



PROGRAM EVALUATION THROUGH QUALITATIVE RESEARCH (PAX 516 & PXD 451)

Fall 2017
Mondays 1:45-4:45 p.m.
Hartzler Library/LB 121

INSTRUCTOR'S INFORMATION:

Roger W. Foster

roger.foster@emu.edu

Cell: 540.746.1711

Office Hours: 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. Wednesdays, or by appointment

Office Location: Roselawn 224

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to help students understand and practice the implementation of program evaluation through the methodologies of qualitative research. Historic and contemporary sociological and anthropological approaches will provide the theoretical and philosophical background for our work, but the focus will be on practical applications of qualitative methodology in evaluation. Students will practice conducting structured and semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews, coding interview transcripts, and will practice designing an evaluation: working with a client, determining appropriate methods, collecting data, analyzing the data, interpreting the data, and communicating the findings. This course complements, but does not take the place of other research and evaluation courses that focus entirely on either research or evaluation.

The course format is participatory, experiential and adaptive. Students will conduct an actual professional evaluation of an on-going program; consequently, students will find themselves leading and/or participating in processes with which they have no prior experience. Further, the syllabus, readings and assignments may need to be adapted to meet the changing needs of the program. The course involves a significant amount of group work; each participant is advised to consider that requirement in relation to personal obligations, distance from campus, ease of meeting with other students and individual willingness to participate in a work team.

This course does not satisfy any EMU Core requirements.

Pre-requisites: PAX 535 Research Methods for Social Change (graduate students); SOC 336 Methods of Social Research (undergraduate students); or permission of the instructor.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Knowledge Objectives

- Students will understand the purpose and components of a program evaluation;
- Students will understand how research methods (specifically, qualitative research) are used in program evaluation; and
- Students will understand the similarities and differences between program evaluation and other types of research-driven programming.

Practice Objectives

- Students will implement a program evaluation using qualitative methods of data collection and analysis.
- Students will develop and utilize interview skills.
- Students will develop and use data analysis skills.
- Students will use presentation skills.
- Students will develop and use team building and process skills.

Required Texts and Other Resources:

I. Required Texts (available in the EMU bookstore) including:

For graduate students enrolled in PAX 516:

Patton, Michael Quinn. (2015). *Developmental Evaluation Exemplars: Principles in Practice*. New York: The Guildford Press. ISBN 978-2-4625-2297-2. Approximately \$40 online.

For all students:

Alkin, Marvin C. (2011). *Evaluation Essentials: From A to Z*. New York: Guilford Press. ISBN 978-1-60623-898-1. Approximately \$40 online; Kindle edition available.

Church, Cheyanne, and Mark M. Rogers. (2006). *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. Search for Common Ground/United States Institute of Peace (USIP). (Available at no cost on-line in 2 parts at: <http://www.sfcg.org/Documents/manualpart1.pdf> and <http://www.sfcg.org/Documents/manualpart2.pdf>)

Lederach, John Paul, Reina Neufeldt and Hal Culbertson. (2007). *Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring and Learning Toolkit*. The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame and Catholic Relief Services (CRS). (Copy available in Moodle; also available at no cost online at <http://www.crsprogramquality.org/publications/2007/3/9/reflective-peacebuilding.html>)

Liamputtong, Pranee (2010). *Performing Qualitative Cross-Cultural Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-72731-0, Approximately \$30 online.

II. Recommended Texts (available in the EMU bookstore) including:

For graduate students:

Patton, Michael Quinn. (2010). *Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use*. New York: The Guildford Press. ISBN 978-1606238721. Approximately \$45 online; Kindle edition available. [On reserve in Hartzler Library]

For all students:

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy and Patricia Leavy. (2011). *The Practice of Qualitative Research* (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN 978-1-4129-7457-8. Approximately \$70 online; Kindle edition available.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (2012) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples, Second Edition*. London: Zed Books. ISBN 978-1-84813-950-5 (pbk.) Approximately \$30 online; Kindle edition available.

Because this course involves extensive writing to be evaluated according to the rubric adopted for use in the graduate school (see “Writing Guidelines” below), the instructor recommends the following text as a helpful resource:

Lunsford, Andrea A. (2014). *The Everyday Writer*, 5th Edition. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s. ISBN 978-1-4576-6082-5. A special EMU edition is available at the bookstore and there are copies on reserve in the library.

III. Course Reader: Recommended or Required reading materials (posted on Moodle or on reserve in Hartzler Library) including:

Hargreaves, Margaret B. (2010). *Evaluating System Change: A Planning Guide*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research. Online at <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/evaluating-system-change-a-planning-guide>. Accessed 8.10.2014.

Patton, M. Q. (2016). *From evangelist to utilization-focused evaluator*. In D. D. Williams (Ed.), *SevenNorthAmericanevaluationpioneers.NewDirectionsforEvaluation*, 150, 69–76.

Saldaña, Johnny. (2012). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers, Second Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN: 978-1-44624-737-2. Approximately \$42 online; Kindle edition available. On reserve.

Scharbatke-Church, Cheyanne. *Evaluating Peacebuilding: Not Yet All It Could Be*. In B. Austin, M. Fischer, H.J. Giessmann (eds.) 2011. *Advancing Conflict Transformation. The Berghof Handbook II*. Opladen/Framington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers. Online at www.berghof-handbook.net.

Woodrow, Peter and Chigas, Diana. *Connecting the Dots: Evaluating Whether and How Programmes Address Conflict Systems*. Online at

<http://www.cdacollaborative.org/media/107125/Connecting-the-Dots-Evaluating-Whether-and-How-Programmes-Address-Conflict-Systems.pdf>. Accessed 8.10.2014.

**IV. Additional books and Readings for background and further information if you have interest.
These items are not required for purchase or class participation:**

Bhattacharya, Kakali. (2017). *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge. ISBN 978-1-41132-133-3 (pbk.) Approximately \$40 online; ebook edition available.

Card, Orson Scott. (1986) *Speaker for the Dead*. New York: Tor. ISBN 0-812-55075-7 (pbk.) Approximately \$8 online; Kindle edition available.

Chadburn, Melissa. (2015). *Resilience Is Futile: How Well-Meaning Nonprofits Perpetuate Poverty*. Online at <http://jezebel.com/resilience-is-futile-how-well-meaning-nonprofits-perpetuate-poverty-1716461384> . Accessed 7.16.2015

Liamputtong, Pranee. (2007) *Researching the Vulnerable: A Guide to Sensitive Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications. ISBN 978-1-4129-1254-9 (pbk.) Approximately \$55 online; Kindle edition available.

Nastasi, Bonnie K., and Hitchcock, John H. (2016) *Mixed Methods Research and Culture-Specific Interventions: Program Design and Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN 978-1-4833-3382-3 (pbk.) Approximately \$26 online; Kindle edition available.

Patton, Michael Quinn. (2012) *Essentials of Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN 978-1-4129-7741-8 (pbk.) Approximately \$60 online; Kindle edition available. [On reserve at Hartzler Library]

Patton, Michael Quinn. (2015) *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice, Fourth Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN 978-1-4129-7212-3 Approximately \$66 online; Kindle edition available. [On reserve at Hartzler Library]

Skloot, Rebecca. (2010) *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*. New York: Broadway Paperbacks. ISBN 978-1-4000-5218-9 (pbk.) Approximately \$10 online; Kindle edition available.

Williams, Bob, and Hummelbruner, Richard. (2011) *Systems Concepts in Action: A Practitioner's Toolkit*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. ISBN 978-0-8047-7063-7521-72731-0 (pbk.) Approximately \$25 online; Kindle edition available.

Williams, Bob, and van 't Hof, Sjon. (2014) *Wicked Solutions: A Systems Approach to Complex Problems*. Self-published by Bob Williams. ISBN 978-0-473-28735-1 (eBook available for purchase at www.gum.co/wicked)

Several of the texts listed above are available through Hartzler Library.

REQUIREMENTS & EVALUATION:

Students are expected to complete assignments in addition to activities performed in class. There are five types of assignments that will comprise part of the overall grade: participation; presentations; interviews, transcripts, and analytical coding; a final evaluation project; and a reflective paper. Given the dynamic nature of the class and our involvement in an actual evaluation, assignments and deadlines may need to be altered after consultation with the third parties involved.

1. CLASS PARTICIPATION & ATTENDANCE

This course is intended to be hands-on and group-oriented. As such, student participation is crucial for the success of the project. Consequently the success of the learning experience depends on active student participation. As much as 5% of total grade points will be awarded for active participation in large and small group and discussion. Students will be expected to attend class having read and analyzed the main materials and contribute to class discussions. Participation will be judged on the quality and contribution of the comments to the overall class discussion. Class discussions should involve an exchange of informed ideas among students and not just the instructor. Students are expected to listen to the comments of others, responding with supporting and/or challenging ideas. It is the responsibility of an absent student to designate a fellow student to obtain any class notes, announcements, or schedule changes.

Especially useful class contributions usually involve one of the following:

- Application of key concepts from the readings in clear and insightful ways
- Bringing in ideas and examples from one's own experience that illustrate and/or question key concepts from the readings
- Expanding on or challenging another student's analysis
- Identifying parallels (or apparent contradictions) across readings
- Other contributions are welcome and encouraged.

2. INTERVIEWS AND TRANSCRIPT

As a development of skills in semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews, students will conduct an interview with an (individual) interviewee and with a focus group of individuals, selected in consultation with the course instructor. Interviews may be conducted in person, via phone or Skype. The interviews will be recorded and transcribed.

3. CODED INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

As practice in qualitative data analysis, students will analyze (code) a provided transcript of an existing interview, using a coding methodology selected in consultation with the course instructor(s).

4. EVALUATION PORTFOLIO

The course is intended to be practical and to offer an opportunity to work as a group on an actual evaluation project. Students will conduct a Utilization-Focused Evaluation of *a program from a selected client*. The final project will include document review; an evaluation plan; designing data-gathering protocols; collecting data, analyzing and interpreting data, writing a report; and giving a final

presentation. There will be a mixture of individual, paired, and group work assignments to be completed throughout the class as incremental steps to completing the overall evaluation design. All of these assignments will be included in the final evaluation portfolio. This will comprise the bulk of the course grade and will include both group and individual work. There will be high expectations that the final evaluation design and implementation be consistent with the standards of a professional, contracted evaluator/researcher.

5. DEVELOPMENTAL EVALUATION PROPOSAL (Graduate students taking three credit hours only)

Graduate students will include in their evaluation portfolio an alternate or supplemental evaluation plan and critique from the “lens” of the framework and methodology of a developmental evaluation. Graduate students will lead class session discussions on selected excerpts from “Developmental Evaluation Exemplars” and from “Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts...” This assignment will require significant reading from the Patton texts and other sources.

6. PEER REVIEW OF CLASS PARTICIPATION

Group projects often struggle with the issue of uneven contributions to the final product. To help reward those whose efforts are exemplary in the group work, one portion of the final grade will be based on peer review.

7. FINAL REFLECTION PAPER

This will be an opportunity to reflect on the concepts and methods we explored during the semester as well as our roles as researcher and program evaluator.

8. IRB ETHICS TRAINING

The Institutional Review Board requires all researchers submitting proposals to complete the online researcher training provided by NIH (the website requires the establishment of a no-cost account). This training covers basic concepts, principles, and issues related to the protection of research participants. When training is successfully completed, the researcher will receive a certificate. This certificate should be saved (as an image or pdf file) and kept on file – proof of training is required when submitting an IRB proposal.

It is likely that most class participants have completed the online researcher training. If so, participants are required to submit a verification of their certificate to the course instructor. If not, participants must complete the online researcher training (about three hours) and submit a verification of their certificate to the course instructor. It is recommended that the training be completed prior to the week three class session. Pass/Fail

GUIDANCE NOTES

In advance of each of the required assignments, separate handouts containing descriptions of the purposes, methodologies and formats of the assignment will be distributed in class or posted on Moodle.

FINAL EXAM

There will be no final exam given in this course. Evaluation will be based on completion of class projects.

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS:

Those taking the course for undergraduate credit will attend all class sessions, complete all required reading, and will participate fully in course projects. Those seeking undergraduate credit will not be required to complete the developmental evaluation proposal (assignment number 5).

This class will meet in regular session during the week of undergraduate exams. Because undergraduate exams are scheduled to begin the day following the class's final regular session, no scheduling conflicts for that week are anticipated.

ASSESSMENT OF GRADED ASSIGNMENTS**UNDERGRAD STUDENTS PXD 451***Requirements*

	<i>Points</i>	<i>Weight</i>
Class Participation (individual)	25	5%
Practice Interview & Transcription (individual)	25	5%
Focus Group Interview & Transcription (team)	25	5%
Practice Coded Transcript (individual)	50	10%
Evaluation Portfolio	300	60%
Evaluation Planning Matrix (team) 50		
Coded data sets (team) 50		
Group's preliminary findings (team) 50		
Client presentation (team) 50		
Evaluation report (individual) 100		
Peer Review	25	5%
Reflection Paper (individual)	50	10%
Total	500	100%

GRADUATE STUDENTS PAX 516*Requirements*

	<i>Points</i>	<i>Weight</i>
Class Participation (individual)	25	4%
Practice Interview & Transcription (individual)	25	4%
Focus Group Interview & Transcription (team)	25	4%
Practice Coded Transcript (individual)	50	8%
Evaluation Portfolio	300	50%
Evaluation Planning Matrix (team) 50		
Coded data sets (team) 50		
Group's preliminary findings (team) 50		
Client presentation (team) 50		
Evaluation report (individual) 100		
Peer Review	25	4%
Reflection Paper (individual)	60	10%
Developmental Evaluation proposal (individual)	90	15%
Total	600	100%

These are brief descriptions of required graded assignments for the course. More details for each assignment can be found on the "Guidance Notes" that will be provided in class.

ASSESSMENT of PASS/FAIL ASSIGNMENTS

In addition to the graded assignments listed above, there will be a number of non-graded (pass/fail) assignments. These exercises typically advance the learning trajectory within the evaluation project, but they are guided "practice" exercises whose real value lies in their role in preparing the students for the graded elements of the learning plan. Consequently, their impact is felt in the grades earned for "graded" assignments; they will not be graded separately, in addition.

Students who complete these assignments and turn them in within the time allotted will pass the assignment, and will receive feedback from the instructor. The only way to fail one of these assignments is to fail to turn it in on time. A deduction of one percent of the total available points (five points for undergraduates, six points for graduate students) will be assessed against the final course grade for each failed assignment. (That would be enough to make the difference between an A and an A-, or between an A- and a B+.)

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Writing Guidelines:

Writing will be a factor in evaluation: EMU has adopted a set of writing guidelines for graduate programs that include six sets of criteria: content, structure, rhetoric & style, information literacy, source integrity, and conventions (see page 3). It is expected that graduates will be able to write at least a “good” level with 60% writing at an “excellent” level. **The course instructor will apply the same guidelines to the work of undergraduate students in this course.** For the course papers, please follow the APA style described in CJP’s *GUIDELINES for GRADUATE PAPERS* (see CJP Student Resources moodle page or request a copy from the Academic Program Coordinator), unless directed otherwise by the instructor.

Academic Integrity Policy (AIP):

EMU faculty and staff care about the integrity of their own work and the work of their students. They create assignments that promote interpretative thinking and work intentionally with students during the learning process. Honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility are characteristics of a community that is active in loving mercy and doing justice. EMU defines plagiarism as occurring when a person presents as one’s own someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source (Adapted from the Council of Writing Program Administrators). This course will apply EMU’s AIP to any events of academic dishonesty. For more information see <http://emu.edu/writing-program/student-resources/Student Academic Integrity Policy.BB.9-16.pdf>. If you have doubts about what is appropriate, one useful website is <http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/>.

Turnitin:

Students are accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. Thus, you should be familiar with EMU’s Academic Integrity Policy (see above) in order to meet the academic expectations concerning appropriate documentation of sources. In addition, EMU is using Turnitin, a learning tool and plagiarism prevention system. For CJP classes, you may be asked to submit your papers to Turnitin from Moodle. For more information about Turnitin, with instructions for using it see:

[https://guides.turnitin.com/01 Manuals and Guides/Student Guides](https://guides.turnitin.com/01_Manuals_and_Guides/Student_Guides).

Moodle:

Moodle (<https://moodle.emu.edu/>) is the online learning platform that EMU has chosen to provide to faculty, administrators and students. Students will have access to course information within Moodle for any class they are registered for in a given term. The amount of time a student has access to information before and after the class is somewhat dependent on the access given to students by the individual faculty member. However, please note that courses are not in Moodle permanently – after two years the class will no longer be accessible. Please be sure to download resources from Moodle that you wish to have ongoing access to.

Grading Scale & Feedback:

For most assignments in this course, *grades* will be based on an accumulation of numerical points that will be converted to a letter grade at the end of the course. (Some assignments may be designated pass/fail.) Assignments will receive a score expressed as a fraction, with the points received over the total points possible (e.g. 18/20).

Designed for interaction from graduate and undergraduate students, this course uses this revision of the basic scale used for evaluation. Points may be subtracted for missed deadlines.

95-100 = A outstanding

90-94 = A- excellent

85-89 = B+ very good
80-84 = B good
76-79 = B- satisfactory
73-75 = C+ passing
70-72 = C unsatisfactory
Below 70 = F failing (for graduate students)
68-69 = C-
66-67 = D+
63-65 = D
60-62 = D-
Below 60 = F failing for undergraduate students

Graduate students are expected to earn A's & B's. A GPA of 3.0 for MA students and 2.75 for GC students is the minimum requirement for graduation. (An "A" grade is reserved for truly exceptional work. Most of us do not function at that level without significant effort and attention to detail.)

Regarding feedback on papers/projects: Students can expect to receive papers/assignments back in a class with faculty feedback before the next paper/assignment is due. This commitment from faculty assumes that the student has turned the paper in on the agreed upon due date.

Institutional Review Board:

All research conducted by or on EMU faculty, staff or students must be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board to assure participant safety: <http://www.emu.edu/irb/>.

Graduate & Professional Studies Writing Center:

Please utilize the writing center! They offer free individual tutoring from graduate student tutors. Please see <http://www.emu.edu/writing-program/> for more information, including how to schedule appointments.

Office of Academic Access:

If you have a physical, psychological, medical or learning disability that may impact your work in this course, it is your responsibility to contact the Office of Academic Access in the Academic Success Center on the third floor of the Hartzler Library. They will work with you to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. All information and documentation is treated confidentially. See <http://www.emu.edu/academics/access/> for more information.

Inclusive, Community-Creating Language Policy:

Eastern Mennonite University expects all its faculty, staff, and students to adopt inclusive written and spoken language that welcomes everyone regardless of race or ethnicity, gender, disabilities, age, and sexual orientation. We will use respectful and welcoming language in all our official departmental documents and correspondence, including those put forth by way of Internet communication, and throughout all academic coursework, inclusive of classroom presentations and conversations, course syllabi, and both written and oral student assessment materials (see CJP Student Resources moodle page or request a complete copy along with best practices from the Academic Program Coordinator).

Class Attendance:

Students are expected to attend all class meetings. If unusual or emergency circumstances prevent class attendance, the student should notify the professor in advance if possible. Multiple absences from class will result in lower grades. The student is responsible for the material presented in classes missed (from EMU Graduate Catalog). Students should be aware of the importance of regular class attendance, particularly in

the case of CJP classes that only meet once a week or over several weekends. Being absent for more than one class leads to a student missing a large portion of the class content. In addition to consistent class attendance, students should make every effort to arrive to class on time out of respect for the learning process, fellow students and faculty.

Course Extensions and Outstanding Grades:

For fall and spring semesters, all coursework is due by the end of the semester. If a student will not be able to complete a course on time, the student must submit a request one week before the end of the semester for an extension (up to 6 months), by emailing the instructor, academic advisor and the Academic Program Coordinator. If the request is granted the student will receive an "I (incomplete) for the course which will later be replaced by a final grade when the work has been turned in on the agreed upon date. If the request for an extension is denied, the student will receive a grade for the work that has been completed up until the time the course was expected to have been completed. If no work has been submitted, the final grade will be an F (or W under unusual circumstances and with permission of the Program Director). Extensions will be given only for legitimate and unusual situations. Extensions are contracted by the student with the program for up to a maximum of 6 months after the deadline for the course work. *PLEASE NOTE: Grades for coursework submitted late may be reduced at the instructor's discretion and in line with their course policy on turning in coursework after the due date. If the extension deadline is not met, the instructor will submit the final grade based on what has been received to date.*

Title IX:

The following policy applies to any incidents that occur (on or off campus) while you are a student registered at EMU. It does not apply if you are talking about incidents that happened prior your enrollment at EMU. It is important for you to know that all faculty and staff members are required to report known or alleged incidents of sexual violence (including sexual assault, domestic/relationship violence, stalking). That means that faculty and staff members cannot keep information about sexual violence confidential if you share that information with them. For example, if you inform a faculty or staff member of an issue of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination he/she will keep the information as private as he/she can, but is required to bring it to the attention of the institution's Title IX Coordinator. If you would like to talk to this office directly, Irene Kniss, Title IX Coordinator, can be reached at 540-432-4302 or irene.kniss@emu.edu. Additionally, you can also report incidents or complaints through the online portal at <http://emu.edu/safecampus/>. You may report, confidentially, incidents of sexual violence if you speak to Counseling Services counselors, Campus Ministries' pastors, or Health Services personnel providing clinical care. These individuals, as well as the Title IX Coordinator, can provide you with information on both internal & external support resources. Please refer to the Student Handbook which can be found at <http://emu.edu/cms-links/graduate-and-professional-studies/docs/graduate-student-handbook.pdf> for additional policies, information, and resources available to you.

Academic Program Policies: For more CJP-specific graduate program policies, please see <http://www.emu.edu/cjp/graduate-programs/academic-policies/>. For EMU graduate program policies see <http://emu.edu/cms-links/graduate-and-professional-studies/docs/2017-18-grad-catalog.pdf>.

Writing Standards –Graduate Level (revised Spring 2016)

Criteria	A excellent	B adequate expectations	C below expectations	Comments
Content <i>(quality of the information, ideas and supporting details)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows clarity of purpose offers depth of content applies insight and represents original thinking follows guidelines for content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows some clarity of purpose offers some depth of content applies some insight and some original thinking mostly follows guidelines for content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows minimal clarity of purpose offers minimal depth of content or incorrect content applies minimal insight and original thinking does not follow guidelines for content 	
Structure <i>(logical order or sequence of the writing)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows coherence, and logically developed paragraphs uses very effective transitions between ideas and sections constructs appropriate introduction and conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows some coherence and some logically developed paragraphs uses some effective transitions between ideas & sections shows some construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows minimal coherence and logically developed paragraphs uses minimal transitions between ideas and sections shows minimal construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion 	
Rhetoric and Style <i>(appropriate attention to audience)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is concise, eloquent and rhetorically effective effectively uses correct, varied and concise sentence structure is engaging to read writes appropriately for audience and purpose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is somewhat concise, eloquent, and rhetorically effective generally uses correct, varied, and concise sentence structure is somewhat engaging to read generally writes appropriately for audience and purpose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows minimal conciseness, eloquence, and rhetorical effectiveness uses incorrect, monotonous or simplistic sentence structure is not engaging to read lacks appropriate writing for audience and purpose uses inappropriate jargon and clichés 	
Information Literacy <i>(locating, evaluating, and using effectively the needed information as appropriate to assignment)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses academic and reliable sources chooses sources from many types of resources chooses timely resources for the topic integrates references and quotations to support ideas fully 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses mostly academic and reliable sources chooses sources from a moderate variety of types of resources chooses resources with mostly appropriate dates integrates references and quotations to provide some support for ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> lacks academic and reliable sources chooses sources from a few types of resources chooses a few resources with inappropriate dates integrates references or quotations that are loosely linked to the ideas of the paper 	
Source Integrity <i>(appropriate acknowledgment of sources used in research)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> correctly cites sources for all quotations cites paraphrases correctly and credibly includes reference page makes virtually no errors in documentation style makes virtually no errors in formatting incorporates feedback given in previous written assignments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> correctly cites sources for most quotations usually cites paraphrases correctly and credibly includes reference page with some errors makes some errors in documentation style makes some errors in formatting incorporates some feedback given in previous written assignments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides minimal sources for quotations sometimes cites paraphrases correctly and credibly, includes reference page with many errors makes many errors in documentation style makes many errors in formatting lacks incorporation of feedback given in previous written assignments 	
Conventions <i>(adherence to grammar rules: usage, spelling & mechanics of Standard Edited English or SEE)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> makes virtually no errors in SEE conventions makes accurate word choices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> makes some errors SEE conventions almost always makes accurate word choices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> makes many errors in SEE conventions makes many inaccurate word choices 	
<p>The weighting of each of the six areas is dependent on the specific written assignment and the teacher's preference. Plagiarism occurs when one presents as one's own "someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (adapted from Council of Writing Program Administrators).</p>				

Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

CRITERIA	A – Excellent	B – Minimal expectations	C – Below expectations	Comments
Goals & Audience <i>Are the goals or learning objectives of the project clear? Have they been met? Is the intended audience clearly specified? Is the project appropriate for this audience? Does the project communicate to the intended audience?</i>	-audience & goals/learning objectives clearly identified. -project appropriate for, and likely to meet, its goals -project is appropriate for specified audience -project understandable to & likely to engage and/or communicate to audience	-audience and goals identified though not as clearly as they could be - project may meet its goals but this is not entirely clear - project is at least somewhat appropriate for, and likely to communicate to audience.	-audience and goals inappropriate or inadequately identified -project unlikely to meet its goals and/or communicate to the audience	
Methodology <i>Is the overall methodology clear and appropriately used? Has the project incorporated specific methods required by the assignment? If intended as a form of intervention, has thought be given to how it will be implemented?</i>	-project incorporates inquiry methods required by the assignment -all methodologies & technologies have been appropriately used, with attention to ethical and methodological issues -if intended as intervention or advocacy, project has given adequate thought to implementation -sources & methods are adequately identified	- methodology basically appropriate to the project and appropriately used, but could be strengthened -sources and methods identified but not as fully as they could be -more thought should be given to implementation issues	-methodology inadequate and/or inadequately articulated. -sources not appropriately identified -inadequate attention to implementation issues	
Analysis <i>Is there evidence of critical thinking and analysis?</i>	- evidence of critical thinking about methods, sources, information and analysis or editing. -uses analysis/editing methods appropriate for the project -method of analysis or editing is adequately articulated	- some evidence of critical thinking but could be stronger -analytical approach and the analysis itself is basically appropriate but could be stronger and/or articulated better.	-inadequate evidence of critical thinking -analysis lacking or inadequate -analytic approach inappropriate or inadequately specified	
Craft & Coherence <i>Is the level of artistic and/or technical craft adequate for the specified goals and audience? Did it involve an appropriate amount of work?</i>	- level of craft is clearly adequate for the audience & to meet project goals (whether or not it meets “artistic” standards) -project is coherent & likely to resonate	-level of craft is minimally adequate for the audience and goals -project coherence could be stronger	-level of craft inadequate for purposes and/or audience -project is not coherent	

<i>Does the final product have coherence and "resonance?"</i>	with the intended audience -product shows an appropriate amount of effort for this assignment			
Content <i>Is the content appropriate & adequate, given the goals, audience & assignment? Is there evidence of insight, originality &/or creativity?</i>	- information conveyed is clearly adequate for goals, audience & assignment -shows depth & breadth of content -shows insight, originality &/or creativity	-information conveyed is adequate but could be strengthened -some evidence of insight, originality, or creativity	-inadequate information -little or no evidence of insight, originality and/or creativity	
				Grade

Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

Background notes:

- Arts approaches can be used in several different stages of a project:
 1. To gain or create knowledge. (For example, research “subjects” or participants might be engaged in an arts-based project as a way of soliciting information or encouraging insight.)
 2. To add complexity or nuance to created knowledge. (For example, an arts practice may serve as one method in a multi-method research project, creating an integrated, reflective methodology for the project. Alternatively, an arts practice could be used to analyze and/or interpret data collected by conventional methods.)
 3. To test knowledge. (For example, researchers might verify their interpretation of findings from a more traditional research process by creating a play or exhibit and testing it for resonance with their subjects.)
 4. To share findings. (For example, a play or exhibit might be created to (re)-present data collected or analyzed via conventional methods in order to impart the particular kinds of meaning the researcher considers important, and as a way to reach and engage a broader audience.)
 5. As a form of intervention. (For example, a project might be designed to raise awareness of an issue or conflict, to promote dialogue on a contested issue, or to advocate for a cause.)
- Arts-based products often do not specify methodologies used. Thus it may be important for a project to be accompanied by a short paper discussing analysis, theory of change, audience, goals, and methods used.
- Patricia Leavy, in *“Method Meets Art: Arts-based Research Practice”* (New York: Guilford Press) 2009, argues that “[t]raditional conceptions of validity and reliability, which developed out of positivism, are inappropriate for evaluating artistic inquiry.” (p. 15). She suggests that authenticity, trustworthiness, and validity can be assessed through attention to such elements as aesthetics, resonance, and vigor.
- For a discussion of standards, see “Method Meets Art” (Leavy, 2009: 15ff and Chapter 8).