courses. In the university, teammates don't usually complain about slackers on their teams, choosing instead to do a disproportionate amount of the work. If you are not pulling your weight on the job, you just get fired. I have finally come to realize that the only way to handle this problem is to grade it. So, at random times during the semester, I will send each of you a question on team participation. Your responses to these will be strictly private. I will talk to people who seem not to be participating adequately on teams. I will follow up on problems

Timeliness – (10 points) 10% of your grade depends on getting everything in on time. This is the most important – and often the most difficult – requirement for success as evaluators. Like us, clients have deadlines. If we miss ours, they miss theirs. This is bad.

On time is the end of the day on the due date (11:59). You can submit products through the assignment function in Blackboard unless it is an assignment that I have directed to a

Discussion Forum. The latter are assignments that I would like shared with the whole class, such as the bio in Week 1.

Participation in class discussions (15 POINTS) Once a week I will post a discussion question on Blackboard. You will read the question and respond. It's a blog format, so you can respond to responses. This is really important because it is the classroom discussion part of the course. It has been my experience that these discussions work really well on online courses. Your name must show up on the discussion page at least twice for every discussion.

Completion of written course assignments (15 POINTS) – This refers to submissions of the "Real Work" assignments. These are simulated evaluation activities. They are often worth a thousand words. There are four of them.

Evaluation – The evaluation is worth 50% of your grade broken down as shown above. The evaluation problem (10 POINTS), the evaluation Plan (15 POINTS) and the final evaluation report (25 POINTS).

As I grade, I will bear in mind the following criteria:

1. *Adequacy for the completion of the project*: Does the product do what it needs to do as discussed in class? Will it support the project that you are trying to do?

2. *Clarity and coherence:* Can I understand it? Is it clear and correctly organized and does it have all of the elements it needs? Or am I baffled about what you proposed? Does it have pictures and tables to explain your approach?

3. *Methodological feasibility:* Do the things you propose be methodologically feasible and do they reflect the state-of-the art around social science method? They don't have to be perfect and they don't have to be final. In fact, they probably will change due to my feedback and class discussion. This is not a problem. But what you propose has to be reasonable method as represented in the readings and discussed in class.

4. *Quality:* The final presentation needs to reflect work and care in its preparation. This is the dimension that reflects how happy I would be if I were your client. In delivering effective evaluation, this is the critical dimension that captures everything else.

More About Projects

As part of this project you will work with at least one other person on the class project. In my experience, a supervised trip through the evaluation process will prepare you to think logistically

and theoretically like an evaluator. And it will face you with the difficulties that all evaluators must manage over and over again.

We have been asked by the University President to undertake evaluation project for the University. Our client will be Jennifer Cowley, UNT Provost. This is a high-profile evaluation and wonderful opportunity for us to show what we can do.

You will learn as much from solving these problems, as you will from anything we do here. I'm always surprised by some of the issues that come up in evaluation. However, here are a few that I expect:

- *Working on teams.* Evaluations are almost never conducted by "lone wolf" evaluators. Evaluation problems are complex and require many different kinds of skills to address. As you have undoubtedly noticed in the past, teamwork is hard work. I encourage you from the start to maintain daily contact with your team members and try not to wander off and do your own thing. And listen carefully to what your team members are saying.

- *Time pressure*. People often wait until the last possible minute to think about evaluation. This means that clients usually want their answers the day before yesterday. There is almost never enough time to do the deliberate, comprehensive plan you would like to do for your evaluation. This is of course a big problem here because we have thirteen weeks, no matter what. You do not have time to dawdle here.

- *Getting a small enough problem.* Just about every evaluation proposal I have ever written looked dauntingly complex to me the first time I saw the problem. A significant evaluation skill is cutting through complexity (dare I say confusion) to discover one, simple question to be evaluated. This is not easy, in fact it may be the most challenging thing about the whole process.

- *Scope creep.* A very frustrating part of evaluation. You start out with a nice clean evaluation question, but as you go on to collect and analyze data, all kinds of interesting stuff show up that you would like to check out. Some of this you can do, but most of it you can't. In a "real" evaluation, you will have neither the time nor the money. In this course, you don't have the time. Keep your eye on the ball and learn how to put off questions that don't directly link to your evaluation question until later.

It's always a voyage of discovery. I expect this list to be longer next time because of what you learn here.

The Project: Program Assessment of Career Connect

You will be collecting data and preparing an analysis of the *Career Connect* program from the view point of *UNT faculty*. In May 2018, each team will meet with our client, UNT's Provost Jennifer Cowley, to present findings and recommendations to help her make decisions about the program. Your team may have members who are geographically dispersed so members may collect data individually. However, it will be the same evaluation with roughly the same evaluation Plan.

Before the third class, 1) build an evaluation team and 2) write a brief team evaluation proposal.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

Activity	Schedule
Read the materials about Career Connect.	**January**
Get organized. Build a team to do your evaluation. Meet in person or by telephone to talk about how to get started. There are anthropologists and non-anthropologists in this course. Please make sure your team includes one non-anthropologist and one anthropologist.	**January**
Task 1: Define an evaluation question. On your team, determine what your evaluation will try to find out about Career Connect. One clear question is best, but you may not get there on the first round.	**January**
Statement of Project Question	*Due February 5*
Task 2: Plan the evaluation. How do you plan to answer your evaluation question? What will you want to find out? What will be your data sources? Faculty are the target group but you may want to collect other types of data too. How will you collect data? How will you analyze the data?	**February - March**
Project Evaluation Plan	*Due March 5*
Task 3: Collect the data. Do the work. It's best if you collect data quickly as possible.	**March - April**
Task 5: Analyze data. Allow plenty of time for analysis	**April**
Task 6: Write Report.	**April - May**
Final Evaluation Report	*Due in May*

Required Texts: There are no required texts for this course. We will rely on articles and readings:

Butler, Mary Odell. *Evaluation: A Culture Systems Approach.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press. 2015,

Butler, Mary Odell and Jacqueline Copeland-Carson, *Evaluation Anthropology: Introducing an Emerging Sub-Field,* NAPA Bulletin 24, University of California Press, 2005. ISBN 1-931303-23-I.

You don't need to buy this book. You can obtain all of the readings from AnthroSource, available at the UNT library. In addition, the bibliography provides recommended books that will give you a good grounding in how evaluation is done. Finally, I will be happy to recommend resources that you need.

Recommended Resources

These are books that I have found very valuable in building evaluations over the years.

For a basic introduction to evaluation:

Everyone has his or her favorite basic text. Mine is:

>Rossi PH, Freeman HE and Lipsey MW. 1999. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. 6th Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. This is a pricey book that is now available in an 8th Ed. You might do better to work through the articles in this course and decide later what to buy if you need it

Evaluation books we will use during this course – a lot.

>Alkin, MC Evaluation *Roots: Tracing Theorists Views and Influences. Thousand Oaks, CA,* Sage. 2004

>Shadish WR, Cook TD, Leviton. LC. *Foundations of Program Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 1991.

You can find these books in the library. If you plan to build a library in evaluation, I strongly recommend one of these two books for a discussion of the evolution of evaluation thought and what the central disputes in evaluation have been.

I always check for used books on Amazon. Sometimes you can get a valuable one for $2.98 plus 4$ shipping.

Another highly useful resource is the American Evaluation Association website. I cannot tell you how intensively I have used it to prepare this course. Check it out at www.eval.org. The cost for a student membership is $30 per year and you get *two* journals. It's worth more than any textbook.

PLAGIARISM POLICY

The department of anthropology considers graduate students to be new members of the community of professional anthropologists, who are thus held to the high ethical standards of practicing professionals. They are expected to follow the American Anthropological Association's code of ethics: "*Anthropological researchers bear responsibility for the integrity and reputation of their discipline, of scholarship, and of science. Thus, anthropological researchers are subject to the general moral rules of scientific and scholarly conduct: they should not deceive or knowingly misrepresent (i.e., fabricate evidence, falsify, plagiarize), or attempt to prevent reporting of misconduct, or obstruct the scientific/scholarly research of others*" (http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm). Any work not meeting this standard will be evaluated in a hearing before the student; infractions will merit dismissal from the master's program. For more information on paper writing, including how to avoid plagiarism, and how to use citations, see http://anthropology.unt.edu/resources-writingpaper.php. For information on the University's policies regarding academic integrity and dishonesty, see the UNT Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities, http://www.unt.edu/csrr/.

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

It is the policy of the University of North Texas not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability (where reasonable accommodations can be made), disabled veteran status or veteran of the Vietnam era status in its educational programs, activities, admissions or employment policies. In addition to complying with federal and state equal opportunity laws and regulations, the university through its diversity policy declares harassment based on individual differences (including sexual orientation) inconsistent with its mission and education goals. Direct questions and concerns to the Equal Opportunity Office, 940 565 2456, or the Dean of Students, 940 565 2648. TDD access is available through Relay Texas, 800 735 2989. Anthropology does not discriminate on the basis of an individual's disability as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. The program provides academic

adjustments and aid to individuals with disabilities in its programs and activities. If you have a disability, you are strongly advised to contact the Office of Disability Accommodations (UU 318A) or by telephone at 940 565 4323. **It is the responsibility of the student to make the necessary arrangements with the instructors.**

ACCEPTABLE STUDENT BEHAVIOR

Student behavior that interferes with an instructor's ability to conduct a class or other students' opportunity to learn is unacceptable and disruptive and will not be tolerated in any instructional forum at UNT. Students engaging in unacceptable behavior will be directed to leave the classroom and the instructor may refer the student to the Dean of Students to consider whether the student's conduct violated the Code of Student Conduct. The university's expectations for student conduct apply to all instructional forums, including university and electronic classroom, labs, discussion groups, field trips, etc. The Code of Student Conduct can be found at www.deanofstudents.unt.edu

SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION, HARRASSMENT, & ASSAULT

UNT is committed to providing an environment free of all forms of discrimination and sexual harassment, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. If you (or someone you know) has experienced or experiences any of these acts of aggression, please know that you are not alone. The federal Title IX law makes it clear that violence and harassment based on sex and gender are Civil Rights offenses. UNT has staff members trained to support you in navigating campus life, accessing health and counseling services, providing academic and housing accommodations, helping with legal protective orders, and more.

UNT's Dean of Students' website offers a range of on-campus and off-campus resources to help support survivors, depending on their unique needs: http://deanofstudents.unt.edu/resources_0. Renee LeClaire McNamara is UNT's Student Advocate and she can be reached through e-mail at SurvivorAdvocate@unt.edu or by calling the Dean of Students' office at 940-565-2648. You are not alone. We are here to help.

Course Outline

Week of January 16 - Introductions

Week of January 22 - What is Evaluation Anthropology?

- What will you gain from this course?

- What is evaluation anthropology?

- What does evaluation bring to anthropology?

- What does anthropology bring to evaluation?

- How you will begin. Discussion of course projects

- Resources for evaluation anthropology

Readings:

Bennett JW, (1954) Interdisciplinary Research and the Concept of Culture. 1954.

Butler, M. (2005) Translating Evaluation Anthropology, NAPA Bulletin 24, pp.17-30

Butler, M (2006) Random Walk. NAPA Bulletin 26, pp. 20-31.

Copeland-Carson, J. Theory Building Evaluation anthropology: Bridging the scholarship-practice divide. NAPA Bulletin 24, pp. 7-16.

Week of January 29 – Some History: Roots of Evaluation Anthropology

- The scope of evaluation

- Development of evaluation as a discipline

- What do evaluators do?

- Development of applied anthropology

- Weaving together the strands. What makes evaluation anthropology different from both parents?

- Linking scholarship and practice.

Readings:

Chen. HT (1996), A comprehensive typology for program evaluation, *American Journal of Evaluation* 17(2): 121-130.

Patton MQ (2005). The view from evaluation. In Butler and Copeland-Carson*, Creating Evaluation Anthropology*, NAPA Bulletin 24. Pp. 31-40.

Recommended:

Alkin, MC Evaluation *Roots: Tracing Theorists Views and Influences.* Part I. Pp. 3-65.

Lincoln YS and Guba EG. *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA. 1985,

Partridge, WL and EM Eddy (1978). The Development of Applied Anthropology in America. In *Applied Anthropology in America*, EE Eddy and WL Partridge, Eds. New York: Columbia University Press. 1978, pp. 1-45.

Shadish WR, Cook TD, Leviton. LC. *Foundations of Program Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 1991. Pp. 1-67.

DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION PROBLEM DUE FEBRUARY 5

Week of February 5 – Theory and Methods in Evaluation

- Definitions in the evaluation literature

- Evaluation research, program evaluation, product evaluation, personnel evaluation

- Evaluation terminology

- Principles of evaluation design

- Blended and mixed method evaluations

Readings:

Campbell, D (1970). Considering the case against experimental evaluation of social innovations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15(1): 110-113.

Scriven M (2005). The logic and methodology of checklists. www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists

Scriven, M (1993). The nature of evaluation, New Directions in Evaluation 58.

Review the Key Evaluation Checklist (KEC) at http://evaluation.wmich.edu/checklists

Recommended

Shadish et al., Foundations of Program Evaluation. Part II, pp. 69-170.

EXERCISE I: Evaluating a Comprehensive Tobacco Control Program in American Indian Tribes – DESIGN PHASE   Due February 12

Week of February 12 – Anthropologically Relevant Approaches to Evaluation

- Case Study evaluations

- Utilization focused evaluation

- Rapid Assessment

- The qualitative-quantitative debate. Do you care and why?

- Doing Good Anthropology in evaluations. Quality assurance.

Readings:

Butler Mary O. 2000. Finding the big picture: Program evaluation in diverse environments. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Honolulu, Hawaii. November 3, 2000.

Greene, Jennifer C and Valerie J. Caracelli, 1997 Defining and Describing the Paradigm Issue in Mixed-Method Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation 74:5-17.

Hebert, Yvonne M. 1986. Naturalistic Evaluation in Practice: A case Study. New Directions in Evaluation 30: 3-21.

Kirkhart, Karen E. 2010. Book review: Patton, Michael Quinn. (2008). Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage. American Journal of Evaluation 31:588.

McNall, Miles and Pennie G. Foster-Fishman. Methods of Rapid Evaluation, Assessment and Appraisal. American Journal of Evaluation 28(2): 151-168. 2007.

Williams David D. When is Naturalistic Evaluation Appropriate? New Directions in Evaluation 30:85-92.

Recommended Readings

Foundations of Program Evaluation, Part III, 270-314.

Patton, MQ, 2008. Utilization –Focused Evaluation, 4th Edition. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Stake, RE. 2006 Multiple Case Study Analysis. New York: Guilford Press

Yin, RK. 2009 Case Study Research: Design and Methods, 4th Ed. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Week of February 19 – Planning your Evaluation Project

- Evaluability assessment – Determining if an evaluation can be done?

- Identifying Stakeholders. How do you discover who they are? How do you know you have coverage of all stakeholders?

- Evaluation questions? Start with questions; not with method. How do you define and refine the questions that the evaluation will address?

- Theory of Logic Modeling.

Readings:

CDC Framework for Program Evaluation. MMWR 48(RR11)10-40, September 17, 1999. Available on the CDC website, www.cdc.gov/mmwr and search for the correct volume. You can download an Adobe file.

Chelimsky, Eleanor. The role of experience in formulating theories of program evaluation*. American Journal of Evaluation* 19: 35-54, 1998.

Copeland-Carson Jacqueline. 2005. Applying theory and method in evaluation anthropology: An example of the South Bronx's community revitalization project. NAPA Bulletin 24:89-106

Hyland Stanley E and Brimhall Robert E. 2005. Evaluation anthropology in community development/community building. NAPA Bulletin 24:125-137.

Pinsker Eve C and Lieber Michael D. 2005. Anthropological approaches to the evaluation of university-community partnerships. NAPA Bulletin 24:107-124.

EXERCISE II: Evaluating a Comprehensive Tobacco Control Program in American Indian Tribes – IMPLEMENTATION PHASE **Due February 26**

Week of February 26 – Ethics and IRB's

- What ethical considerations are critical in evaluation anthropology?

- Linking ethics to client requirements and needs

- What can you never do?

- IRBs can be your best friend?

- De-Intimidating the IRB process.

Readings: Review the following ethical Statements

Guiding Principles for Evaluators from the American Evaluation Association at http://www.eval.org/GPtraining. You can download an Adobe file of the Comprehensive Guide that will give you everything you need. There is an interesting article on ethical reasoning that you might also be interested.

Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association at http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm Downloadable in .PDF format.

Ethical and Professional Responsibilities at http://www.sfaa.net/sfaaethic.html

45 CFR 46. (Law Governing Human Subjects) at https://irb.llnl.gov/appendices/Appendix03.pdf

The Belmont Report at http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.htm

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Public Welfare, Department of Health and Human Services, Part 46, Protection of Human Subjects.

Readings

Butler, MO. 1999. Protecting the Rights of Government Employees in Program Evaluations. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology Tucson, Arizona, April 24 1999

AAA Commission on the Engagement of Anthropology with the US Security and Intelligence Communities (CEAUSSIC). 2009. Final report on the Army's Human Terrain System Proof of Concept Program. Submitted to the Executive Board of the American Anthropological Association, October 14, 2009. At http://www.aaanet.org/cmtes/commissions/ceaussic/upload/ceaussic_hts_final_report.pdf. Accessed August 5, 2012

Fleur-Lobban Carolyn. 2003. Ethics and anthropology 1890-2000: A review of issues and principles. In Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for Ethically Conscious Practice, 2nd Ed. C. Fleur-Lobban (Ed.). Willow Creek CA: Altamira. Pp. 1-28.

Palumbo DJ, The political roots of misuse of evaluation. New Directions in Evaluation, 64, Winter 1994: pp. 15-23.

Price. David. 2003. Anthropology Sub Rosa: The CIA, AAA and the Ethical Problems Inherent in Secret Research. In Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for Ethically Conscious Practice, 2nd Ed. C. Fleur-Lobban (Ed.). Willow Creek CA: Altamira. Pp. 29-49.

Stevens CJ and Dial M, What constitutes misuse? New Directions in Evaluation 64, Winter 1994:3-13.

Suggested Reading:

Sherwood Kay E. 2005. Evaluation of the Fighting Back initiative. New Directions in Evaluation 105: 15-38. I gave this mostly so you can see what a real-life evaluation design looks like and how difficult it can be!

Week of March 5 – Ethnographic Approaches to Evaluation

- Ethnography as an evaluation tool. Emics and etics of evaluation.

- How to define "success" from multiple perspectives.

- Participatory evaluations – How participatory can they be? How to maintain rigor with ongoing community input, judging effectiveness? Are findings stable?

- Empowerment evaluation – Is it really evaluation? Where is the line between science and advocacy?

Reading:

Fetterman, D and A. Wandersman. Empowerment Evaluation: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. AJE 28(2): 179-198. 2007.

Fetterman D. 2005. Empowerment and ethnographic evaluation: Hewlett-Packards $15 million digital divide project (a case example). NAPA Bulletin 24:

Goodman C, Trainor B and Dovorski S. 2005 Using ethnographic methods to evaluate the Department of Veterans Affairs Patient Safety Program. NAPA Bulletin 24:57-70.

Miller RL and Campbell R, Taking stock of empowerment evaluation: An empirical review. AJE 27: 296 -319. 2006

Smith, Nick L. Empowerment evaluation as evaluation ideology. American Journal of Evaluation 28(2): 169-178. 2007.

Squires Susan E. 2005. Telecommunication – Product meaning and use: Two examples of needs assessment. NAPA Bulletin 24: 79-88.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. 1994 Empowerment Evaluation, Objectivist Evaluation, and Evaluation Standards: Where the future of evaluation should not go and where it needs to go. American Journal of Evaluation 15:321-338.

Whyte William F. 1989. Advancing scientific knowledge through participatory action research. Sociological forum 4(3): 367-385.

RECOMMENDED (One or the other - Fetterman can be pretty repetitive!):

Fetterman, David. Foundations of Empowerment Evaluation. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage. 2001.

Fetterman D and Wandersman A. Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice. New York: Guilford Press. 2005.

Hopson, Making (More) Room for Ethnography at the Evaluation Table. In *Exploring Evaluator Role and Identity*, Katherine Ryan and Thomas A. Schwandt, eds., pp. 37-56. Greenwich, CT: New Age Publishing. 2000.

Spring Break

Week of March 19 – Project Data Collection

- Preparing an Evaluation Plan and Instrumentation

- Control of Evaluation Design – Using and Managing your evaluation protocol

- Site selection and site visits

- Data Collection Methods – Interviews, surveys, participant observation, focus groups, etc.

- Guarding against bias in data collection

- Data Management – In the field and out.

- Protecting everyone's confidentiality.

- Building and maintaining an evaluation database.

Week of March 26 - Synthesis of Evaluation and Anthropology

- Applications of Anthropological Theory in Evaluation. Culture theory, cultural adaptation, systems, etc.

- Synergies across disciplines

Week of April 2 – Building Theory

- Using Evaluation to Build Anthropological Theory and Vice Versa
- Theories of Value

- Mid-level and high-level theory in the design and dissemination of evaluations. Fit of evaluation in the paradigms of anthropology.

- What evaluation tells us about culture? Priorities, values and assumptions?

Reading:

Hill Carole E. 2000. Strategic issues for rebuilding a theory and practice synthesis. In The Unity of Theory and Practice in Anthropology: Rebuilding a Fractured Synthesis. Napa Bulletin 18: 1-44. (Note: You can download this whole volume on AnthroSource.)

House, ER 2001 Unfinished business: Causes and values. AJE 22(3): 309-315.

House ER and Howe KR. 1998 The issue of advocacy in evaluations. AJE 19(2):233-236.

RECOMMENDED:

House ER and Howe KR, Values in Evaluation and Social Research. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage. 1999.

Week of April 9 – Analyzing your Project Evaluation Data

- Analysis Planning

- Specifying a priori expectations

- Balancing stakeholder perspectives in Analysis

- Using qualitative text analysis software to answer evaluation questions

- Maintaining credibility. Linking conclusions to evaluation evidence

- Who am I to make recommendations? What your clients need from you.

EXERCISE III: Evaluating a Comprehensive Tobacco Control Program in American Indian Tribes – ANALYSIS PHASE Due April 16

Reading

Thomas David R. 2006. A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. American Journal of Evaluation 27: 237-246.

Recommended

Strauss A and Corbin J. Basics of Qualitative Research, 1990, Sage. Pp. 7-47.

Miles MB and Huberman AM. 1992, Introduction. Qualitative Data Analysis, 2nd Wd. pp. 1-48. (Or use a later edition. This just happens to be the one I have.)

Week of April 16 - Reporting

- What happens to evaluations? How are they made available and to whom?

- Contextualizing your evaluation in the existing research

- Death by Power Point? – Effective presentation of evaluation results

- Publish or Perish? Getting your evaluation off the shelf and into the evaluation literature.

- Permissions, clearances, other precautions.

- Misuses of evaluation for political and cultural ends.

Reading:

Simon EL and Christman, JB. 2005. Getting real about what it takes to conduct evaluation research: What do you need to know. In Creating Evaluation Anthropology: Introducing an Emerging Sub-Field. MO Butler and J Copeland Carson, eds. NAPA Bulletin 24: Pp. 138-155.

Practical Work: Exercise IV - Essay Due April 30

Write a 5-page essay on "What happens to Evaluation."   Back up your points with examples and references. You can use the required readings and a selection of the suggested readings.   Make sure you address the following issues

- What happens to evaluations? How are they made available and to whom?
- Contextualizing evaluation in the existing research. Does this help? Why and How? Why not?
- Permissions, clearances, other precautions. Do these influence use? Access?
- Death by Power Point? – Effective presentation of evaluation results.
- Publish or Perish? Getting your evaluation off the shelf and into the evaluation literature. Why? Why not?
- Misuses of evaluation for political and cultural ends. Does it happen?   If yes, what can the evaluator do?
- Other use issues?

Week of April 23 - Career planning in Evaluation and Anthropology

- Where do I go from here? Career options
- Evaluation in the broader context of evaluation anthropology
- Job Hunting: Where do I look for jobs in Evaluation?
- How are evaluation jobs labeled?
- Interviewing the Interviewer: Getting smart and nailing down the job.

Reading:

Butler Mary O. 2006. Random Walk. *NAPA Bulletin* 26: 20-31.

Butler Mary O, Copeland-Carson Jacqueline and Van Arsdale Peter. 2005 Career planning for evaluation anthropology. NAPA Bulletin 24: 169-178.

Shaeffer, Scarlett. 2008. Further resources for careers in applied anthropology. *NAPA Bulletin* 29:195-205.

Squires, Susan E. Solving puzzles. *NAPA Bulletin* 26: 191-208.

Young, Phillip D. 2008. Practicing anthropology within the academy: combining careers. NAPA Bulletin 29:56-69.

Week of April 30 - Future Pathways

- What happens next?

Readings:

Caracelli, V. 2000. Evaluation use at the threshold of the twenty-first century. New Directions in Evaluation, 88, winter 2000: pp. 99-111.

Chelimsky E. 1995 The political environment of evaluation and what it means for the development of the field: Evaluation for a new century: A global perspective. AJE 16:215-225.

Copeland Carson J and Butler MO.2005. Evaluation anthropology futures: Next steps in an emerging paradigm. In Creating Evaluation Anthropology: Introducing an Emerging Sub-Field. MO Butler and J Copeland Carson, eds. NAPA Bulletin 24: 179-181.

Hopson, R. 2001 Global and local conversations on culture, diversity and social justice in evaluation: Issues to consider in a 9/11 era. New Directions in Evaluation 22(3): 375-380, 2001.

House, ER. 1994. The future perfect of evaluation. AJE 15: 239-247.

FINAL REPORT OF EVALUATION DUE MAY. DATE TO BE DETERMINED BY PROVOST'S SCHEDULE