

An Evaluation Plan: Designed for the IDE/EDA 641 Online Course



By: Rita Barger, Erin Barrett, Peggy Brown, Susanne Cameron,
Tom Carroway, Jean Hallagan, and Francine Ruva

Date: May 23, 2003

For: Dr. Nick Smith
IDE/EDA 641 Techniques in Educational Evaluation
Syracuse University

Table of Contents

I Program Selection	3
II Focus Summary	5
III Question Summary	7
IV Question/Procedure Matrix	9
V Procedure Summary	11
VI Analysis and Interpretation Plan	13
VII Reporting Summary	17
VIII Management Plan: Personnel	19
IX Management Plan: Budget	24
X Meta-Evaluation Summary	25

References

Smith, N. (2003). IDE/EDA 641: Techniques in Educational Evaluation Course Syllabus. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University.

<http://idde.syr.edu/>

http://www.col.org/resources/operational/remote_delivery.htm

I Program Selection

Program to Be Evaluated

The IDE/EDA 641: Techniques in Educational Evaluation online course offered through Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York, currently taught by Dr. Bobbi Yonai.

Purpose of the Program

The object of the evaluation is IDE/EDA 641, an introductory evaluation course offered online by the School of Education [SOE], Instructional Design, Development, and Evaluation department [IDDE] at Syracuse University [SU]. This is a required course for the IDDE masters [MS], certificate of advanced study [CAS], and doctoral programs [PhD]. In the IDDE program, MS students are required to take 8 core courses (24 credits) and four additional courses (12 credits) in one of four concentration areas for a total of at least 36 credits beyond a bachelor's degree. The CAS program requires a minimum of 60 credits beyond a bachelor's degree and a PhD requires a minimum of 90 credits. This three-credit course is one of the eight mandatory core courses offered for these programs. Educational Leadership students may also use this course to fulfill their certificate of advanced study and/or doctoral degree.

The primary aim of IDE/EDA641 is to provide a basic introductory understanding in the vast discipline of program evaluation. It teaches the central ideas and procedures associated with carrying out evaluations in a variety of contexts. While this information is transferable into many fields, the course predominantly focuses on how to conduct evaluations of educational related programs, products, staff, and policies (including training programs in various business related areas). This course provides the "step by step guidelines for planning, implementing, managing, and evaluating service-oriented field evaluations" (Smith, 2003).

Course topics include: the purpose of evaluation, evaluation focus, evaluation questions, collecting, analyzing, and reporting information, managing evaluations, meta-evaluations, cost analysis and design review.

A secondary purpose of the course is to provide students with the opportunity to work in small groups and conduct a simulated evaluation of an educational program while learning the essentials of performing an evaluation.

Clients of the Program

The primary clients are the students enrolled in this online course every other year in the spring. In 2002 there were nine students enrolled. In 2004 the course will be offered again in presumably the same format as in 2002. Typically these students have little or no prior evaluation experience or preparation in evaluation. As previously stated, all IDDE MS, CAS, and PhD students are required to complete this course. Past students may be working in a field in which they are required to perform evaluation; Thus, there may be many people who are affected differently by having taken this course.

The consumers of the program are the people/businesses that hire those students that have taken IDE/EDA641 online. These consumers of the program are directly affected by the information and understanding that students take with them from this course. Additional consumers include, but are not limited to the following:

SU personnel that would benefit from the information gathered in the evaluation such as the IDDE department chairman, Dr. Mike Spector and the IDE/EDA641 on-campus faculty, Dr. Nick Smith. Dr. Smith teaches the face-to-face version of IDE/EDA641 and has done so for over 20 years. He is the department expert in the field of evaluation. Other secondary consumers are the SOE dean, as well as the deans of other departments interested in online course/curriculum planning. Presumably the information gathered in the evaluation of this online course may aid future curriculum planning of other online courses throughout the SU campus and for other universities.

The sponsors of the program include the IDDE & Educational Leadership departments, The School of Education at Syracuse University, and University college (who co-offers this course with IDDE and Ed. Leadership). Additionally included are the people and companies who pay tuition fees to enroll in this course, as well as taxpayers and private funding resources that help students pay for their tuition through grants and loans.

The audience for IDE/EDA 641 includes: Dr. Bobbi Yonai, the current teacher of the online course; Dr. Nick Smith, the current department expert in the field of Evaluation; Dr. Mike Spector, chair of the IDE department; prospective students of IDE and Leadership Education who are required to take this course, and who might want to understand how the application of this course will affect their future careers; other departments interested in online learning and teaching might want to know how this course structure could help them in the future. Dr. Smith has taught the face-to-face version of this course for over twenty years at Syracuse University. Dr. Spector's interests include offering the entire program online to obtain a masters degree. Dr. Spector is therefore concerned with the quality of the online course offerings, wanting to insure that it meets the highest of standards for which the department has an international reputation.

The stakeholders for IDE/EDA641 online include but are not limited to the following: Dr. Bobbi Yonai, the current professor and teacher of the online version of IDE/EDA641; Dr. Nick Smith, department expert on Evaluation; the Dean of Education, the Chancellor and graduate departments all having a vested interest in increasing and maintaining the quality of Education at Syracuse University. Another group of stakeholders might include anyone interested in the fields of Evaluation and online teaching.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to determine the extent to which the course objectives have been met. Another purpose is to evaluate the process and structure of the online course, as these topics relate to the course goals and objectives. This will assist Dr. Yonai in making the changes necessary to improve the quality of the course and to enhance student outcomes.

Basic Operation

All IDDE graduate level students must take this course to meet degree requirements. The course is typically spread over of a 14-week period. The course is taught using an online course tool (such as WebCT or Blackboard). Within this course tool the instructor and students communicate using a variety of online tools available such as email, bulletin boards, and chat rooms. The course objectives are provided to the students in an online course syllabus, outlining the course overview, necessary resources, expected schedule of topics and assignments due. There is no content prerequisite and no computer skills prerequisite required in taking IDE/EDA 641.

Students learn the concepts associated with completing program evaluations.

They apply concepts learned through a group project evaluating a particular program. They are required to work both individually and collaboratively in an online environment, which includes the various synchronous and asynchronous communication methods available.

There are ten class assignments due at various times, and these are to be posted in the online course tool. Each of the ten steps builds upon the former to eventually complete an entire “real world” evaluation in a chosen context.

II Focus Summary

Focus of the Study

The focus of the evaluation is the IDE/EDA641: Techniques in Educational Evaluation online course. This course is offered through Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York and is currently taught by Dr. Bobbi Yonai.

The course is a required course in the department of IDDE, necessary to meet minimum degree requirements for the master's degree in IDDE. The course has traditionally been taught in its face-to-face context for over 30 years in the department, and has been a required course since its inception. The course is designed to satisfy minimum introductory requirements to the broad field of evaluation.

As the name implies, Instructional Design, Development and Evaluation [IDDE] has inherent in its mission a goal of educating future designers and evaluators. The IDDE department believes evaluation is a critical part of the skills necessary to conduct proper consulting/assessment of educational programs, and research in virtually any subject.

The department is currently offering a new online masters degree program. In order for the degree to be completed online, IDE/EDA641 online was developed in the fall semester, 2001. Taught initially online to 9 students, it is the hope of the department that the enrollment in this, as well as other online courses, will increase as the online coursework greatly increases the departments capacity for global influence in education of instructional, design, development and evaluation.

To ensure the quality and consistency of the IDDE graduate program, it is imperative that the online courses be as effective a delivery system as the traditional on-campus course, currently taught by Dr. Nick Smith.

Therefore, a primary focus of this evaluation is to identify the goals and course objectives of IDE/EDA641 online, as well as to generate valuable information about the structure and process of IDE/EDA641.

The secondary focus is to ascertain if these previously identified requirements (goals and objectives) are adequately being met. It is the intent of this evaluation to identify both strengths and weaknesses of the existing online course, specifically in the areas of process, and structure.

Purpose

The primary purpose of the evaluation will focus on whether the online course is meeting the minimum requirements of the faculty perception of what those standards (requirements) should be. This will not only be useful to Dr. Bobbi Yonai but also to other faculty who teach future IDE/EDA courses. It will be useful to the students and a variety of other internal audiences as well. A secondary purpose is to identify strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations so the course can be enhanced and improved from these findings. Once the goals/objectives, process and structure have been identified with the course evaluation, the team will be able to identify problem areas in need of improvement as well as suggest possible solutions to alleviate such problems.

Audience

The client for this evaluation is Dr. Bobbi Yonai

Other Audiences include but are not limited to:

The department chairman, Dr. Mike Spector, other faculty, the chancellor of SU (for economic reasons) and anyone else interested in the evaluation of online coursework, or with a desire to design future online courses more effectively. (At the discretion of the client, Dr. Bobbi Yonai.)

Other possible stakeholders are the future students of IDE/EDA641 and other IDDE enrolled students. The new Dean of Education who will be looking at the various courses and programs in the School of Education. These audiences and stakeholders will have access to the evaluation at the discretion of the client Dr. Bobbi Yonai. Those who teach evaluation in any forum, or those who are interested or currently teaching it online. Other faculty who are interested in both online courses and evaluation.

The international audiences and communities associated with the vast field of evaluation; professional organizations, etc.

The IDDE department: this allows the department to increase its quality of education, reaching wider audiences and cross listing with other departments such as IST. It allows for increased exposure of the department and field of IDDE, specifically evaluation.

All of these groups stand to benefit from the findings of this evaluation of IDE/EDA 641. By identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the IDE 641 online program, decisions can be made to adjust accordingly to improve 641, as well as many other online courses offered at SU.

Contextual Factors

The evaluation must be completed between the months of March and August 2004. A Budget has been approved and agreed upon set at \$5,000 for this project. A timeline will be set to accommodate the six-month time frame.

The team must arrange to meet w/ faculty to discuss the requirements, and to meet around individual conflicting schedules during the aforementioned timeframe

. The student evaluators will distribute study findings and instruments to the faculty. This poses particular ethical concerns in the power structure of such relationships and the potential for conflicts of interest.

Instruments need to be agreed upon by the team and Dr. Bobbi Yonai since the value of her professional work is the object of evaluation. Since the results will be reported to her supervisors, this also, poses potential ethical concerns.

There is limited prior experience in statistical analysis among team members to complete appropriate measurements for content analysis. Therefore an expert will need to be hired to eliminate this potential flaw.

The team members all possess virtually no prior experience in evaluation, particularly in an academic, online setting. The expert hired will compensate for these inadequacies.

The following table is designed to assist in the explanation of this project.

	Instructional Structure	Instructional Process
Method	Discussion Readings Projects	Instructor post question, Student read, post, react & respond Student Reading, Post reaction, respond Each do one part, share
Media	Webct Email Blackboard	Access # emails/week Post reactions
Materials	Books Readings Docushare URLs List	Buy, read, write summary Access, read write summary Access & post reactions

III Question Summary

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions	Audience	Importance
1. What is IDE/EDA 641 online?	1a. What are the goals and objectives? 1b. What are the components? 1c. Do the components correlate with the course objectives? 1d. Were all the objectives relevant to the goals of the course?	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Nick Smith Dr. Mike Spector IDDE and EDA Faculty SU Faculty SU Students	This question will serve as a frame of reference.
2. Did the online version of the course achieve its goals and objectives?	2a. Was the intended information and application of the material achieved to a satisfactory level from the faculty and students' perspectives? 2b. Were students able to design a high quality evaluation plan? 2c. Did students gain familiarity with professional standards in conducting evaluations?	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Nick Smith Dr. Mike Spector	This question allows the audience to infer how well the goals and objectives were met which provides useful information in terms of making formative changes.
3. Did the structure of this course facilitate meeting the objectives?	3a. Did the method meet the course objectives? 3b. Did the media meet the course objectives? 3c. Did the materials meet the course objectives?	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Nick Smith Dr. Mike Spector	The structure of a course has significant relevance in helping the professor to meet the course objectives. It also encompasses many components that can be altered to assist the professor in meeting these objectives.
4. Did the processes of the online course facilitate meeting the course objectives?	4a. Did the selected methods meet the course objectives? 4b. Did the media meet the course objectives? 4c. Did the materials meet the course objectives?	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Nick Smith Dr. Mike Spector	The processes used in terms of methods, media and materials have significant impact on student retention and passing grades. These factors directly corroborate to the course meeting its objectives.
5. Does the online 641 course follow established standards (e.g. The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) Guidelines for remote delivery of courses) for the objective of Distance Learning Programs?	5a. Did the online 641 course fulfill its responsibilities to students? 5b. Is it marketed accurately to students? 5c. Does the course have a development, review and revision process that is adequate to maintain quality assurance and cultural sensitivity? 5d. Is the course appropriate for the students to whom it is made available? 5e. Do the students have access to the materials needed to achieve the course goals and objectives.	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Nick Smith Dr. Mike Spector IDDE and EDA Faculty SU Faculty	This question is important because it provides data to establish whether the course meets these established standards. If the course does meet the standards, it adds credibility and prestige for the professor designing the course and the university at large. In turn, the world community that may be influenced to enroll in this online course.

This page intentionally left blank.

IV Question / Procedure Matrix

Procedure	Questions				
	<p>1.) What is IDE / EDA 641 online?</p> <p>a.) What are the goals and objectives?</p> <p>b.) What are the components?</p> <p>c.) Do the components correlate with the course objectives?</p> <p>d.) Were all the objectives relevant to the goals of the course?</p>	<p>2.) Did the online version of the course achieve its goals and objectives?</p> <p>a.) Was the intended information and application of the material achieved to a satisfactory level from the faculty and students' perspectives?</p> <p>b.) Were students able to design a high quality evaluation plan?</p> <p>c.) Did students gain familiarity with professional standards in conducting evaluations?</p>	<p>3.) Did the structure of this course facilitate meeting the objectives?</p> <p>a.) Did the method meet the course objectives?</p> <p>b.) Did the media meet the course objectives?</p> <p>c.) Did the materials meet the course objectives?</p>	<p>4.) Did the processes of the online course facilitate meeting the course objectives?</p> <p>a.) Did the selected methods meet the course objectives?</p> <p>b.) Did the media meet the course objectives?</p> <p>c.) Did the materials meet the course objectives?</p>	<p>5.) Does the online 641 course follow established standards (e.g. The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) Guidelines for remote delivery of courses) for the objective of Distance Learning Programs?</p> <p>a.) Did the online 641 course fulfill its responsibilities to students?</p> <p>b.) Is it marketed accurately to students?</p> <p>c.) Does the course have a development, review and revision process that is adequate to maintain quality assurance and cultural sensitivity?</p> <p>d.) Is the course appropriate for the students to whom it is made available?</p> <p>e.) Do the students have access to the materials needed to achieve the course goals and objectives.</p>
Records Analysis	X (a-c)	X (b)			X (b, c, e)
Past Semester Student Survey	X (d)	X (a, c)	X (a-c)	X (a-c)	X (a, d)
Post-Semester Student Survey	X (d)	X (a, c)	X (a-c)	X (a-c)	X (a, d)
Faculty Survey	X (d)		X (a-c)	X (a-c)	X (a-d)
Faculty Interview	X (c-d)	X (a-c)	X (a-c)	X (a-c)	X (a)

This page intentionally left blank.

V Procedure Summary

Procedure	Evaluation Questions Addressed	Schedule for Collection	Respondents	Sample
Records Analysis	1a, 1b, 1c, 2b, 5b, 5c, 5e	We will analyze the Spring 2002 course syllabus from the online course 3/24 – 3/26. At that time we will also review the standards from the accreditation boards of distance learning programs. Additionally we will analyze Spring 2004 information documentation in June 2004.	Course syllabus and grades from the Spring 2002 and Spring 2004 online offerings.	All current documentation from the Spring 2002/2004 offerings.
Spring 2002 Student Surveys	1d, 2a, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5d	Survey the Spring 2002 online class 3/17.	Students of the Spring 02 online IDE/EDA 641.	All students of the Spring 2002 online IDE/EDA 641.
Faculty Surveys	1d, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d	Survey all IDDE and EDA faculty 3/23.	All IDDE and EDA faculty.	All IDDE and EDA faculty.
Spring 2004 Student Surveys	1d, 2a, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5d	Survey the Spring 2004 online class 5/7.	Students of the Spring 04 online offering of IDE/EDA 641.	All students of the Spring 2004 online offering of IDE/EDA 641.
Faculty Interviews	1c, 1d, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a	Interview Bobbi Yonai, Mike Spector, and Nick Smith 6/7 - 6/11.	Bobbi Yonai, Mike Spector and Nick Smith.	All 3

This page intentionally left blank.

VI Analysis and Interpretation Plan

Evaluation Questions	Collection Procedure	Analysis Procedure	Evaluation Criteria	Procedure for Making Judgment
<p>1. What is IDE /EDA 641 online?</p> <p>a. What are the goals and objectives?</p> <p>b. What are the components?</p> <p>c. Do the components correlate with the course objectives?</p> <p>d. Were all the objectives relevant to the goals of the course?</p>	<p>Records Analysis (syllabus, course description on file in IDD&E department)</p> <p>Faculty Surveys</p>	<p>Restate objective; restate course components.</p> <p>Create a matrix of course objectives and components. Using the matrix and written statements, establish the degree of correlation that exists.</p> <p>Code frequency of responses. Calculate mean and range for each question. Rank order the scores for each question. Compare stated objectives to course components.</p>	<p>These findings will be used as baseline information.</p> <p>In the rank order of scores for each question, scores that are less than a 3 on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a discrepancy between stated objectives and course components. (*For this entire study, scores 2 and below on the survey are indicative of the non-agreement on the part of the respondent.)</p>	<p>Results will be presented to the client in the form of a written statement indicating where the components/objectives do/not align. Evaluator will also present a corresponding matrix of the course objectives and course components.</p> <p>Results will be presented to client in the form of a written report and chart with areas of discrepancy highlighted.</p>
<p>2. Did the online version of the course achieve its goals and objectives?</p> <p>a. Was the intended information and application of the material achieved to a satisfactory level from the faculty and students' perspectives?</p> <p>b. Were students able to design a high quality evaluation plan?</p> <p>c. Did students gain familiarity with professional standards in conducting evaluations?</p>	<p>Records Analysis (students' grades)</p> <p>Spring 02 Student Surveys</p> <p>Spring 04 Student Surveys</p> <p>Faculty Interview</p>	<p>Rank order the students grades.</p> <p>For all surveys: Code frequency of responses. Calculate mean and range for each question. Rank-order the scores. Compare response means between the objectives and application of the material. Compare ranges for each question.</p>	<p>Students who achieved a grade of A- or better are determined to design high quality evaluation plans.</p> <p>In the rank order of scores for each question, examined by each response group, scores that are less than a 3 on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a discrepancy between stated objectives and application of the material. For each question examined across groups, scores that differ by ≥ 2 points on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a discrepancy between objectives and application of the material. Such ranges indicate possible areas to probe in subsequent interviews.</p>	<p>Report ratio of number of high achieving to total number of students completed the course. Client makes judgments based on data.</p> <p>Results will be presented in the form of a chart of Spring 02, Spring 04 students and Faculty survey results with areas of discrepancy highlighted by group and across groups.</p> <p>Findings will be summarized.</p>

		Read transcripts and code data by themes relating to course objectives.	Examine themes for similarities and differences in relation to objectives and across faculty interviewed.	Analysis results will be compared to stated objectives and presented in the form of a written report with explanations and major discrepancies noted.
3. Did the structure of this course facilitate meeting the objectives?	Spring 02 Surveys	For all surveys: Code frequency of responses.	In the rank order of scores for each question, examined by each response group, scores that are less than a 3 on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a discrepancy between stated objectives and structure of the course. For each question examined across groups, scores that differ by ≥ 2 points on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a potential discrepancy between objectives and structure. Such ranges indicate possible areas to probe in subsequent interviews.	Results will be presented in the form of a chart of Spring 02, Spring 04 students and faculty survey results with areas of discrepancy regarding structure highlighted by group and across groups.
a. Did the method meet the course objectives?	Spring 04 Student Surveys	Calculate mean and range for each question. Rank-order the scores.		
b. Did the media meet the course objectives?	Faculty Surveys	Compare response means between stated objectives and structure of course. Compare ranges for each question.		
c. Did the materials meet the course objectives?				
	Faculty Interview	Read transcripts and code data by themes relating to methods.	Examine themes for similarities and differences in relation to objectives and across faculty interviewed.	Findings will be summarized. Analysis results will be compared to stated objectives and presented in the form of a written report with explanations and major discrepancies noted.
4. Did the processes of the online course facilitate meeting the course objectives?	Spring 02 Surveys	For all surveys: Code frequency of responses.	In the rank order of scores for each question, examined by each response group, scores that are less than a 3 on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a discrepancy between stated objectives and processes used in the course. For each question examined across groups, scores that differ by ≥ 2 points on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a discrepancy between objectives and processes. Such ranges indicate possible areas to probe in subsequent interviews.	Results will be presented in the form of a chart of Spring 02, Spring 04 students and faculty survey results with areas of discrepancy regarding processes highlighted by group and across groups.
a. Did the selected methods meet the course objectives?	Spring 04 Student Surveys	Calculate mean and range for each question. Rank-order the scores.		
b. Did the media meet the course objectives?	Faculty Surveys	Compare response means between stated objectives and processes of course. Compare ranges for question.		
c. Did the materials meet the course objectives?				
	Faculty Interview	Read transcripts and code data by themes relating to processes.	Examine themes for similarities and differences in relation to objectives and across faculty interviewed.	Findings will be summarized. Analysis results will be compared to stated objectives and presented in the form of a written report with explanations and major discrepancies noted.
5. Does the online 641 course	Records Analysis	Use previously created matrix	There should be a high correlation between	Present discrepancies to client.

follow established standards (e.g. The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) Guidelines for remote delivery of courses) for the objective of Distance Learning Programs?	(syllabus, course description on file in IDD&E department)	of course objectives and components. Using the matrix and written statements, determine whether the objectives appear to match the COL guidelines.	items in all comparisons.	
a. Did the online 641 course fulfill its responsibilities to students?	Spring 02 Surveys	For all surveys: Code frequency of responses.		
b. Is it marketed accurately to students?	Spring 04 Student Surveys	Calculate mean and range for each question.	In the rank order of scores for each question, examined by each response group, scores that are less than a 3 on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a discrepancy between stated objectives and application of the COL guidelines. For each question examined across groups, scores that differ by ≥ 2 points on a 5-point Likert scale will indicate a discrepancy between objectives and COL guidelines. Such ranges indicate possible areas to probe in subsequent interviews.	Results will be presented in the form of a chart of Spring 02, Spring 04 students and faculty survey results with areas of discrepancy regarding COL guidelines highlighted by group and across groups.
c. Does the course have a development, review and revision process that is adequate to maintain quality assurance and cultural sensitivity?	Faculty Surveys	Rank-order the scores. Compare response means between stated objectives and processes of course. Compare ranges for question.		
d. Is the course appropriate for the students to whom it is made available?				
e. Do the students have access to the materials needed to achieve the course goals and objectives?	Faculty Interview	Read transcripts and code data by themes relating to COL guidelines.	Examine themes for similarities and differences in relation to objectives and across faculty interviewed.	Findings will be summarized. Analysis results will be compared to stated objectives and presented in the form of a written report with explanations and major discrepancies noted.

This page intentionally left blank.

VII Reporting Summary

The evaluation of the online version IDE/EDA 641 Techniques in Education Evaluation at Syracuse University covers a six month period of time, March 2004 through August 2004. The August deadline is necessary to enable the evaluation team to complete a student survey upon completion of the online course being taught in the spring 04 semester and adequate time for Dr. Bobbi Yonai to review the findings of the evaluation summary. Being an internal evaluation, there will be many opportunities for informal and frequent reporting. Formal reports will be completed on a set schedule and those deadlines are also indicated.

Event	Date/Freq.	Format	Nature/Scope of Content	Audience
Informal meeting	March 1	Meeting over coffee	Discuss evaluation plan, purpose and set guidelines	Dr. Bobbi Yonai
Summary Report re: syllabus and objectives. Solicit cooperation – student and faculty surveys	March 29	Brief written internal memorandum sent via email	State the course objectives. This summary report will prepare them for their upcoming faculty interview session. Explain purpose of planned data collection via faculty interview, solicit cooperation and input	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Mike Spector Dr. Nick Smith Spring 02 and 04 IDDE students, IDDE/EDA faculty
Summary Report re: grades and components. Solicit cooperation – faculty interview	March 29	Brief written internal memorandum sent via email	State the course grades and components. This summary report will prepare them for their upcoming faculty interview session. Explain purpose of planned data collection via faculty interview, solicit cooperation and input	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Mike Spector Dr. Nick Smith
Final Comparison Report	March 30	Brief written report with graphics/charts	Compare the course objectives, grades and components (Spring 02 & Spring 04) - Information on distributing and collecting survey/interview instruments	Dr. Bobbi Yonai
Initial Report	April 1-April 2	Oral report by Evaluation Team Leader	Status and planning report	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Mike Spector Dr. Nick Smith
Progress Updates	Monthly	Brief written report with graphics/charts	Progress, preliminary findings, next steps	Dr. Bobbi Yonai
Preliminary Executive Report	August 2	Informal meeting - written report and oral presentation, question and answer session	Review of evaluation, present data, conclusions, interpretations, recommendations, and implications	Dr. Bobbi Yonai
Revised Executive Report	August 13	Written report with appendices, instruments	Review of evaluation, present data, conclusions, interpretations, recommendations, implications, and fuller report	Dr. Bobbi Yonai
Final Executive Report and Executive abstract	August 23	Written report with appendices, instruments and completed analysis with brief executive abstract.	Review of evaluation, present data, conclusions, interpretations, recommendations, implications, and fuller report	Dr. Bobbi Yonai Dr. Mike Spector Dr. Nick Smith IDDE faculty EDA faculty
Final Executive abstract to the press and public	August 31	News article in Syracuse Record in September, article post on following websites: SU, IDDE and EDA	Release the executive summary of the evaluation, data and implications.	All SU faculty All SU students

This page intentionally left blank.

VIII Management Plan: Personnel

An evaluation for the online version of IDE/EDA 641 *Techniques in Education Evaluation* at Syracuse University covers a six-month period of time from March 2004 through August 2004. The evaluation team will be comprised of: a lead evaluator who will also serve as the overall project manager of the evaluation (referred to as Evaluator 1); an IDD&E Graduate Assistant (referred to as Evaluator 2); an Administrative Assistant to help with secretarial duties (referred to as Administrative); and an outside consultant will be hired for design review and analysis and interpretation assistance (referred to as Consultant). The GA and Administrative Assistant will be available to perform data entry duties, and to tabulate survey results and format data in a comprehensive package. Work time for each work position is represented in terms of days (1 – full; .75 three-quarters of a day; .50 half day; .25 quarter of a day.) Each day in hours is an eight (8) hour workday with a one-hour lunch break.

Evaluation Work Plan	Description	Responsibility	March 2004	April 2004	May 2004	June 2004	July 2004	August 2004
Evaluation								
A.1	Develop Focus of Evaluation	Evaluator 1	.75 (3/1)					
A.1		Evaluator 2	1 (3/1)					
A.2	Draft Design	Evaluator 1	1.5 (3/2-3/5)					
A.3	Review Draft	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/8)					
A.3		Consultant	.5 (3/8)					
A.4	Revise Draft	Evaluator 1	1 (3/9)					
A.5	Review Revised Draft	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/10-3/11)					
A.5		Consultant	.5 (3/10-3/11)					
A.6	Produce Copies of Final Plan	Admin	.5 (3/12)					
Develop	Procedures and Instruments							
B.1	Create Master Schedule	Evaluator 1	1 (3/15)					
B.2	Schedule Record Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object Spring 02	Evaluator 2	.25 (3/1)					
B.3	Schedule Record Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object Spring 04	Evaluator 2	.25 (3/1)					
B.4	Schedule Comparative Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object. Spring 02 & 04	Evaluator 2	.25 (3/1)					
B.5	Schedule Record Analysis Spring 02 Students' Grades	Evaluator 2	.25 (3/1-3/5)					
B.6	Schedule Record Analysis Spring 04 Students' Grades	Evaluator 2				.25 (6/1)		
B.7	Draft Spring 02 Student Survey Questions	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/16)					
B.8	Review Spring 02 Student Survey	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/16)					
B.8		Consultant	.5 (3/16)					
B.9	Revise Spring 02 Student Survey Questions	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/17)					
B.10	Print Spring 02 Student Survey Questions	Admin	.5 (3/17)					

Evaluation Work Plan	Description	Responsibility	March 2004	April 2004	May 2004	June 2004	July 2004	August 2004
B.11	Draft Spring 04 Student Survey Questions	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/18)					
B.12	Review Spring 04 Student Survey	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/18)					
B.12		Consultant	.5 (3/18)					
B.13	Revise Spring 04 Student Survey Questions	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/19)					
B.14	Print Spring 04 Student Survey Questions	Admin	.5 (3/19)					
B.15	Draft Faculty Survey Questions	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/22)					
B.16	Review Faculty Survey Questions	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/22)					
B.16		Consultant	.5 (3/22)					
B.17	Revise Faculty Survey Questions	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/23)					
B.18	Print Faculty Survey Questions	Admin	.5 (3/23)					
B.19	Design Faculty Interview Questions	Evaluator 1		.5 (4/5)				
B.19		Evaluator 2		.5 (4/5)				
B.20	Review Faculty Interview Questions	Evaluator 1		.5 (4/6-4/7)				
B.20		Consultant		.5 (4/6-4/7)				
B.21	Revise Faculty Interview Questions	Evaluator 1		.5 (4/6-4/7)				
B.22	Print Faculty Interview Questions	Admin		.5 (4/8-4/9)				
B.23	Schedule Faculty Interviews	Admin			.5 (5/3-5/7)			
Information	Collecting							
C.1	Do Record Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object Spring 02	Evaluator 2	.5 (3/3)					
C.2	Do Record Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object Spring 04	Evaluator 2	.5 (3/3)					
C.3	Do Comparative Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object Spring 02 & 04	Evaluator 2	.5 (3/4)					
C.4	Do Record Analysis Spring 02 Students' Grades	Evaluator 2	.5 (3/4)					
C.5	Do Record Analysis Spring 04 Students' Grades	Evaluator 2				.5 (6/2)		
C.6	Send Out Spring 02 Student Surveys	Admin	.25 (3/17)					
C.7	Tabulate Spring 02 Student Surveys	Admin		1 (4/19-4/23)				
C.8	Send Out Spring 04 Student Surveys	Admin			.25 (5/7)			

Evaluation Work Plan	Description	Responsibility	March 2004	April 2004	May 2004	June 2004	July 2004	August 2004
C.9	Tabulate Spring 04 Surveys	Admin				1 (6/14-6/18)		
C.10	Send Out Faculty Surveys	Admin	.25 (3/23)					
C.11	Tabulate Faculty Surveys	Admin			1 (5/3-5/7)			
C.12	Interview Faculty	Evaluator 1				2.5 (6/7-6/11)		
Analyze								
D.1	Analyze Record Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object Spring 02	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/24-3/26)					
D.2	Analyze Record Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object Spring 04	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/24-3/26)					
D.3	Analyze Comparative Analysis of Syllabus, Course Description & Object. Spring 02 & 04	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/24-3/26)					
D.4	Analyze Spring 02 Students' Grades	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/24-					
D.5	Analyze Spring 04 Students' Grades	Evaluator 1				.5 (6/3-6/4)		
D.6	Analyze Spring 02 Student Surveys	Evaluator 1		1 (4/26-4/30)				
D.7	Analyze Spring 04 Student Surveys	Evaluator 1				1 (6/7-6/11)		
D.8	Analyze Faculty Surveys	Evaluator 1			1 (5/10-5/14)			
D.9	Analyze Faculty Interview Data	Evaluator 1				.5 (6/14-		
Reports								
E.1	Informal meeting	Evaluator 1	.25 (3/1)					
E.2	Summary Report re: syllabus and	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/29)					
E.3	Summary Report re: grades and	Evaluator 1	.5 (3/29)					
E.4	Draft Comparison Report	Evaluator 1	1 (3/30)					
E.5	Review Comparison Report	Evaluator 1	1 (3/31)					
E.5		Consultant	1 (3/31)					
E.6	Revise Comparison Report	Evaluator 1		.5 (4/1)				
E.7	Print Final Comparison Report	Admin		.5 (4/1)				
E.8	Draft Initial Report	Evaluator 1		1 (4/1-4/2)				
E.9	Review Initial Report	Evaluator 1		.5 (4/6)				
E.9		Consultant		.5 (4/6)				

Evaluation Work Plan	Description	Responsibility	March 2004	April 2004	May 2004	June 2004	July 2004	August 2004
E.10	Revise Initial Report	Evaluator 1		.5 (4/7)				
E.11	Print Initial Report	Admin		.5 (4/8)				
E.12	Solicit cooperation – Spring 02 survey via listserv	Evaluator 2	.5 (3/5)					
E.13	Solicit cooperation – faculty survey via listserv	Evaluator 2	.5 (3/11)					
E.14	April 04 Progress Update	Evaluator 1		.5 (4/1-4/2)				
E.15	May 04 Progress Update	Evaluator 1			.5 (5/3-5/4)			
E.16	June 04 Progress Update	Evaluator 1				.5 (6/1-6/2)		
E.17	July 04 Progress Update	Evaluator 1					.5 (7/1-7/2)	
E.18	August 04 Progress Update	Evaluator 1						.5 (8/2-8/3)
E.19	Solicit cooperation – Spring 04 survey via listserv	Evaluator 2		.5 (4/26)				
E.20	Solicit cooperation – faculty interview – via listserv	Evaluator 2		.5 (4/26)				
E.21	Draft Executive Report	Evaluator 1					2 (7/20-7/21)	
E.21		Evaluator 2					2 (7/20-7/21)	
E.22	Review Executive Report	Evaluator 1					1 (7/23)	
E.22		Consultant					1 (7/23)	
E.23	Revise Executive Report	Evaluator 1					2 (7/26-7/27)	
E.24	Print Final Executive Report	Admin					1 (7/29)	
E.25	Deliver Final Report: Abstract to the press	Evaluator 1						1 (8/31)
E.25	Deliver Final Report: Abstract to the press	Evaluator 2						1 (8/31)

This page intentionally left blank.

IX Evaluation Budget

Personnel	Cost Per Day	Total Days	Cost Totals
Evaluator 1	\$75	34.5	\$2587.50
Evaluator 2	\$50	10.25	\$512.50
Administrative	\$50	8.75	\$437.50
Consultant	\$150	5.5	\$1100.00
Total Personnel Costs			\$4637.50
Food Allowance			
Meals (Lunch w/Bobbi 8/2/03)			\$60.00
Snacks for Various Meetings: including consultant visits & lunches			\$100.00
Total Food Allowance			\$160.00
Printing/Mail			
*Printing of Reports: Monthly Progress, Revised & Final Executive Reports, Summary Reports, Final Comparison Report			\$100.00
**Postage			\$75.00
Total Printing/Mail Costs			\$175.00
Budget Total			\$4972.50

*Printing costs based on \$0.07 - \$0.10 per page/copy cost.

**Most surveys will be sent out in electronic form if possible, but an allowance for postage has been made for mailing costs if necessary.

The IDD&E department has agreed to allow this team to use the computer lab on the third floor of Huntington Hall.

X Meta-Evaluation Summary

Standards considered not applicable or marginally applicable

A12 Metaevaluation

Metaevaluation is an evaluation of an evaluation. The evaluation team consists of Master's level students within the IDDE/EDA program itself. The limited internal evaluation that was conducted does not warrant or need a formal metaevaluation. There is not sufficient money and time to conduct an appropriate metaevaluation. Due to the limitations, this would have been conducted internally and this would cause a conflict of interest. Both internal and external perspectives are desirable, and this could not be done. This would be more applicable in a formal evaluation.

U7 Evaluation Impact

The evaluation team was given a very specific purpose. The purpose was to generate information about the efficacy of IDE/EDA 641 as taught online and the process of the online course structure to assist the client in making changes necessary to improve the quality of the course and enhance student outcomes. The evaluation team cannot guarantee that the client will read the results or guarantee that the client will implement the findings. Because this evaluation was planned, conducted, and reported with the client in mind, it does not have much influence on the actions and decisions of the stakeholders.

F2 Political Viability

This evaluation is focused on the client and the stakeholders. The evaluation had limited resources and time. Interests groups were not considered for this particular evaluation. A formal contract to assure that the evaluation team would have access to the appropriate data was not necessary with this internal evaluation. The client agreed in the initial meeting to give access to all information to the evaluation team.

Standards which are applicable and which have been well provided for in the evaluation

U1 Stakeholder Identification

This is an incredibly important standard to follow with an internal evaluation conducted by Master's level students within the IDDE/EDA program itself. Upon the initial information meeting with the client, the Evaluation Team Leader is well aware of who will use the evaluation results, what the evaluation plan involved and who it will affect. The stakeholders were also identified and notified of this evaluation via formative summary briefs, reports, and informal meetings. All stakeholders will receive a notification of the upcoming survey or other data collection tool. This will encourage any feedback to assist us to develop realistic expectations and for any stakeholder biographical information (for example, past student information). To ascertain and accommodate the needs, special effort and energy was given at the beginning and throughout the evaluation to identify the client and all the crucial audiences.

A11 Impartial Reporting

The evaluation team has carefully planned numerous reports throughout the evaluation. Upon the initial informal meeting, the client and the evaluation team leader agreed upon a tentative schedule of reporting, which included preliminary and final reports. The Reporting Summary will reflect the timeline. One major focus that the evaluation team is that all parties will be neutral. To factor this out, the decision was made to hire an external consultant. This consultant will have the authority to make edits to the Comparison Report in the beginning stages and the Executive Report at the end will be reviewed by an external consultant prior to the submission to the client and/or crucial audiences. Ultimately, the client will have the final decision regarding edits. In the informal initial meeting with the client, the evaluation team leader and the client reached an agreement regarding the steps to be taken to ensure the fairness of all reports. Upon review and final revision, the report will be given to the Client prior to any public communication to safeguard against any distortions. The Executive Report will state the strengths that can be utilized and the weaknesses or problems that can be addressed.

P8 Fiscal Responsibility

The allocation and expenditures of the resources for this evaluation have been clearly stated in our Management Plan and Budget. The evaluation team leader and the client have agreed upon the established budget. One person on the evaluation team has been designated to maintain accurate records of all the sources of funding and expenditures, which include personnel, the external consultant, all office supplies, printing, and any other overhead. Any updates, changes or reallocations that might occur during the process of the evaluation will be properly recorded and accounted for within the budget. All unexpected occurrences that might threaten the financial viability of evaluation will be discussed with the client.

Standards which are applicable and not yet well provided for in the evaluation

P7 Conflict of Interest

Every internal evaluation will experience some conflict of interest. The client of this evaluation works in a very small department where relationships may influence the outcomes. In the initial meeting, the evaluation team leader addressed these issues openly and honestly with the client. They both agreed to protect this evaluation and to discuss any concerns and/or issues throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team leader will report directly to the client and will not distribute any information to other stakeholders or the public without the client's prior knowledge and approval. An external Consultant was hired to review various reports and will be used in this area, if necessary. Stakeholders will be notified throughout the process of upcoming data collection and will receive the Executive Report. Our design addresses a number of issues that may arise with conflict of interest. However, there will be assumptions that not all conflict of interest within an internal evaluation can be foreseen. To assure compliance with this standard, a formal metaevaluation could be conducted to reduce the problems. Unfortunately, a formal metaevaluation is not an option for us due to cost and the limitations of this evaluation.

U2 Evaluator Credibility

The work plan and the composition of the evaluation have been considered and the concerns of the key stakeholders will be addressed throughout the evaluation. It will be presented to the stakeholders in non-technical reports that will be easy to understand and use for implementation. The evaluation will be conducted in such a manner that it will not create or lean toward the values of one stakeholder's perspective. Resources will not be used to achieve credibility, but will be used to conduct and complete the evaluation. To assure the compliance of this standard, our team must consist of persons with a collective knowledge and qualifications to meet the needs of the client and the stakeholders. They must exhibit the competence required of them to complete the findings and the reports. Being master level students conducting this evaluation, it is impossible to know all the social and political forces associated with this evaluation and they have not established total credibility with the client.

U3 Information Scope and Selection

The evaluation team has successfully addressed and understood the requirements for the evaluation. During the initial meeting with the client and in the communication sent out to the stakeholders to notify them of the upcoming data collection, everyone was notified that not all questions can be answered. The timeline of the evaluation has taken into account that there needs to be flexibility to add questions and include unanticipated information that could influence the evaluation. In addition, the evaluation team has considered the needs of the client and the stakeholders and had continuous communication. An issue that the evaluation team needs to address is the scope and selection of the data. One issue was the limited amount of time in this class, there was not time to review pertinent literature, research reports or discuss with stakeholders their specific needs. Since the evaluation team made the decision on which tools to use, the data collection tools will create very limited data. Specifically, the tools used were three surveys (students from the online spring 02 course, students from the online spring 04 course and IDDE/EDA faculty) and an interview session with a selected group of faculty. To improve, the client should have been able to rank the audiences in order of importance and had more input as to who the audiences were. Last, it is possible that we could have interviewed students, but because of the convenience, we used the methodology we chose.