New Course Proposal

Course name:

Organizational Assessment and Program Evaluation in Nonprofit Organizations

שם הקורס: הערכה ארגונית ומדידת תכניות בארגונים ללא כוונת רווח

Course type: ☐ Class ☐ Seminar ☒ Workshop
Requirement: ☒ Required ☐ Elective ☐ Prerequisite

Brief course description:
The course is designed to introduce students to the approaches to organizational assessment and evaluation of nonprofit programs and interventions. The class will explore a variety of ways of assessing organizations, review the dimensions essential to nonprofit organizations, and explore some processes useful to enable change. In addition, the course will focus on the process of creating and measuring program outcomes.

תיאור הקורס:

הקורס מיועד להציג בפני הסטודנטים את הגישות למדידה ולהערכה ארגונית של תכניות וארגונים ללא מטרת רווח. הכיתה תבחן מגוון דרכים של הערכת ארגונים, תסקור את הממדים החיוניים לארגונים ללא מטרות רווח, ותחקור כמה תהליכים שימושיים כדי לאפשר שינוי. בנוסף, הקורס יתמקד בתהליך של יצירה ומדידת תוצאות תכנית.

Sources:
1. Patton, M.Q. (2010). Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use. The Guilford Press: New-York.
2. Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. Seventh Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. [Referred to as Rossi et al. in course outline]
3. Additional outside readings as assigned in the syllabus (below).

Course goals:

1. Understand the current state of nonprofit management as it relates to the evaluation of program and agency outcomes;
2. Learn to assess evaluation studies and use prior research in enhancing the quality of program interventions;
3. Formulate program evaluation questions appropriate for specific nonprofit settings;

4. Apply theories, research principles, and methods to program evaluation in specific settings;
5. Learn to use appropriate research design, measurement, sampling, data collection, and data analysis in conducting program evaluation;
6. Understand the effects of organizational environment and cultural context in designing, managing, implementing, and utilizing program evaluation;
7. Perceive ethical and political issues in program evaluation; and
8. Appreciate the role of class, race, gender, sexual orientation, and culture in evaluation research design and the interpretation of study results.

Course topics:

Introduction to the Course
The Field of Evaluation
Ethical Issues & Protection of Human Subjects
Identifying Community Needs
Assessing Agency Performance Management Tools for Self-Assessment
Introduction to Process and Outcome Evaluation Methods
Articulating Program Theory & Structure
Monitoring Approaches and Measures
Designing Systematic Evaluation Plans I
Designing Systematic Evaluation Plans II
Real World Evaluation: Deciding what to measure, how and when.
Evaluation Findings and Lesson Learned

Bibliography:
[1] Bocquet, G. (2010). The 20 Worst Charities in America. www.mainstreet.com
[2a] Cunnigham, K., & Ricks, M. (2004). Why measure? Nonprofits use metrics to show that they are efficient. But what if donors don't care? *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Stanford Graduate School of Business. Summer.
[2b] Snibbe, A. C. (2006). Drowning in data. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Stanford Graduate School of Business. Fall. 39-45.
[3] Newcomer, K.E. (1997). Using performance measurement to improve programs. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 75, 5-14.
[4] Program, Policies and Evaluation (Rossi et al., Ch. 1, 3-30)
[5] Tailoring Evaluations (Rossi et al., Ch. 2, 31-66)
[6] Oakes, J. M. (2002). Risks and wrongs in social research: An evaluator's guide to the IRB. *Evaluation Review*, 26(5), 443-479.
[7] Guiding Principles for Evaluators -- available on-line at http://www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesPrintable.asp
[8] Assessing the Need for a Program (Rossi et al., Ch. 4, 101-132)
[9] Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). Using the Balanced Scorecard as a Strategic Management System. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb, 75-85.
[10] Putnam, K. (2004). Measuring Foundation Performance: Examples from the Field. Oakland, CA: California Healthcare Foundation.

[11] Schalock, R. L., & Bonham, G. S. (2003). Measuring outcomes and managing for results. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 26, 229-235.

[12] Identifying Issues and Formulating Questions (Rossi et al., Ch. 3, 67-100)

[13] Jacobs, F. H. (2003). Child and family program evaluation: Learning to enjoy complexity. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7(2), 62-75.

[14] Expressing and Assessing Program Theory (Rossi et al., Ch. 5, 133-168)

[15] Plantz, M. C., Greenway, M. T., & Hendricks, M. (1997). Outcome measurement: Showing results in the nonprofit sector. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 75, 15-30.

[16] Fischer, R. (2001). The sea change in nonprofit human services: A critical assessment of outcomes measurement. *Families in Society*, 82(6), 561-568.

[17] Assessing & Monitoring Program Process (Rossi et al., Ch. 6, 169-202)

[18] Measuring & Monitoring Program Outcomes (Rossi et al, Ch 7, 203-232)

[19] Czaja, C. & Blair, J. (2005) Questionnaire design: Writing the questions. *Designing Surveys: A Guide to Decisions and Procedures*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 59-83.

[20] Assessing Program Impact: Randomized Field Experiments (Rossi et al., Ch. 8, 233-264)

[21] Myers, D., & Dynarski, M. (2003). Random Assignment in Program Evaluation and Intervention Research: Questions and Answers. Washington: U.S. Department of Education.

[22] Boruch, R. (2002). The virtues of randomness. *Education Next*. Fall. 37-41.

[23] Cook, T. D. (2001). Sciencephobia: Why education researchers reject randomized experiments. *Education Next*. Fall. 63-68.

[24] Assessing Program Impact: Alternative Designs (Rossi et al., Ch. 9, 265-300)

[25] Detecting, Interpreting, & Analyzing Program Effects (Rossi et al., Ch.10, 301-330)

[26] Gueron, J. M. (2004). Throwing good money after bad: A common error misleads foundations and policymakers. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. 69-71.

[27] The Social Context of Evaluation (Rossi et al., Ch. 12, 369-421)

[28] Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., Church, M., & Fort, L. (2004). Shoestring evaluation: Designing impact evaluations under budget, time, and data constraints. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 25(1), 5-37.

[29] Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). Psuedoevaluations. *Evaluation Theories, Models, & Applications*. Chapter 6 (pp. 145-158). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[30] Patton, M. Q. (2006). Evaluation for the way we work. *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, Spring, 28-33.

Course requirements:

Final Exam 50%
Presentation 35%

Participation 15%

אישור ועדת ההוראה של תוכנית מנדל

יו"ר ועדת ההוראה:__פרופ׳ פייר קלץ _   תאריך: ___27/03/16_____

☒ אושר   ☐ לא אושר   חתימה:_____

ראש התכנית: _____   תאריך: _____

☐ אושר   ☐ לא אושר   חתימה:_____

אישור ועדת הוראה של בית הספר

יו"ר ועדת הוראה בית-ספרית: _____

☐ אושר   ☐ לא אושר   חתימה: _____   תאריך: _____

הערות:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____