

Introduction to Research, Assessment, and Evaluation (15:245:603:01)
 Fall 2013 Mondays 1:00-3:40pm
 GSE 025B (College Avenue Campus)

Professor: Florence A. Hamrick, PhD **Telephone:** (732) 932-7496, ext.8328
Office Hours: by appointment **Office:** GSE Room 336 (CAC)
E-mail: florence.hamrick@gse.rutgers.edu

Course description:

This course will provide overviews of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies and methods in higher education as well as an overview of basic designs and techniques related to assessment and evaluation in student affairs. This course is designed to build basic competencies in evaluating completed studies and designing small-scale research studies and assessment projects.

Relevant Learning Outcomes (*ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies-basic levels*):

1. Advising and Helping:
 - Facilitate reflection to make meaning from experience
 - Facilitate problem-solving
 - Challenge and encourage students and colleagues effectively
2. Assessment, Evaluation, and Research (AER):
 - Differentiate among assessment, program review, evaluation, planning, and research and the methodologies appropriate to each
 - Effectively articulate, interpret, and use results of AER reports and studies, including professional literature
 - Facilitate appropriate data collection for system/department-wide assessment and evaluation efforts using up-to-date technology and methods
 - Assess trustworthiness and other aspects of quality in qualitative studies and assess the transferability of these findings to current work settings
 - Assess quantitative designs and analysis techniques, including factors that might lead to measurement problems, such as those relating to sampling, validity, and reliability
 - Explain the necessity to follow institutional and divisional procedures and policies (e.g., IRB approval, informed consent) with regard to ethical assessment, evaluation, and other research activities
 - Explain to students and colleagues the relationship of AER processes to learning outcomes and goals
 - Identify the political and educational sensitivity of raw and partially processed data and AER results, handling them with appropriate confidentiality and deference to the organizational hierarchy
 - Align program and learning outcomes with organizational goals and values
3. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI):
 - Assess and address one's own awareness of EDI, and articulate one's own differences and similarities with others
 - Design culturally relevant and inclusive programs, services, policies, and practices.

- Demonstrate fair treatment to all individuals and change aspects of the environment that do not promote fair treatment.
4. Ethical Professional Practice:
- Articulate one's personal code of ethics for student affairs practice, which reflects the ethical statements of professional students affairs associations and their foundational ethical principals
 - Explain how one's behavior embodies the ethical statements of the profession, particularly in relationships with students and colleagues, in the use of technology and sustainable practices, in professional settings and meetings, in global relationships, and while participating in job search processes
 - Identify ethical issues in the course of one's job
 - Demonstrate an ethical commitment to just and sustainable practices
5. History, Philosophy, and Values
- Demonstrate responsible campus citizenship
 - Articulate the principles of professional practice
 - Articulate the history of inclusion and exclusion of people with a variety of identities in higher education
 - Explain the public role and societal benefits of student affairs and of higher education generally
 - Articulate an understanding of the ongoing nature of history and one's role in shaping it
 - Explain how the values of the professional contribute to sustainable practice
6. Human and Organizational Resources:
- Demonstrate effective stewardship and use of resources (i.e., financial, human, material)
 - Communicate with others using effective verbal and nonverbal strategies appropriate to the situation in both one-on-one and small group settings
 - Recognize how networks in organizations play a role in how work gets done
7. Law, Policy, and Governance:
- Explain when to consult with one's immediate supervisor and campus legal counsel about those matters that may have legal ramifications
 - Identify the major policy makers who influence one's professional practice at the institutional, local, state/province, and federal levels of government
8. Leadership:
- Identify basic fundamentals of teamwork and teambuilding in one's work setting and communities of practice
 - Think critically and creatively, and imagine possibilities for solutions that do not currently exist or are not apparent
 - Articulate the logic used in making decisions to all interested parties
 - Exhibit informed confidence in the capacity of ordinary people to pull together and take practical action to transform their communities and world
 - Identify and introduce conversations on potential issues and developing trends into appropriate venues such as staff meetings
9. Personal Foundations:
- Articulate meaningful goals for one's work
 - Recognize the importance of reflection in personal and professional development

10. Student Learning and Development:

- Assess teaching, learning, and training and incorporate the results into practice

Student learning:

Students will integrate textbook material, supplemental readings, discussions, learning activities, group work, class presentations, assignments, and original research and assessment proposals to demonstrate their learning. Periodic classroom assessments will also be conducted to ascertain progress.

Required texts:

McMillan, J. H. (2012). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Schuh, J. H., & Associates. (2009). *Assessment methods for student affairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lichtman, M. (2006). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strongly Recommended Text:

Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.). (2009) Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

(Do NOT under any circumstances rely on the First Printing of the Sixth Edition – multiple errors within the First Printing have been corrected in subsequent printings.)

Supplemental readings: See Sakai course site - Resources link.

Required Assignments and Grading: Points will be used to evaluate each course assignment. Assignments carry the following point totals:

Quantitative Journal Article Review	10
Qualitative Journal Article Review	10
Quantitative Study Proposal	25
Quantitative Study Proposal Learning Reflection	0
Qualitative Study Proposal	25
Qualitative Study Proposal Learning Reflection	0
Assessment Proposal	20
Rutgers University IRB Training	0
APA Tutorial/Quiz	0
<u>Participation/Engagement</u>	<u>10</u>
Total:	100

Unless prior arrangements have been approved by the instructor, assignments submitted after the posted due date are not eligible to earn full points.

Grading Scale: To calculate final course grade, the numerical values below will be used: A = 90 or above, B+ = 86-89, B = 80-85, C+ = 76-79, C = 75 or below. A grade of F (numerical value = 0) will be earned for any course assignment still outstanding at the beginning of the final class meeting. Applicable grade penalties will be factored into the evaluation of assignments submitted after the stipulated deadline.

Note: CSA Ed.M. students must maintain a minimum 3.0 cumulative GPA to demonstrate satisfactory academic progress.

NO INCOMPLETES WILL BE GIVEN IN THIS CLASS except for major emergencies (e.g., hospitalization) and only after advance consultation with the instructor. Incompletes will not be granted simply because more time is desired to complete the assignments.

Class Policies

Learning Accommodations: "Rutgers University welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University's educational programs. In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, a student with a disability must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, participate in an intake interview, and provide documentation: <https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/documentation-guidelines>. If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your campus's disability services office will provide you with a Letter of Accommodations. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early in your courses as possible."

Syllabus Changes: The instructor reserves the right to alter the syllabus as needed to meet course objectives and will provide as much advance notice as possible.

Electronic Devices: Cell phones and all other devices must be turned off or silenced and put away during class. Laptops are permitted in class **ONLY** for note-taking. Social networking sites (e.g., Facebook) and other websites may not be open on any electronic device during class. Checking electronic accounts, texting, and engaging in any other electronic communications may be conducted **ONLY** during the mid-class break. Unauthorized use of electronic devices during class will result in subtractions from class participation/engagement points.

Late Assignments: If you must submit an assignment late, contact the instructor to discuss the situation **PRIOR TO** the deadline. Documentation of the situation, such as a physician's note, must be provided upon request of the instructor.

Attendance: If you must miss class for a legitimate reason (e.g., illness, family emergencies, court appearance, conference attendance), contact the instructor to discuss the situation WELL IN ADVANCE OF the class meeting in question. Emergencies notwithstanding, class will start on time. You are expected to be ready to begin class at the start time. Arriving late to class is disruptive and unprofessional. If a prior commitment will affect your ability to arrive on time, notify the instructor PRIOR TO the class meeting. Repeated late arrivals will result in lowered participation points.

Written assignment parameters and expectations: All written work must conform to the guidelines and reference formats specified in the most recent edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. All work must be word processed, double-spaced, using 12-point font and maximum one inch margins. Assignments must be submitted electronically via Sakai. The Turnitin filter on Sakai will be enabled for all assignments, and students will have access to the Turnitin report for their assignments. Students may revise and resubmit an assignment in light of the Turnitin report, as long as the resubmission is received prior to the assignment's posted deadline.

Assignments will be graded on the technical quality of the writing as well as accuracy and quality of the content. All written work should be carefully proofread to ensure correct spelling, grammar, and syntax. Assignments containing multiple errors will be graded accordingly. At the instructor's discretion, students may be invited to revise and resubmit an assignment for re-grading. If the revised assignment is not received by the stipulated deadline, the initial grade earned on the assignment will stand.

Class preparation expectations: Students are responsible for completing all required readings in advance of the designated class session. Students are also expected to check the course Sakai site at least once weekly to learn of any announcements, postings, or changes. To the extent possible, class discussion and activities will focus on analysis, application, critique, and Q&A over the assigned material.

Course engagement and participation: Students are expected to contribute actively and productively to all class discussions and activities. Actively engaging in discussion about ideas and concepts is one means of learning new material as well as considering your opinions and conclusions with regard to new ideas and concepts. Class participation helps you develop verbal and listening skills and demonstrates your active involvement in the learning process. Participation does not mean "talking a lot" or "saying at least one thing during each class." In fact, talking for talking's sake detracts from your participation and restricts the participation of your classmates. The following are examples of factors considered when evaluating class participation:

- * contributing interesting, insightful comments
- * presenting clear examples of concepts being discussed
- * building upon the comments of others
- * voicing dissent or additional perspectives with civility and respect
- * raising pertinent questions
- * offering pertinent answers

- * being sensitive to your level of participation and making attempts to increase or decrease it if necessary
- * listening and responding thoughtfully and appropriately to others' comments
- * refraining from use of electronic devices
- * refraining from (even unintended) disruptive behaviors
- * attending all class meetings and being on time

Academic Integrity

In graduate courses where students utilize and reference the work of others while also developing their own original ideas, conclusions, or contributions, attention to academic integrity is paramount. Violations of academic integrity at Rutgers University include: Plagiarism, Cheating, Fabrication, Facilitation of Dishonesty, Academic Sabotage, Violation of Research or Professional Ethics, and Violations Involving Potentially Criminal Activity. The following overview passages appear in the Academic Integrity Policy of Rutgers University. The full policy, including definitions of the above and information on levels of sanctions, is at:

http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/files/documents/AI_Policy_9_01_2011.pdf):

The University administration is responsible for making academic integrity an institutional priority and for providing students and faculty with effective educational programs and support services to help them fully understand and address issues of academic integrity. The administration is also responsible for working with other members of the academic community to establish equitable and effective procedures to deal with violations of academic integrity.

Failure to uphold these principles of academic integrity threatens both the reputation of the University and the value of the degrees awarded to its students. Every member of the University community therefore bears a responsibility for ensuring that the highest standards of academic integrity are upheld.

The faculty shares with the administration the responsibility for educating students about the importance and principles of academic integrity. Faculty members¹ are expected to inform students of the particular requirements regarding academic integrity within their specific courses, to make reasonable efforts to minimize academic dishonesty, and to respond appropriately to violations of academic integrity. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to provide a statement concerning academic integrity and a link to the Academic Integrity Policy on their course syllabi.

Students are responsible for understanding the principles of academic integrity and abiding by them in all aspects of their work at the University. Students are also encouraged to help educate fellow students about academic integrity and to bring all alleged violations of academic integrity they encounter to the attention of the appropriate authorities.

Course Calendar, Assigned Readings, and Assignment Deadlines

Note: M=McMillan text. L=Lichtman text. Sch=Schuh text. Sa=Readings or other materials posted on course Sakai site (under Resources tab).

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 1 – Sep 9 | <p>Introductions, Course Overview, Group Assignments, Writing</p> <p>To Do List (before next week’s class):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carefully review Rutgers academic integrity policy. 2. Create Rutgers University Libraries Account 3. Review RU Library links on locating refereed journal articles 4. Explore course Sakai site - “Resources” in particular 5. Complete assigned readings for next week’s class 6. Create your group [3-4 students] for Quantitative Study Proposal 7. With proposal group members, review and discuss “Group Dynamics and Phases” document (Sakai site) as well as individual working style preferences |
| 2 – Sep 16 | <p>Quantitative Research - Intro, Design Frameworks, Literature
M: Chs 1-3
<u>Due:</u> Quantitative Groups - Membership and Group Discussion Summary</p> |
| 3 – Sep 23 | <p>Quantitative Research - Sampling & Measurement
M: Chs 4-5
<u>Due:</u> Quantitative Groups - Topic, Time Frame and Member Tasks
<u>Due:</u> Rutgers Human Subjects Certification</p> |
| 4 – Sep 30 | <p>Quantitative Research - Data Collection, Non-Experimental Designs
M: Chs 6-7
<u>Due:</u> Annotated Questionnaire
<u>Due:</u> Informed Consent Document
<u>In Class:</u> Questionnaire Pretesting w/informed consent</p> |
| 5 – Oct 7 | <p>Quantitative Research - Experiments, Inferential Intro, Mixed Methods
M: Chs 8-9, 11
<u>Due:</u> Quantitative Journal Article Review</p> |
| 6 – Oct 14 | <p>Quantitative Research - Presentations
<u>Due:</u> Quantitative Study Proposal assignment</p> |
| 7 – Oct 21 | <p>Qualitative Research - Traditions and Influences
L: Part 1 (Chs. 1-5)
<u>Due:</u> Qualitative Groups - Membership and Group Discussion Summary</p> |

8 – Oct 28	Qualitative Research - Gathering, Organizing, and Analyzing I L: Chs. 6-7 <u>Due:</u> Qualitative Groups - Topic, Time Frame and Member Tasks
9 – Nov 4	Qualitative Research - Gathering, Organizing, and Analyzing II L: Chs. 8-9 <u>Due:</u> Annotated Interview Protocol <u>Due:</u> Informed Consent Document <u>In Class:</u> Pretesting of all Interview Protocols
10 – Nov 11	Qualitative Research - Putting it All Together L: Part 3 (Chs. 10-13) <u>Due:</u> Qualitative Journal Article Review
11 – Nov 18	Qualitative Research - Presentations <u>Due:</u> Qualitative Study Proposal
12 – Nov 25	Assessment in Student Affairs - Data Collection, Sampling Sch: Chs 1-4 Sa: AEA Guiding Principles
13 – Dec 2	Assessment in Student Affairs - Instrumentation, Methods, Briefings, Ethics Sch: Chs 5-8
14 – Dec 9	Assessment in Student Affairs - Mixed Methods, Future Issues Sch: Chs 9-10
15 – Dec 16	Assessment in Student Affairs - Presentations <u>Due:</u> Assessment Proposal assignment Course Wrap-up.

Assignment Descriptions

Quantitative Journal Article Review assignment (10 points):

Each student will select for review ONE of the following two articles (posted on Sakai site): Northern, O'Brien, & Goetz, 2010; Reynolds, Sneva, & Beehler, 2010. Students will submit a maximum 5-page review paper that addresses at least three blocks of questions in McMillan pp. 380-382 and critiques *at least two* features of the article, offering warranted suggestions for improvement (with relevant references to McMillan text). Students may also take issue with McMillan's criteria, offering critique and proposing alternative approaches or criteria along with their own supporting rationales.

Qualitative Journal Article Review assignment (10 points):

Each student will select for review ONE of the following two articles (posted on Sakai site): Edwards & Jones, 2009; Mueller & Cole, 2009. Students will submit a maximum 5-page review paper that reviews at least three of the subsections within the selected article and critiques at least two aspects of the article, offering warranted suggestions for improvement (with relevant references to Lichtman text), offering critique and proposing alternative approaches or criteria along with supporting rationales.

Note: Reliance on McMillan's questions and prompts about qualitative research articles will NOT serve you well in completing this assignment successfully.

Study Proposal Assignments

Note: The Quantitative and Qualitative Study Proposal assignments are solely class-directed exercises undertaken for the purpose of learning research techniques. All work undertaken on the Quantitative and Qualitative Study Proposal assignments **MUST** be conducted in strict accordance with this purpose.

Quantitative Study Proposal assignment (25 points):

This assignment entails designing and planning all aspects of a quantitative study, writing up the proposal in the form of a scholarly manuscript, and presenting a 10-minute talk in class about the study. Additionally, each team member will write and submit a brief essay reflecting on her or his learning from this assignment.

The members of each three- or four-person proposal team will identify a research question, determine a student population to study; review relevant literature; design, pilot test, and refine a questionnaire of the group's original construction; and analyze pilot data using descriptive statistical techniques. At least four design and/or methods references (from McMillan text) and at least five topically-relevant published research studies must be formally referenced in the paper (below).

Team members will co-author a paper (20 pages maximum; inclusive of tables, references, and appendices) reporting on the planning, design, and pilot-testing of their proposed study. All papers must include: introduction, brief literature review, research question(s), design and methods, instrumentation (i.e., original questionnaire), procedures for collecting pilot data, data analyses, results, and interpretations. All proposals must end with a discussion of revisions to the questionnaire, design, and/or methods that would be made prior to conducting a follow-up study; and a time frame for conducting the follow-up study must be included. Teams must also determine (ideally in advance) the order of listed authors that is acceptable to group members.

Each member of the team will submit separately a maximum 2-page essay that: describes the efforts that she or he contributed to the group's project, discusses what he or she learned about research from completing the assignment, and described what she or he learned about being part of this working group that can be applied to future group work.

Qualitative Study Proposal assignment (25 points):

This assignment entails designing and planning all aspects of a qualitative study, writing up the proposal in the form of a scholarly manuscript, and presenting a 10-minute talk in class about the study. Additionally, each team member will write a brief essay reflecting on her or his learning from this assignment.

The members of each three- or four-person team will identify a research question, determine a student population to study; review relevant literature; create, pilot test, and refine an interview protocol and observation plan; and analyze pilot data from at least three interviews. At least four design and/or methods references (from Lichtman text) and at least five topically-relevant published research studies must be formally referenced in the paper (below).

Team members will co-author a paper (20 pages maximum; inclusive of figures, references, and appendices) reporting on the planning, design, and piloting of their proposed study. All papers must include: introduction, brief literature review, research question(s), design and methods, data collection strategies, data analyses, findings, interpretations, and researcher reflections. All papers must end with discussion of the revisions to the interview protocol and/or observation strategy, design, and/or methods that would be made prior to conducting a full-scale follow-up study; and a time frame for conducting the follow-up study must be included. Teams must also determine (ideally in advance) the order of listed authors that is acceptable to group members.

Each member of the team will submit separately a maximum 2-page essay that: describes the efforts that she or he contributed to the group's project, discusses what he or she learned about research from completing the assignment, and described what she or he learned about being part of this working group that can be applied to future group work.

Assessment Proposal (20 points):

Teams of two to three students will create and propose a formal assessment of a (hypothetical or actual) student affairs related program, service, or intervention. Team members will write a maximum 15-page (all inclusive) proposal that addresses the eight questions in Schuh (2009, pp. 15-17). Team members must create a time frame for conducting the proposed assessment and include reference to at least three guidelines in the AEA Guiding Principles document (on Sakai site). Team members (or a designee) will have 10 minutes to present the proposal (5 minutes) and answer questions.

Rutgers Human Subjects Certification (0 points - required):

Each student must individually complete the Human Subjects Certification and earn a passing score. A copy of the Certification letter must be submitted (via Sakai) to the instructor by the beginning of class on September 16. If Certification has not been earned by that time, participation in data collection is prohibited.

<http://orsp.rutgers.edu/index.php?q=content/institutional-review-board-irb>

Sakai Readings (See Resources link):

American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators (2004). Fairhaven, MA: Author. Retrieved August 27, 2013 from: <http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51>

Quantitative Journal Article Review - choose one:

Northern, J. J., O'Brien, W. H., & Goetz, P. W. (2010). The development, evaluation, and validation of a financial stress scale for undergraduate students. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(1), 79-92.

Reynolds, A. L., Sneva, J. N., & Beehler, G. P. (2010). The influence of racism-related stress on the academic motivation of Black and Latino/a students. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(2), 135-149.

Qualitative Journal Article Review - choose one:

Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(2), 210-228.

Mueller, J. A., & Cole, J. C. (2009). A qualitative examination of heterosexual consciousness among college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(3), 320-336.

Sample Quantitative Studies:

Gordon, C. F., Juang, L. P., & Syed, M. Internet use and well-being among college students: Beyond frequency of use. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(6), 674-688.

Grandzol, C., Perlis, S., & Draina, L. (2010). Leadership development of team captains in collegiate varsity athletics. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(4), 403-418.

King, R. H. (2012). Student conduct administration: How students perceive the educational value and procedural fairness of their disciplinary experiences. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53(4), 563-580.

Svanum, S., & Bigatti, S. M. (2010). Academic course engagement during one semester forecasts college success: Engaged students are more likely to earn a degree, do it faster, and do it better. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(1), 120-132.

Williams, A. E., & Janosik, S. M. (2007). An examination of academic dishonesty among sorority and nonsorority women. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(6), 706-714.

Wolf, D. S., Sax, L. J., & Harper, C. E. (2009). Parental engagement and contact in the academic lives of college students. *NASPA Journal*, 46(2), 325-358.

Sample Qualitative Studies:

Myers, K. A., & Bastian, J. J. (2010). Understanding communication preferences of college students with visual disabilities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(3), 265-278.

Quaye, S. J. (2012). Think before you teach: Preparing for dialogues about racial realities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 53(4), 542-562.

Rhoads, R. A., & Martinez, J. G. (1998). Chicana/o students as agents of social change: A case study of identity politics in higher education. *Bilingual Review*, 23(2), 124-136.

Rumann, C.B., & Hamrick F. A. (2010). Student veterans in transition: Re-enrolling after war zone deployments. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(4), 431-458.

Torres, V. (2009). The developmental dimensions of recognizing racist thoughts. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(5), 504-520.

Sample Assessment and Evaluation articles:

Mattanah, J. F., Ayers, J. F., Brand, B. L., Brooks, L. J., Quimby, J. L., & McNary, S. W. (2010). A social support intervention to ease the college transition: Exploring main effects and moderators. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(1), 93-108.

Reynolds, A. L., & Chris, S. (2008). Improving practice through outcomes based planning and assessment: A counseling center case study. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(4), 374-387.