**SPEA V550: Research Concepts for Public Affairs (Spring 2019)**

**Professor: Dr. Molly Stewart (Research Scientist at the IU Center for Evaluation, Policy, and Research)**

Email: stewarmo@indiana.edu Office Phone: 812-856-6025 Office: Eigenmann Hall 503

Cell: 202-431-7407 *(Please use this only for texting in case of an emergency/urgent situation; e.g., last-minute deployment, family emergency, work-related crisis. See late work policy for more information on emergencies.)*

The purpose of this course is to introduce and critically consider topics applicable to certain dimensions of public and nonprofit management that are related to research. *Research,* as defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary,* is “the systematic investigation into and study of materials and sources in order to establish facts and reach new conclusions.” These materials and sources are broadly known as *data*, and there many ways in which to use and manipulate data to show specific outcomes or results. However, not all of these methods are rigorous, reliable, and/or valid in relation to the data used or the purpose of the analysis. This course will focus on research concepts that are necessary for conducting or understanding how data may be used (or mis-used) to make program and/or policy decisions. Even though public and nonprofit managers may not actually conduct research projects, the concepts and elements of rigor that are required for research should be applied to any circumstance in which data is used to draw conclusions. In addition, this course conceptualizes *data* broadly, including qualitative and multiple data sources, which are often applicable for public and nonprofit management. Specifically, the topics in this course will be applicable for public managers (and others) who may be (a) under research/evaluation/monitoring scrutiny, (b) who are responsible for conducting research, evaluation, or compliance monitoring, (c) who must understand and apply others’ research to their own organizational context, and/or (d) who must communicate information to stakeholder groups, including the public.

**By the end of this course, students will:**

1. Understand how a study’s purpose drive the research questions, design, and methods
2. Be able to identify the kinds of data and data collection needed to answer research questions
3. Be able to identify the population/sample from which data will be collected
4. Be able to draft instrumentation aligned to the research purpose and design
5. Be able to identify potential issues related to the use of data and study findings
6. Understand how to communicate research-based results to various stakeholders
7. Be able to identify and mitigate unintended consequences of measurement, reporting, etc.

These learning objectives can be applied in various ways to work that is done by, with, or in observation of public and nonprofit organizations. Some examples:

1. Evidence-based/data-based decision making
2. Performance measurement
3. Compliance/monitoring
4. Institutional research/research and development (R&D)
5. Internal evaluation

**Description of course requirements:**

The online course will have weekly readings (all online—no required print textbook), many of which will be supplemented by video lectures from the professor, podcasts, and other resources. A few weeks include **optional** readings; if you’re particularly interested in the topic for that week, you might want to check them out.

* In the beginning of the course, forum posts and responses will be required in order for the class (and myself) to get to know each other (7 total forum posts).
* Most weeks will have a required (brief) reading/lecture quiz, as forum posts will not require analysis of the reading/lecture material.
* During Week 3, I will begin assigning Final Project partners. Every student will turn in their own final project; the role of the partner is to have someone to bounce ideas off of, read initial drafts before they are submitted to me, etc. (See description of Final Project for specific requirements of partner work.)
* Around Week 6, you will need to set up a time to meet with me via phone call or video conference. Depending on schedules, we can do these any time between Week 5 and 7; I’ll have a doodle poll from which you can select your time. If none of the options work for you, let me know as soon as possible so that we can look at alternatives.

**Course Assignments**

* 1. Forum posts and responses
  2. Weekly quizzes on readings, videos, and other sources listed in syllabus
  3. One-on-one meeting with me around Week 6
  4. Final project drafts, revisions, and final submission (see below for details)

**Final Project. Drafts will be due in 6 increments as well as a final full submission after revisions:**

Draft: Sections (due dates in weekly schedule)

1: 1a. Introduce your topic, describe the significance of it (why is it important to study?). Include relevant organizational or knowledge goals (i.e., who/what is interested in the potential findings? What is the purpose of the research?)

1b. Research questions (these will likely change over the course of the semester). You may have multiple research questions, or 1-2 overarching research questions with sub-questions that focus on specific parts of the research questions. In your draft, organize these however they make sense to you.

2: 2a. Introduce and discuss the constructs underlying your questions/focus

2b. Find at least 3 empirical sources (books/articles/research reports) that study a similar construct. How does each source describe the construct? Do you agree/disagree with how they have described it? Do these sources change how you view your construct(s)?

3: 3a. Detailed discussion of unit of analysis: how/why did you choose this? What are alternative units of analysis that you could have chosen?

3b. Detailed discussion of measurement: how/why did you decide to measure the construct/unit of analysis in this particular way? What are potential challenges for measurement in your project?

4: 4a. Detailed discussion of instrumentation: how/why did you choose a particular kind of instrumentation? How is it related to your unit of analysis and measurement decisions? What are possible challenges for using this particular instrumentation?

4b. Draft of your instrument. Note where the questions/items in your instrument align with your research questions. Does your instrument seem capable of collecting data to answer all of your research questions? Do the instrument questions/items align with the constructs that you identified?

5. 5a. Detailed discussion of the population and how you will sample. Connect this discussion to your unit of analysis. This section should also include some information on the context of your population (is it bounded geographically or otherwise? Etc.). What method of sampling will you use and why did you choose this? What challenges do you foresee in sampling? Will these challenges impact the study quality?

5b. Detailed discussion of data collection procedures: how will you actually collect the data? (Recruiting your sample; logistical issues of timing, communication, access, language barriers, etc.; in what format will you receive the data? Where will the data be stored when you receive it?) What procedures are in place in case of low response rates?

6. 6a. Reporting and communication plan; include visualization template if applicable: Connect this discussion to 1a: Considering the purpose of the study and the people/organization(s) that may be interested in the outcomes, how do you plan to report and communicate your study outcomes? Who needs to be informed about this study? Can you rely on your audience(s) to seek out the findings, or will you need to actively share them?

6b. IRB study information sheet: There is a template for this that I will share.

6c. Overview of research design (how will you answer your questions?). Include a brief statement on each of the following: unit of analysis; measurement; instrumentation; sampling; data collection. [I know it seems counterintuitive that this would be last, but it is easier to write an introduction/overview after you have made all of your methodological decisions. In the *final* version, this should be placed after 1b, but the draft is not due until Week 14, when you should have drafted and gotten feedback on sections 1-5.]

Final submission should be double-spaced, 12-point font, Times font. Drafts can be formatted however you and your partner prefer. Final version should include a bibliography. I will deduct points for typos, etc. in the *final version*.

Process for final project draft submissions:

Each draft will first be shared with your assigned partner. Partners will give each other feedback (using the MS Word or Google Docs comment and/or track changes functions), make revisions based on that feedback, and then turn in the draft to Canvas (with changes and comments). Part of your grade will reflect the quality of feedback that you give your partner and your responsiveness to revisions. If you disagree with a suggestion, simply respond to the comment with your rationale for not making a change (or changing it differently than suggested). Some advice on getting good feedback: Note places in your draft that you specifically want feedback on (maybe you aren’t sure whether you answered something sufficiently, or you aren’t sure about your choice of method, etc.—point your partner to those areas that you think are weakest). Some advice on giving good feedback: Be detailed and give reasons for your comments, both positive and negative. It will help your partners decide whether to make changes, and it will help you solidify the concepts of good research design throughout the semester (revisit lectures and readings if necessary, feel free to refer to those in your comments). Your feedback should primarily be about *content*, it should not be proofreading or copyediting. However, if you feel that your partner has a confusing writing style, etc., you may want to give feedback about that as well. This should also be detailed and well-reasoned (e.g., why is it confusing?). Discussing concepts and measurement, especially, is very difficult to do clearly, and will likely take a few drafts. If something is confusing to you as a reader, *tell your partner*—this will help them work on the clarity before their first draft gets to me, and will make the whole process more efficient and effective.

Each draft is worth 20 points. 15 points are for your own writing (including revisions and responses to feedback), and 5 points are for your responses to your partner’s work. I will not take off points for spelling, typos, grammar, etc. on drafts, though I will point out if there are writing issues that you should rectify in the final version (points will be deducted for this kind of error in the final version). The grading of the drafts is primarily based on whether you included all of the required material. If you follow the rubrics I’ve provided, you will meet the requirements of the draft assignment and you should get full credit, even if there are significant changes that need to be made in revisions. This may seem simple, but it is amazing how many people do not read the assignment instructions in full. In reality, research designs are often created in response to a Request for Proposals or Submission Requirements for a conference or publication; thus you *must* pay attention to the requirements, since your submission may be ineligible for funding or acceptance if you do not follow guidelines.

Full credit for partner response feedback will be given if your feedback is thoughtful, detailed, and relevant to the assignment requirements. Feel free to refer to the assignment requirements if your partner seems to be off-track. Partner feedback should be collegial as well as critical. The goal of giving feedback is for the study to be improved, which means you need to be honest and professional. If funding for a research proposal is at stake, you do your colleagues no favors by being overly forgiving of mistakes or low-quality work. This is also a skill you will need if you ever become a reviewer for a journal publication or a conference, as well as in informal feedback situations. You may give feedback that goes beyond the assignment requirements, but make sure you note that in your comments; e.g.: “Something to think about if you pursue this idea beyond this class is….”

**Grading:**

* Late work will result in a decrease of 1 point per day. This applies to all drafts, forum posts, quizzes. *If your partner’s late feedback is impacting your ability to turn a revision in on time and you cannot work it out with them directly, please let me know.*
* Late deductions will be waived if you have a reasonable excuse and you communicate with me in advance. When in doubt, communicate! (I have given my cell number for emergency communication via text)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Forum posts | 10 for each post plus 5 for response | 15 x 7 = 105 |
| Weekly quizzes | 10 for each | 10 x 12 = 120 |
| Office hours | 25 (one meeting required) | 1 x 25 |
| Drafts of final project parts | 20 points for each draft (15 points for your own writing and 5 points on your feedback to your partner) | 6 x 20 = 120 |
| Final project submission | 10 points for each section | 130 |
| Total |  | 500 |

Grading scale is reflected on Canvas grade calculations:

97-100%: A+

93-96.9%: A

90-92.9%: A-

87-89.9%: B+

83-86.9%: B

80-82.9%: B- Etc.

Other Class Policies

**Canvas:** I will use Canvas to post all announcements, assignments, and grades. It is the student’s responsibility to regularly check Canvas for announcements, handouts, reading materials, and assignment instructions.

**Academic Integrity:** Academic and personal misconduct by students in this class are defined and dealt with according to the procedures in the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct*. Please note that this policy includes both personal and academic integrity. Not all infractions which occur in a classroom are necessarily academic, but rather can be considered as personal misconduct (e.g., signing in another student for class when the person is not there).

**Course Evaluation:** It is the policy of the University to evaluate all courses taught through the School. Final student course evaluations will be conducted in a manner that maintains the integrity of the process and the anonymity of evaluators.

**Student Accommodations:** Every attempt will be made to accommodate qualified students with disabilities (e.g. mental health, learning, chronic health, physical, hearing, vision neurological, etc.) You must have established your eligibility for support services through the appropriate office that services students with disabilities. Note that services are confidential, may take time to put into place and are not retroactive; Captions and alternate media for print materials may take three or more weeks to get produced.  Please contact Disability Services for Students at http://disabilityservices.indiana.edu or 812-855-7578 as soon as possible if accommodations are needed.  The office is located on the third floor, west tower, of the Wells Library, Room W302.  Walk-ins are welcome 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.  There are a variety of [campus resources](http://www.iu.edu/~ada/index.shtml) for students and visitors that need assistance.

**Religious Observation:** In accordance with the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, any student who wishes to receive an excused absence from class must submit an Accommodation Request form available from the [Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs](http://enrollmentbulletin.indiana.edu/pages/relo.php?Term=1) for each religious observation. This form must be presented to the course professor by the end of the second week of this semester. The form must be signed by the professor, who will make a copy and return the original to the student.

**Title IX Sexual Misconduct:** As your instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help create a safe learning environment on our campus. Title IX and our own Sexual Misconduct policy prohibit sexual misconduct. If you have experienced sexual misconduct, or know someone who has, the University can help. I encourage you to visit [Stop Sexual Violence](http://stopsexualviolence.iu.edu/) website to learn more. If you are seeking help and would like to speak to someone confidentially, you can make an appointment with a [Mental Health Counselor](http://stopsexualviolence.iu.edu/help/confidential.html) on campus. It is also important that you know that federal regulations and University policy require me to promptly convey any information about potential sexual misconduct known to me to our Deputy Title IX Coordinator or IU’s Title IX Coordinator. In that event, they will work with a small number of others on campus to ensure that appropriate measures are taken and resources are made available to the student who may have been harmed. Protecting a student’s privacy is of utmost concern, and all involved will only share information with those that need to know to ensure the University can respond and assist.

**Weekly schedule follows. I will post a more detailed guide in the Canvas module for each week with concepts to look out for in the readings/lectures, etc. Any syllabus changes that need to be made will be announced via Canvas (or Canvas message). If you see any errors (due dates, etc.), please let me know ASAP!**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week 1 (Jan. 7): Overview of the roles of research-related topics in public and nonprofit management** | | | |
| Resources | Assigned reading (unless noted as optional) | Quiz? | Assignments |
| Intro to the course (video lecture) | Heinrich, C. (2007). Evidence-based policy and performance management: Challenges and prospects in two parallel movements. *American Review of Public Administration, 37*(3), 255-277.  Riccucci, N. M. (2010). *Public administration: Traditions of inquiry and philosophies of knowledge.* (Chapter 4, sections). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.  Ch. 13: “Facts.” In Stone, D. (1988/2002). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making.* New York, NY: Norton, pages 305-314. [see comment in text where to stop reading] | No | Forum post + at least one response to another classmate’s post.  First post due Thurs. 1/10 by midnight; response to at least *one other student’s original post* due Sat. 1/12 by midnight |
| **Week 2 (Jan. 14): Research purpose, questions, context, and design choices** | | | |
| Video lecture  Ted Talk: “What do we do with all this big data?” Susan Etlinger | Raimondo, E., & Newcomer, K. E. (2017). Mixed-methods inquiry in public administration: The interaction of theory, methodology, and praxis. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 37*(2), pages 186-194.  Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management, 35*(3), 718-804. (only the highlighted sections in the pdf are required) | Yes (due Fri. 1/18) | Forum post + at least one response to another classmate’s post.  First post due Thurs. 1/17 by midnight; response to at least *one other student’s original post* due Sat. 1/19 by midnight |
| **Week 3 (Jan. 21): Types and characteristics of data; measurement** | | | |
| Video lecture | Ch. 7: Numbers. In Stone, D. (1988/2002). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making.* New York, NY: Norton, pages 163-187.  Nigam, A., & Trujillo, D. (2016). Quantification as a philosophical act. In R. Mir, H. Willmott, & M. Greenwood (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to philosophy in organization studies* (pp. 525-532). Oxon, UK: Routledge.  Card, D. (2011). Origins of the unemployment rate: The lasting legacy of measurement without theory. *American Economic Review, 101*(3), 522-577. | Yes (due Fri. 1/25) | Forum post + at least one response to another classmate’s post.  First post due Thurs. 1/24 by midnight; response to at least *one other student’s original post* due Sat. 1/26 by midnight |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week 4 (Jan. 28): Population and sampling** | | | |
| Resources | Assigned reading (unless noted as optional) | Quiz? | Assignments |
| Video lecture | **Optional (yes, you read that right—no *required* readings this week):**  National Research Council. (2012). *Small populations, large effects: Improving the measurement of the group quarters population in the American Community Survey.* Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. (Chapters 2-3). Full online text can be found here: <https://iucat.iu.edu/catalog/14782419> [these chapters are assigned reading in week 11]  Merriam, S. B. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Pages 95-102. Full online text can be found here: <https://iucat.iu.edu/catalog/15156692> [this content will be covered in the lecture] | Yes (due Fri. 2/1) | Forum post + at least one response to another classmate’s post.  First post due Thurs. 1/31 by midnight; response to at least *one other student’s original post* due Sat. 2/2 by midnight |
| **Week 5 (Feb. 2): Validity and Reliability** | | | |
| Video lecture | Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 124-130.  Stewart, M. S., & Hitchcock, J. H. (2016). Quality considerations. In G. J. Burkholder, K. A. Cox, & L. M. Crawford (Eds.), *The scholar-practitioner’s guide to research design* (pp. 103-128). Baltimore, MD: Laureate.  **Optional:**  Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: Validation of inferences from persons’ responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist, 50*(9), 741-749.  Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*(4), 281-302.  Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design & analysis issues for field settings.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin. (Chapter 2) | Yes (due Fri. 2/8) | Draft of Final Project Part 1 (1a and 1b) due by midnight 2/9 |
| **Week 6 (Feb. 11): Instrumentation (overview)** | | | |
| Video lecture (including IRB overview) | Hatry, H. P. (2015). Chapter 17: Tracking the quality of services. In J. L. Perry & R. K. Christensen (Eds.), *Handbook of public administration* (pp. 312-332). E-book.  Review Table 4.1 from Riccucci (2010) – week 1 reading.  “Submitting a New Study for Review” (IU Office of Research Compliance): <https://research.iu.edu/compliance/human-subjects/submissions/new-studies.html> | Yes (due Fri. 2/15) | Participate in one-on-one phone/video conference meeting with professor this week (or in week 5 or 7, depending on scheduling needs). |
| **Week 7 (Feb. 18): Surveys** | | | |
| Resources | Assigned reading (unless noted as optional) | Quiz? | Assignments |
| Video lecture (tentative)  Interview with Dr. Anita Kim | Fowler, F. J. (1995). *Improving survey questions: Design and evaluation.* Chapter 1: Questions as measures: An overview. (pp. 1-7). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.  Lee, G., Benoit-Bryan, J., & Johnson, T. P. (2011). Survey research in public administration: Assessing mainstream journals with a total survey error framework. *Public Administration Review, 72*(1), 87-97.  **Optional:**  Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer E., & Tourangeau, R. (2009). *Survey methodology.* Chapter 7: Questions and answers in surveys. (pp. 217-254). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.  Daneke, G. A., & Klobus-Edwards, P. (1979). Survey research for public administrators. *Public Administration Review, 39*(5), 421-426. | Yes (due Fri. 2/22) | Draft of Final Project Part 2 due by 2/23 at midnight |
| **Week 8 (Feb. 25): Interviews & ethnography** | | | |
| Video Lecture  Tricia Wang, “The human insights missing from big data” (Ted Talk). | Patton, M. Q. (Date). Chapter 7: Qualitative interviewing. In *Qualitative designs and data collection* (pp. 340-355, 358-380, 385-394, 405-415. See pdf for notes on what sections to read.)  Wihantoro, Y., Lowe, A., Cooper, S., & Manochin, M. (2015). Bureaucratic reform in post-Asian Crisis Indonesia: The Directorate General of Tax. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 31*, 44-63.  **Optional:**  Watson, T. J. (2011). Ethnography, reality, and truth: The vital need for studies of “how things work” in organizations and management. *Journal of Management Studies, 48*(1), 202-217.  Rhodes, R. A. W. (2004). Everyday life in a ministry: Public administration as anthropology. *American Review of Public Administration, 35*(1), 3-25. | Yes (due Fri. 3/1) | Forum post + at least one response to another classmate’s post.  First post due Thurs. 2/28 by midnight; response to at least *one other student’s original post* due Sat. 3/2 by midnight |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week 9 (Mar. 4): Assessment instruments** | | | |
| Resources | Assigned reading (unless noted as optional) | Quiz? | Assignments |
| Interview with Dr. Dubravka Svetina | Sloan, M. M. (2014). The consequences of emotional labor for public sector workers and the mitigating role of self-efficacy. *American Review of Public Administration, 44*(3), 274-290.  Grimmelikhuijsen, S., Jilke, S., Olsen, A. L., & Tummers, L. (2016). Behavioral public administration: Combining insights from public administration and psychology. *Public Administration Review,* 77(1), 45-56. | Yes  (due Fri. 3/8) | None |
| ***Spring break: March 10-14*** | | | |
| **Week 10 (Mar. 18): Extant archival (qualitative) data, observation and rubrics** | | | |
| Video lecture | Merriam, S. B. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. **Pages 162-189**. Full online text can be found here: https://iucat.iu.edu/catalog/15156692  **And choose ONE of these two:**  Mueller, S., Volery, T., & von Siemens, B. (2012). What do entrepreneurs actually do? An observational study of entrepreneurs’ everyday behavior in the start-up and growth stages. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* September, 995-1017.  Vaughn, A. E., Mazzucca, S., Burney, R., Ostbye, T., Neelon, S. E. B., Tovar, A., & Ward, D. S. (2017). Assessment of nutrition and physical activity environments in family child care homes: Modification and psychometric testing of the Environment and Policy Assessment and Observation.  **Optional:**  Mintzberg, H. (1970). Structured observation as a method to study managerial work. *Journal of Management Studies, 7*(1), 87-104. | Yes (due Fri. 3/22) | Draft of Final Project Part 3 due by midnight on 3/23 |
| **Week 11 (Mar. 25): Extant quantitative data** | | | |
| Video lecture  Podcast: The Data Skeptic, “Data Provenance” | Diesner, J. (2015). Small decisions with big impact on data analytics. *Big Data & Society* (July-December).  National Research Council. (2012). *Small populations, large effects: Improving the measurement of the group quarters population in the American Community Survey.* Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. (Chapters 2-3). Full online text can be found here: https://iucat.iu.edu/catalog/14782419 | Yes (due Fri. 3/29) | Draft of Final Project Part 4 due by midnight on 3/30 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week 12 (Apr. 1): Visualization and Communication of Data** | | | |
| Resources | Assigned reading (unless noted as optional) | Quiz? | Assignments |
| Video lecture  Interview with Dr. Jodi Moon | Oh, J., Lim, H. S., Copple, J. G., & Chadraba, E. K. (2018). Harnessing the persuasive potential of data: … *Telematics and Informatics, 35*(6), 1755-1769.  Isett, K. R., & Hicks, D. M. (2018). Providing public servants what they need: Revealing the “unseen” through data visualization. *Public Administration Review, 78*(3), 479-485.  Optional:  Rom, M. C. (2015). Numbers, pictures, and politics: Teaching research methods through data visualizations. *Journal of Political Science Education, 11*, 11-27. | Yes (due Fri. 4/5) | Draft of Final Project Part 5 due by midnight on 4/6 |
| **Week 13 (Apr. 8): Transparency and democratization of data** | | | |
| Video lecture  TedTalk:  Alan Smith, Why we’re so bad at statistics | Moon, J. S., & Stewart, M. S. (2019). Comparing transparency among publicly funded school voucher programs. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, April 2019.  Kassen, M. (2013). A promising phenomenon of open data: A case study of the Chicago open data project. *Government Information Quarterly, 30*, 508-513.  Gouveia, C., Fonseca, A., Camara, A., & Ferreira, F. (2004). Promoting the use of environmental data collected by concerned citizens through information and communication technologies. *Journal of Environmental Management, 71,* 135-154. | **No** | Forum post + at least one response to another classmate’s post.  First post due Thurs. 4/11 by midnight; response to at least *one other student’s original post* due Sat. 4/13 by midnight |
| **Week 14 (Apr. 15): Unintended consequences** | | | |
| Video lecture (tentative)  TedTalk: “How Stats Fool Juries” by Peter Donnelly | Werner, R. M., & Asch, D. A. (2005). The unintended consequences of publicly reporting quality information. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 293*(10), 1239-1244.  Jennings, J. L., & Bearak, J. M. (2014). “Teaching to the test” in the NCLB era: How test predictability affects our understanding of student performance. *Educational Researcher, 43*(8), 381-389.  **Optional:**  Campbell, D. A., & Lambright, K. T. (2016). Struggling to get it right: Performance measurement challenges and strategies for addressing them among funders of human services. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 27*(3), 335-351. | Yes (due Fri. 4/19) | Draft of Final Project Part 6 due by midnight on 4/20 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week 15 (Apr. 22): Revisiting common applications (evidence-based decision making, performance measurement, benchmarking, etc.)** | | | |
| Resources | Assigned reading (unless noted as optional) | Quiz? | Assignments |
| Video lecture (tentative) | Carrilio, T. E. (2008). Accountability, evidence, and the use of information systems in social service programs. *Journal of Social Work, 8*(2), 135-148.  Folz, D. H. (2004). Service quality and benchmarking the performance of municipal services. *Public Administration Review, 64*(2), 209-220.  **Optional:**  Schlapp, J., Oraiopoulos, N., & Mak, V. (2015). Resource allocation decisions under imperfect evaluation and organizational dynamics. *Management Science, 61*(9), 2139-2159. | **No** | Forum post + at least one response to another classmate’s post.  First post due Thurs. 4/25 by midnight; response to at least *one other student’s original post* due Sat. 4/27 by midnight |
| **Week 16 (Apr. 29): Finals week** | | | |
|  | **Optional:**  Sunstein, C. R., & Hastie, R. (2015). Garbage in, garbage out? Some micro sources of macro errors. *Journal of Institutional Economics, 11*(3), 561-583. | No | Final Project with revisions due by 5/2 at midnight |