

**University of Pennsylvania**  
**School of Social Policy & Practice**  
**NPLD 783-001 2021C Field Exercise in Social Impact Measurement**

**TIME/LOCATION**

Mondays, 8:30 am to 11:30 am

Van Pelt 302

**(Note: The first day of the class will be September 13, 2021, and the last day will be December 13, 2021. Since the Van Pelt Library opens at 8:30 am. Therefore, the class will start no later than 8:45 am.)**

**INSTRUCTOR**

Instructor: Sidney R. Hargro, MSME, MDIV

Home Office Phone (856) 375-4297 (Texting Preferred)

E-mail: [srhargro@gmail.com](mailto:srhargro@gmail.com)

Zoom Office Hours: By Appointment

**COURSE PURPOSE**

The purpose of social impact measurement in philanthropy is to assess, learn, and improve the impact of nonprofit programs and social impact initiatives, and to improve the effectiveness of grantmaking. In addition to reporting program results, social impact measurement offers both grantmakers and nonprofits the opportunity to consider the following:

- Influences of historical and systemic inequity on the conditions experienced by the prioritized audience;
- Cultural and contextual awareness of program design and implementation, as well as evaluation design; and
- Inclusion of prioritized populations in the identification of key measures of success.

This course covers social impact measurement methodology types, case studies, and offers the opportunity to participate in a field exercise. The student teams will be assigned to a local nonprofit program and will develop an evaluation plan and instrument(s) using one or more methodology types while giving specific and appropriate attention to the nonprofit's capacity to implement the plan.

Teams will present their evaluation plan, instrument(s), and recommendations to the nonprofit organization at the end of the course. This course includes lecture sessions, out-of-class group work sessions, and group fieldwork sessions with nonprofit leaders.

**EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES**

This course explores standard and emerging social impact measurement methodology types and related case studies while centering on the program participant's cultural and contextual environment and acknowledging historical and systemic drivers of racial and intersectional disparities. These factors will be considered as students develop evaluation plans and instruments during the course. Upon completion of this course, students will:

1. Demonstrate beginning skill in identifying appropriate social impact methodology based on program size and complexity.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the theory of change and logic model frameworks with consideration for the non-linear nature of social impact programs.

- Demonstrate application of one or more social impact methodology types while centering racial equity with intersectionality and other issues of equity in the development of an evaluation plan, instrument(s), and recommendations for the nonprofit organization.

### COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

All assignments must be completed and submitted per the assignment guides located in Canvas and included in the syllabus. All assignments must be submitted on the required platform and by the time and date specified below to receive full credit.

Assignments		
No.	Description/Platform	Due
#1	[INDIVIDUAL] Discussion Board Post (400-word minimum): "Not racist" vs. "Anti-racist" Organizations post in Canvas	9/24/2021, 11:59 pm EST
#2	[GROUP] Introductory Interview Questions developed using Google Docs	9/27/2021, 7:30 am EST
#3	[GROUP] Methodology Case/Logic Model/Work Plan Presentations developed using Google Slides	10/18/2021, 7:30 am EST
#4	[GROUP] Preliminary Evaluation Instruments Design Presentations developed using Google Slides	11/15/2021, 7:30 am EST
#5	[INDIVIDUAL] Evaluation Plan Critique developed using Google Docs	11/22/2021, 7:30 am EST
#6	[GROUP] Final Report: Evaluation Plan/Instruments/Recommendations Presentations developed using Google Slides	12/13/2021, 7:30 am EST

### ASSIGNMENT GRADING RUBRICS AND COURSE GRADING SCALE

Demonstrated knowledge and implementation of evaluation methodology, student engagement (including attendance, engagement in class, and contribution to team activities), and the quality and thoroughness of assignments will comprise the course grades. Grades are calculated using the following grade scale, assignment weighting, and grading rubrics:

Course and Assignment Grade Scale			
Letter	Range	Letter	Range
A+	97-100	C+	77 - 79.99
A	94-96.99	C	74 - 76.99
A-	90 - 93.99	C-	70 - 73.99
B+	87 - 89.99		
B	84 - 86.99		
B-	80 - 83.99		

Assignment Weighting for Course Grade	
Assignment	% of Grade
Discussion Board Post (400-word minimum): "Not racist" vs. "Anti-racist" Organizations	10%
Introductory Interview Questions	5%
Methodology Case/Logic Model/Work Plan Presentation	10%
Evaluation Plan Critique	20%
Preliminary Evaluation Instruments Design Presentation	10%
Final Report: Evaluation Plan/Instruments/Recommendations Presentation	30%
Student Engagement ( <i>see Student Engagement Assessment below</i> )	15%

**Assignment Grading Rubrics:**

Assignments and student engagement will be graded using the following rubrics.

Assignment 1:

CRITERIA	RATING			PTS
COMPLETION	10 pts A post is completed and submitted by the deadline unless approved by the instructor beforehand. Post is 400-500 words. Post addresses the video and addresses the prompts in the assignment guide.	5 pts A post is completed with less than 400 words, or is completed late (within 48 hours of the deadline) without approval in advance by the instructor, or does not adequately address the prompts given in the assignment guide.	0 pts A post is not completed or completed after 48 hours of the deadline or does not address any of the prompts given in the assignment guide.	0 to 10
				0 to 10

Assignment 2:

CRITERIA	RATING		PTS
COMPLETION	5 pts The assignment is completed and submitted by the deadline and offers a diverse array of questions developed by the team to use during the informational interview.	0 pts Assignment not completed.	0 to 5
			0 to 5

Assignments 3,4, and 6:

CRITERIA	RATING			PTS
<b>ANALYSIS</b>	60 pts  The team <b>exceeds expectations</b> regarding their grasp of course concepts and depth of analysis.	58 pts  The team demonstrates adequate grasp of course concepts and depth of analysis.	0 pts  The team fails to demonstrate a grasp of course concepts and depth of analysis.	0 to 60
<b>DESIGN</b>	20 pts  The slide deck is clear, succinct, and exceptionally designed and produced with great clarity.	18 pts  The slide deck is clear with few if any errors, and easy to understand.	0 pts  The slide deck has several errors and is difficult to understand.	0 to 20
<b>DELIVERY</b>	20 pts  The presentation is <b>exceptionally</b> delivered with all team members having speaking roles.	18 pts  The presentation is adequately delivered with most of the team members having speaking roles.	0 pts  The presentation is delivered with only a few team members participating (or not delivered).	0 to 20
				0 to 100

Assignment 5:

CRITERIA	RATING			PTS
<b>GRASP AND ANALYSIS</b>	65 pts The student demonstrates a thorough grasp of course concepts including but not exclusive to potential issues of equity in the evaluation plan and <b>exceeds expectations.</b>	60 pts The student demonstrates an adequate grasp of course concepts including but not exclusive to potential issues of equity in the evaluation plan but lacks a thorough analysis of these concepts.	0 pts The student fails to demonstrate an understanding of course concepts in the evaluation critique.	0 to 65
<b>QUALITY</b>	35 pts The student exceeds expectations in their evaluation critique regarding the structure, format, and quality of the writing assignment.	30 pts The student adequately demonstrates the basic requirements for the evaluation critique with minimal errors and adequate quality.	0 pts The writing assignment has several errors and does not appropriately critique the evaluation plan.	0 to 35
				0 to 100

Student Engagement Assessment:

14-15 points	<b><u>Always arrives at class on time unless excused.</u></b> The student participates <i>exceptionally</i> in group work and to class discussions by raising thoughtful questions, analyzing relevant issues, building on others' ideas.
11-13 points	<b><u>Mostly arrives to class on time unless excused (tardy two or fewer times).</u></b> The student participates <i>adequately</i> in group work and discussions with periodic contributions to the class.
9-10 points	The student is periodically tardy to class, participates <i>adequately</i> in group work, but <i>rarely contributes</i> to discussions in class.
0-8 points	The student is frequently tardy to class, participates <i>minimally</i> in group work, and <i>rarely contributes</i> to class discussions.

## **COURSE ATTENDANCE POLICY**

Students are expected to attend and actively participate in all class and field exercise sessions. Excused absences require the **prior approval of the instructor**. Repeated tardiness to class and unexcused absences will **impact the final course grade**. The final grade will be calculated based on the assignment grades and student engagement at the sole discretion of the instructor.

## **GUEST LECTURER(S)**

During the semester, experts in philanthropy and social impact measurement may present as guest lecturers during class. Details regarding guest lecturer(s) will be available prior to their participation. Students should be prepared to engage the guest lecturers with thoughtful and relevant ideas and questions.

## **CLASS EXPECTATIONS**

Student groups must:

- Arrange at least three site visits with their nonprofit to discuss programming and offer updates on the development of an evaluation plan;
- Complete all assigned readings;
- Attend and participate actively in all classes and field exercise visits; and
- Prepare adequately for team presentations.

## **STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

Students are expected to conduct themselves consistent with the University of Pennsylvania's Code of Academic Integrity, which presents standards regarding plagiarism, multiple submissions, and other actions. Students are expected to be familiar with the code, which is located at <https://catalog.upenn.edu/pennbook/code-of-academic-integrity/>

## **COURSE ASSIGNMENTS AND ACTIVITIES**

### **Week 1 (9/13): Introduction: Social Impact Measurement Terminology and Methodology**

#### Major Concepts and Activities:

- Class Introductions
- Course Syllabus Overview
- Social Impact Measurement: What is it? What is our focus?
- Understanding Programs: Theory of Change
- Understanding Programs: Logic Model
- Historical Development of Program Evaluation
- Social Impact Measurement Methodology and Indicators
  - Formative Evaluation
    - Process
  - Summative Evaluation
    - Outcome
    - Impact
    - Cost-benefit/Cost-effectiveness
  - Developmental Evaluation

#### Assignments Due:

- None

#### Required Readings/Videos:

- Sample Proposals 1,2, & 3
- Guided Example: Project Superwomen
- NOAA Program Evaluation Guide (pp. 1-15)
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2012, January). Designing Evaluations (Publication No. GAO-12-208G). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-208G> (Chapter 2 only)
- Considering Evaluation: Thoughts for Social Change and Movement Groups, “So That” Chain Sample (p.14)
- Considering Evaluation: Thoughts for Social Change and Movement Groups, Change Goals (p.20)
- Hogan, R. L. (2007). The historical development of program evaluation: Exploring past and present. Online Journal for Workforce Education and Development, 2(4), 5.
- Evaluation is an Every Day Activity - Developmental Formative Summative - by Molly Engel
- Patton, M Q. “A World Larger Than Formative and Summative.” The American Journal of Evaluation. 17.2 (1996):131-144
- [Video: Evaluating Social Innovation - Developmental Evaluation \(LINK\)](#)

### **Week 2 (9/20): Introduction II: Equity-informed Social Impact Measurement**

#### Major Concepts and Activities:

- What is Equitable Evaluation?
- Equity-based social impact measurement plans
- Assignment of field exercise sites/programs
- Structuring and managing the field exercise
  - Goals and expectations
  - Preparation for the introductory interviews (how to develop probing questions)
  - Scheduling the initial site visit
- Preparing for Assignment 1: Discussion Board Post (350-word) - “Not racist” vs. “Anti-racist” Organizations (DUE this week)

- Preparing for Assignment 2: Introductory Interview Questions (DUE next week)

Assignments Due:

- Assignment 1 [INDIVIDUAL] Discussion Board Post (400-word): “Not racist” vs. “Anti-racist” Organizations, **due 9/24/2021 at 11:59 pm EST**

Required Readings/Videos:

- Field exercise site documents (see the folder on Canvas)
- [Video: The difference between being "not racist" and antiracist \(51:14\) | Ibram X. Kendi \(LINK\)](#)
- Bamberger, M., & Segone, M. (2011). How to design and manage equity-focused evaluations. Evaluation Working Paper, Issue, (6).
- Dean-Coffey, J., & Casey, J. (2014). Raising the Bar-Integrating Cultural Competence and Equity: Equitable Evaluation. *The Foundation Review*, 6(2), pp. 81-94.
- “Why Am I Always Being Researched?” - A Guidebook for Community Organizations, Researchers, and Funders
- Equitable Evaluation Framing Paper - Luminare Group, Center for Evaluation Innovation, and Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy
- Potapchuk, M., Leiderman, S., Bivens, D., & Major, B. (2005). Flipping the script: White privilege and community building. Silver Springs, Md.: MP Associates, Inc., and the Center for Assessment and Policy Development (CAPD), Chapter 9: Doing Evaluation Differently (only)
- Sayer, K. (2002). Guidelines for Culturally Competent Evaluations, prepared for the Colorado Trust.
- “How can we avoid blaming the victim when we present information on poor outcomes for different racial, ethnic, language, or immigrant groups in our community?” - Racial Equity Tools Tip Sheets.

**Week 3 (9/27) [GROUP] Introductory Interview Questions**

Major Concepts and Activities:

Groups will interview their assigned nonprofit field site representative to gather sufficient information to propose an evaluation methodology to use.

Assignments Due:

Assignment 2 [GROUP] Introductory Interview Questions **due 9/27/2021 at 7:30 am EST**

Required Readings:

None

**Week 4 (10/4) Evaluation Preparation, Planning, and Design**

Major Concepts and Activities:

- Debrief Introductory Interviews
- Evaluator’s Toolkit
  - 6 Key Questions
  - Methodology at a Glance - Review
  - Practical Workplan Development
  - Evaluation Design Components Matrix (Required)
  - Sample Evaluation Planner
- Case Studies
- Common challenges in evaluation design
- Fieldwork Days
- Preparing for Assignment 3: Case/Logic Model/Work Plan Presentations

Assignments Due:

None



Required Readings:

- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2012, January). Designing Evaluations (Publication No. GAO-12-208G). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-208G> (Chapter 3 only)
- Ruchlin, H. S., & Morris, J. N. (1981). Cost-benefit analysis of an emergency alarm and response system: a case study of a long-term care program. Health Services Research, 16(1), pp. 65-80.
- Ragan, S. J. (2005). CONDUCTING A FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF A MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT. Case Examples of Project Evaluations, pp. 70-82.
- Germuth, A. A. (2005). Evaluation of An ATE Center: Assessing Components of Student Impact of a Community College Adult Technical Education Program. Case Examples of Project Evaluations, pp.160-174.
- Three Examples of Using Developmental Evaluation to Address Uncertainty from a Systems Perspective - American Evaluation Association
- Considering Evaluation: Thoughts for Social Change and Movement-Building Groups - Evaluation Case Study: Participants Assess An Exploratory Program (p. 9)

**Week 5 (10/11): Fieldwork Day#1**

Major Concepts and Activities:

Each student team will work with their assigned nonprofit organization to collect and analyze the information needed to complete the requirements of the course. Meetings do not necessarily have to take place during the regular class time segment.

Assignments Due:

None

Required Readings:

None

**Week 6 (10/18): [GROUP] Methodology Case/Logic Model/Work Plan Presentations**

Major Concepts and Activities:

- Each group will present a slide deck of their methodology case and work plan, then receive constructive criticism from the class.
- Managing and testing your methodology and approach.

Assignments Due:

Assignment 3 [GROUP] Methodology Case/Logic Model/Work Plan Presentations on Google Slides **due 10/18/2021 at 7:30 am EST**

Required Readings:

None

### **Week 7 (10/25): Fieldwork Day #2**

#### Major Concepts and Activities:

Each student team will work with their assigned nonprofit organization to collect and analyze the information needed to complete the requirements of the course. Meetings do not necessarily have to take place during the regular class time segment.

#### Assignments Due:

None

#### Required Readings:

None

### **Week 8 (11/1): Instrument Design**

#### Major Concepts and Activities:

- Instrument Design and data collection
- Preparing for Assignment 4: Preliminary Evaluation Instruments Design Presentations
- Preparing for Assignment 5: Evaluation Plan Critique

#### Assignments Due:

- None

#### Required Readings:

- Barkman, S. "A field guide to designing quantitative instruments to measure program impact." *West Lafayette, IN Purdue Extension* (2002).
- Indicators of Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts in Security and Justice Programming (Section 3 and 4 only)
- Changing Lives of Girls: Evaluation of the African Girls' Education Initiative Report

### **Week 9 (11/8): Fieldwork Day #3**

#### Major Concepts and Activities:

Each student team will work with their assigned nonprofit organization to collect and analyze the information needed to complete the requirements of the course. Meetings do not necessarily have to take place during the regular class time segment.

#### Assignments Due:

None

#### Required Readings:

None

### **Week 10 (11/15): [GROUP] Preliminary Evaluation Instruments Design Presentations**

#### Major Concepts and Activities:

Each group will present a slide deck of their preliminary evaluation instruments and receive constructive critique from the class.

#### Assignments Due:

Assignment 4 [GROUP] Preliminary Evaluation Instruments Design Presentations on Google Slides due **11/15/2021 at 7:30 am EST**

#### Required Readings:

None

## **Week 11 (11/22): The Future of Social Impact Measurement**

### Major Concepts and Activities:

- Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (video and discussion)
- Evaluating Collective Impact
- Predictions of leading evaluation experts will be reviewed and discussed.

### Assignments Due:

Assignment 5 [INDIVIDUAL] Evaluation Plan Critique **due 11/22/2021 at 7:30 am EST**

### Required Readings:

- Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action - OECD
- Preskill, H., Parkhurst, M., & Juster, J. (2014). Guide to evaluating collective impact, C1 01. FSG.

## **Week 12 (11/29): Fieldwork Day #4**

### Major Concepts and Activities:

Each student team will work with their assigned nonprofit organization to collect and analyze the information needed to complete the requirements of the course. Meetings do not necessarily have to take place during the regular class time segment.

### Assignments Due:

None

### Required Readings:

None

## **Week 13 (12/6): Careers in Social Impact Measurement**

### Major Concepts and Activities:

- The variety of career opportunities in social impact measurement will be discussed.
- Preparing for Assignment 6: Final Report Presentation

### Assignments Due:

None

### Required Readings:

None

## **Week 14 (12/13): [GROUP] Final Report: Evaluation Plan/Instruments/Recommendations Presentations**

### Major Concepts and Activities:

Each group will present a slide deck of their final evaluation plan, evaluation instrument(s), recommendations, and lessons learned to the class and nonprofit representatives.

### Assignments Due:

Assignment 6 [GROUP] Evaluation Plan/Instruments/Recommendations/Lessons Learned Presentations on Google Slides **due 12/13/2021 at 7:30 am EST**

### Required Readings:

None

## ASSIGNMENT GUIDES 1 - 6

### A. Assignment 1 Guide - Discussion Board Post (400-word minimum/500-word maximum): “Not racist” vs. “Anti-racist” Organizations

**Prompt:** This is an individual assignment. After viewing the video, “[The Difference Between Being “Not Racist” and Anti-racist \(LINK\)](#)”, featuring Dr. Ibram X. Kendi, write a discussion board post reflecting on the following questions.

- What must foundations do to become anti-racist organizations?
- What must nonprofits do to become anti-racist organizations?

The “Not racist” vs. “Anti-racist” Organizations post is an assignment and must be completed in Canvas.

### B. Assignment 2 Guide - Information Interview Questions

Below, you will find sample categories for questions to be used during the interview. Student teams should review introductory materials for the assigned nonprofit, which can be found in Canvas, and develop the questions as a group.

This group assignment must be completed using Google Docs. The file must be submitted to the Google Gmail account at [srhargro@gmail.com](mailto:srhargro@gmail.com).

- I. Introduction
  - Introduce the team
  - Ask the nonprofit representatives to introduce themselves and the nonprofit program.
  - Clarification of the project purpose
  - What aspect of this program is most important to evaluate
  - Permission to record
  - Background
- II. Organization/Program History
  - Who questions: audience/staff/leadership/partners
  - Why questions: this program/this approach/this neighborhood/this audience/this theme
  - Logistics – How/When/Where
- III. Audience
  - Outreach and Recruitment
  - Demographics (get as detailed as possible in your questions)
  - Subcategories
  - Eligibility
  - Specific obstacles (to success)
- IV. Program

- Days of operation
  - Staff Size/Key Staff/Expertise
  - Budget (get a copy)
  - Funding (including trends up/down/cuts)
- V. Current Evaluation Methods (if any)
- What do you do? How well is it working? What are the challenges?
  - Key definitions (ex. What does employment mean?)
  - Results (what outputs/outcomes are currently being collected)?
  - What instruments are currently being used (get a copy)?
  - What happens when this is not achieved
- VI. Anticipated Challenges
- Known obstacles/challenges
  - What would you like to know?
- VII. Others (**Be creative. Be detailed. No wrong questions.**)

### C. Assignment 3 Guide - Methodology Case, Logic Model, Work Plan Presentation

This group assignment must be created as a slide deck using Google Slides. The slide deck must be submitted to the Gmail account [srhargro@gmail.com](mailto:srhargro@gmail.com). The presentation must include the following components:

- I. Program Description (1-2 slides) - Summarize the nonprofit organization and program your team is evaluating and the segment of the program being evaluated.
- II. Methodology Case (as many slides as you need)
  - Indicate what methodology the team proposes to use to evaluate the program and the team's reasoning for doing so.
  - Complete Evaluation Design Components Matrix based on the methodology you will use.
- III. Logic Model for the program (1 Slide) - Create a logic model that includes the inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact, for the program based on current understanding.
- IV. Anticipated Challenges (1 Slide) - Indicate any challenges that you foresee with developing an evaluation plan. The class will brainstorm ways to help your team overcome the stated challenges.
- V. Evaluation Work Plan (1 Slide) - Complete an evaluation work plan using the sample format provided.

This is a professional presentation and presentation design, team participation, and delivery will be considered in the team grade.

### D. Assignment 4 Guide - Preliminary Evaluation Instruments Design Presentations

In this group assignment, the team will develop one or more evaluation instruments to be used by the nonprofit to collect data. The presentation must be created as a slide deck using Google Slides. The slide deck link must be submitted to the Google Gmail account at srhargro@gmail.com. If needed, include handouts for the entire class.

Consider the following checklist adapted from the University of Texas at Arlington, School of Social Work Instrument development checklist. Not all items listed below need to be included.

- I. Instrument Title
  - Develop a clear and concise title and description of the instrument(s).
  - Indicate the type of service provided (e.g., counseling, housing shelter).
  - Reflect on the instrument method and content (e.g., survey, interview).
  
- II. Introductory Statement
  - Include information about the instrument's purpose.
  - Include information about how the data will be used.
  - Include information about the level of confidentiality that will need to be arranged (e.g., who will see their responses, how responses will be reported). Always provide the level of confidentiality offered with the instrument.
  
- III. Demographics
  - Include appropriate questions to ask respondents for relevant information about themselves and their backgrounds (e.g., year of birth, grade, country of origin, and language).
  - If appropriate, ask about the person(s) administering the instrument (e.g., program staff's name).
  
- IV. Directions
  - Include general directions on how to complete the instrument itself (e.g., when, where, and how).
  - Include specific directions on how to complete each section of the instrument.
  - Offer a description for each section if there are multiple sections.
  
- V. Questions
  - Use language that is appropriate for the respondents (ex. Children, youth, adults, senior adults).
  - Avoid "double-barreled" questions (ex. "Has there been an increase in program resources and the number of program participants?").
  - Allow enough space for respondents to answer when using open-ended questions.
  - Avoid biased and value-laden words or phrases.
  - Include only questions asking for useful information.
  - Keep question and answer options on the same page.

- Allow space for comments.

## VI. Format

- Use icons or graphics as clarifiers (e.g., “Please place a check in the appropriate box.”).
- Use a clearly legible font (e.g., Arial, Times New Roman).
- Allow enough space between questions.
- Design the instrument to be visually appealing.
- Indicate the date of instrument administration.
- If appropriate, identify whether it is a pre-, post-, or another survey type.
- Note the name of the program/organization (UPENN School of Social Policy & Practice - NPLD 783) that developed the instrument in the footer (at the bottom of the page).
- Include the tool document file location path or hyperlink (ex. C:\Program Participant Survey), if appropriate.
- Include the date of each new version in the header/footer.

## VII. Pilot Testing

- Clearly label DRAFT on the instrument for testing.
- Be mindful that advance permission to conduct the pilot test might be necessary.
- Arrange for pilot test participants and conditions to be as close to actual administration conditions as possible (e.g., time of day, location, methods, respondents).

## E. Assignment 5 Guide - Evaluation Plan Critique

For this individual assignment, students will critique a published program evaluation plan and report. As you read the report, think about its strengths and weaknesses and how well the evaluation considered gender and racial equity and intersectionality. As stated during the introductory social impact measurement lectures, all evaluation plans have flaws. Think critically as you review the design, methodology, instruments, and delivery of the evaluation plan.

It is important to recognize that while the plan may have flaws, however, it can still produce the best information available to determine program results. Prepare a concise 5-to-7 page critique of the *Changing Lives Of Girls: Evaluation Of The African Girls' Education Initiative* (pp. 1-34). The assignment should use an 11 pt. font and it should be double-spaced and include appropriate essay formatting.

This individual assignment must be completed using Google Docs. The file **must be submitted to the Google Gmail account at [srhargro@gmail.com](mailto:srhargro@gmail.com).**

The critique must at a minimum include:

- I. **Evaluation and Program Overview** - Briefly summarize the program.

- II. **Methodology** - Summarize the methodology used in the report and why you think it was chosen. Was it formative or summative (or both)? What were the objectives of the evaluation report?
- III. **Strengths** - What were the strengths of the evaluation plan design? Some of the following areas may be seen as a strength:
  - Format/Organization/Readability
  - Size/Scope
  - Methodology
  - Voice - Is the language accessible to a wide audience of stakeholders?
  - Recommendations
  - Clarity
  - Instruments
- IV. **Weaknesses** - What were the weaknesses of the evaluation plan design? Some of the following areas may be seen as a weakness:
  - Format/Organization/Readability
  - Size/Scope
  - Methodology
  - Voice - Is the language accessible to a wide audience of stakeholders?
  - Recommendations
  - Clarity
  - Instruments
- V. **Gender and Racial Equity, Intersectionality, Social Equity** - Did the plan address issues of equity effectively? If so, in what way? If not, how might the plan have been approached?
- VI. **Conclusion** - Summarize your overall thoughts regarding the evaluation report and conclude whether or not you think it will produce a useful understanding of the program's results and why or why not.

#### F. **Assignment 6 Guide - Final Report: Evaluation Plan, Instruments, and Recommendations Presentations**

This group assignment must be created as a slide deck using Google Slides. The slide deck link must be submitted to the Gmail account at [srhargro@gmail.com](mailto:srhargro@gmail.com). The slide deck must include revised components from previous assignments, I through IV below, and additional final report components, V through VIII, below. Highlight ways in which the team sought to produce an equitable evaluation. **The presentation should take 45 minutes total including 30 minutes for the team speakers and 15 minutes for questions.**

The final presentation must include:

- I. **Program Description (1-2 slides)** – Summarize the program your team is evaluating and the segment of the program being evaluated.



- II. **Logic Model for the program (1-2 Slides)** – You can either create a chart or table that indicates inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact, etc.
- III. **Methodology (1-3 slides)** – Describe the methodology the team will use to evaluate the program and the team's reasoning for using the methodology.
- IV. **Evaluation Instrument (Using as many slides as needed, summarize and copies of the full instrument)** - Present and describe the evaluation instrument(s) that will be used and the team's reasoning behind the instrument(s).
- V. **Evaluation Plan (As many slides as needed)** – Describe how the evaluation instrument will be implemented.
  - Consider the following:
    - Who will implement the instrument?
    - How will data be collected (in-person survey, focus group, online, etc.) and why?
    - Who will manage and analyze the data from the instrument?
    - How often will the data be collected?
    - What tools (if any) are needed to implement the instrument?
- VI. **Challenges (1-2 slides)** – Indicate any challenges that you foresee with implementing the plan.
- VII. **Recommendations (1-2 slides)** – Offer recommendations to guide the nonprofit in the implementation of the evaluation plan and instrument (ex. Special considerations regarding the participants, staff lead, etc.)
- VIII. **Lessons Learned (1-2 Slides)** – Explain what lessons the group learned during the development of the evaluation plan that might be useful for the nonprofit in the future.

**Note:** Please acknowledge and thank the nonprofit representatives for their time and engagement during the evaluation process.