

Data-Driven: Introduction to Arts Assessment A&HG 4199

Spring 2021 Tuesdays, 9:00 – 10:40 a.m. (all syllabus times EST)

Meeting Link: For synchronous sessions, log in [here](#)

Lecturer: Gemma Mangione

Office Hours: On Zoom: [Mondays](#), 08-9:30 a.m.; [Wednesdays](#), 07:30-9 p.m.

These are by **appointment**: Please sign up [here](#) at least one hour before the start of office hours on Mondays or Wednesdays.

E-mail: gm2735@tc.columbia.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Since the mid-20th century, arts organizations responding to pressures for greater accountability from third parties have increasingly relied on data monitoring and assessment as a way to justify their public value. Regardless, capacity building and training for evaluation continues to be inconsistently available for arts professionals, necessitating reliance on external consultants for which there are rarely sustainable funds. To best prepare the arts administrator for the “evaluative turn” in arts practice, this course offers both a conceptual framework and a set of practical tools to broaden arts evaluation literacy. We will examine the emergence of the arts sector’s emphasis on evaluation, specific challenges of arts evaluation within the broader field of assessment, and the need for cultural intelligence in evaluation. We will also discuss how to formulate ethical protocols for arts evaluation and research, workshop different steps of the assessment process, train in basic interview and survey methods, and explore how to develop evaluations with external parties. This 3-credit course is designed for a broad community of scholars interested in arts evaluation theory and design. There are no prerequisites. The course is eligible for a letter or P/F grade.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Having taken this course, students will be able to:

- Contextualize contemporary arts assessment issues and models within the broader professional evaluation field;
- Understand key challenges within arts assessment and identify their solutions;
- Describe the arc of the evaluation process and strategies for each stage;
- Draft preliminary interview and survey instruments for program evaluation;
- Plan for external evaluation by communicating objectives and need

ASSESSMENT (ha. ha. ha.)

Please see the appendix to this syllabus for detailed descriptions of assignments.

Discussion Participation: Weeks 2, 3, 4, and 5 20%

Assessment Background: Due **3/9** 15%

Assessment Instrument: Draft (10%; due **3/30**)/Revised (25%; due **4/13**) 35%

Project RFP: Example (5%, due **4/5**)/Paper (25%, due **4/22**) 30%

| | |
|---------------------------------|------|
| Total | 100% |
| <u>COURSE PHILOSOPHY</u> | |

Statement on Teaching and Learning During the Covid-19 Pandemic: [This article](#) in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* -- penned shortly after the pandemic hit the United States -- wonderfully captures the course philosophy for These Times that feels most appropriate to me. Nobody signed up for this; the humane option is the best option; we cannot just do the same thing online as we do in the classroom; we must work to foster our intellectual, social, and personal needs; we must remain flexible and adaptive.

I also appreciate how these principles honor the two main ways people respond to stress. In times of crisis, some of us crave normalcy. We think to ourselves: "Let's try to keep going. Let's problem-solve. Either way, we move forward, best we can." Others like to slow down. We move inward: we need to conserve our energy, to process, to not feel like we are "pretending" that everything is the same as it was. Wherever you are, I too want to honor this and have designed my course to do two things. First, I aim to keep you moving forward in your graduate education by providing the high-quality, stimulating educational and professional training you signed up for. We will engage one another in necessary conversations about the relationship of assessment, accountability, and power; practice and workshop specific skill sets critical to ethical evaluation; and overall, think critically about the relationship between ideas and their implementation. You will discuss main issues and trends in arts evaluation and their implications, design and revise evaluative instruments, and build capacity in working with external consultants.

Second, I aim for this course to be responsive. We'll have check-ins built into the semester. We will blend synchronous and asynchronous approaches to practice different types of thinking and learning. We may swap out readings and introduce new ones to respond to your interests. (And I've included a week where we'll decide the content of together, based *entirely* on your interests!). Finally, we will remember that some of the more ostensibly Draconian aspects of learning can actually promote a sense of individual well-being and of social cohesion. Deadlines are given not for the sake of deadlines, but to give you the comfort of structure: of pacing, and of clear expectations about how much time and work is expected of you across course modules and for assignments. Arriving on time for synchronous sessions and keeping up with asynchronous writing at a steady clip helps create a feeling of community and solidarity at a time where we are all plagued by anomie.

Nobody signed up for this. I acknowledge some (many) of you may feel disappointed with the shift to online learning, not to mention exhausted by the ongoing slog of pandemic life. One thing I like to teach in teaching accessible arts practice is that teaching strategies are not hierarchical: one is not necessarily better than another. The best approach is to have many tools in the kit and draw on them as appropriate. Online teaching and the many strategies within offer very special tools for the learning kit. I'm hopeful this semester will keep you excited about the modality and you'll be able to see the tremendous learning potential (and accessibility potential) it has to offer.

Let's have some fun and take care of each other.

COURSE GUIDELINES

Structure of Course: This is a 14-week, primarily synchronous course with some elements of asynchronous teaching. We will meet each week “live” -- on Zoom -- each week for one hour and 40 minutes (here’s your [link](#)), as well as participate in some online discussion and group activities that do not require we meet all together at the same time. We will rely on Canvas to access course materials, submit assignments, and facilitate communication with one another.

Course Attendance and Participation: **Appendix C** discusses my participation policy in the context of grading, and this section describes some protocols for our synchronous sessions.

- **Attendance policy:** If you have to miss our synchronous sessions, I ask you let me know in advance. I am hopeful that maintaining a steady schedule will ensure you receive the most from the course. But things will come up, so let me know.
- **Readings:** I’ll ask that you attend all synchronous sessions having completed any assigned readings for that day (all readings are posted to Canvas).
- **Technical details about synchronous sessions:**
 - **Recording courses:** All synchronous sessions this semester will be recorded on Zoom, and all PowerPoints will be posted as PDFs weekly on Canvas. We’re doing so to preserve asynchronous learning opportunities for those whose access to synchronous (live) online learning may be limited week-to-week, or more generally, by various factors. If you need the recording, please email me after class. Recordings should not be circulated.
 - **Using video:** I recommend we use video. This helps keep us focused and feeling like part of a community. In addition, several students who participated in the ARAD survey in spring 2020 stated courses that required video participation felt more “lively” and less “tedious” to them. At times, of course, we will need to turn video off; that’s fine. If you are concerned about regular use of video, let’s chat! Please reach out.
 - **Asking questions:** To minimize background noise, we will plan to have everyone’s microphone muted unless they would like to ask a question. We are a small group. Just take yourself off mute to jump in.
 - **Using the chat function:** In my experience we mostly use the chat function for providing supplemental information/resources (i.e. Googling something and sharing it related to another classmates’ comment). You can also privately chat me if you need to for any reason during the course session. Keep in mind the best way to “get” me immediately during class is just jumping in; it can be hard to monitor chat as regularly, particularly when I’m presenting PowerPoints, which I’ll do in most sessions.
 - **Sickness policy:** In the age of COVID-19, but also more generally, you are *never* required to attend class if you are feeling unwell. You don’t need my permission for this. I ask only that you let me know in advance of class

that you will miss due to reasons involving sickness so we can arrange how best to make sure you keep up with the course material.

Assignments: Assignment deadlines are designated in this syllabus, with details on submission formats and criteria for assessment in **Appendices B and C**. I work hard on assignment descriptions so expectations are clear to you, so please do reach out in advance of deadlines if you have any questions at all. Deadlines are here to help you and keep you on pace, not to ruin your life. Assignment submission deadlines are designed to help you pace your work, and I'll expect that you will reach out in advance if there are mitigating circumstances in meeting them. You can expect grades back from me on your assignments within two weeks of submission.

I have no policy or preference for which of the major citation formats (e.g., MLA, ASA, Chicago, Turabian) you use, but you must choose one and use it consistently. Incomplete citations are equivalent to the absence of a citation.

E-mailing and Meeting with the Instructor: I welcome e-mails about any questions unanswered in the syllabus. I truly enjoy meeting with students throughout the semester and learning more about your background and interests, in addition to clarifying any questions or concerns you might have about the course. I will respond to e-mails typically within 48 hours during the business week (Monday through Friday) and 72 hours during the weekend. Note that in These Times, the time on a given day I respond to you might vary and may be outside typical business hours; don't feel obligated to respond if it's outside your typical working day.

Office hours are held on Zoom, by appointment. You can sign up for a time slot **up to an hour** before the start of office hours Mondays and Wednesdays. **Links for sign-up and for Monday/Wednesday Zoom log-ins are on the first page of the syllabus.**

Emergency Preparedness: In keeping with Teachers College's policy on Emergency Preparedness (see the entry for this in the next section), and in addition to the requirements of you stipulated therein, here is information on my emergency plan. Emergency preparedness primarily relates to inability to travel to campus, so our week-to-week protocol is actually our emergency plan. Nevertheless, I ask you to **download** all available readings for the course from Canvas to a desktop or course system folder on your personal computer **at the start of the semester**, in the event you are unable to access them digitally at some point during the semester. If you have technology concerns about your ability to do so, please contact me.

COURSE POLICIES

The Provost and Dean of the College in conjunction with the Faculty has adopted the following statements to be included on all Teachers College syllabi.

Student Responsibility for Monitoring TC email account: Students are expected to monitor their TC email accounts. For the full text of the Student Responsibility for Monitoring TC email account please refer to [http://www.tc.columbia.edu/policylibrary/Student Responsibility for Monitoring TC Email Account](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/policylibrary/Student%20Responsibility%20for%20Monitoring%20TC%20Email%20Account)

Privacy: Students who receive or are provided access to a recording of a class may not download the recording to a computer or other electronic device on which it would be accessible to others and may not distribute the recording or any portion or transcript of it to anyone else. We are part of a learning community and students must respect each other's privacy. Students may talk about personal or sensitive topics and it is important to the course that we have a safe space to share openly. If a student is found to have shared a recording in violation of this rule, the student will be subject to sanctions for academic and general misconduct, including a failing grade for this course. The instructor has the option of sharing the class session recordings with other members of your class. Any other use of the recording will require your expressed written permission.

Accommodations: The College will make reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact the Office of Access and Services for Individuals with Disabilities (OASID) for information about registration. You can reach OASID by email at oasid@tc.columbia.edu, stop by 301 Zankel Building or call 212-678-3689. Services are available only to students who have registered and submit appropriate documentation. As your instructor, I am happy to discuss specific needs with you as well. Please report any access related concerns about instructional material to OASID and to me as your instructor.

Incomplete Grades: For the full text of the Incomplete Grade policy please refer to [http://www.tc.columbia.edu/policylibrary/Incomplete Grades](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/policylibrary/Incomplete%20Grades)

Religious Observance: For the full text of the Religious Observance policy, please refer to <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/policylibrary/provost/religious-observance/>

Sexual Harassment and Violence Reporting: Teachers College is committed to maintaining a safe environment for students. Because of this commitment and because of federal and state regulations, we must advise you that if you tell any of your instructors about sexual harassment or gender-based misconduct involving a member of the campus community, your instructor is required to report this information to the Title IX Coordinator, Janice Robinson. She will treat this information as private, but will

need to follow up with you and possibly look into the matter. The Ombuds Officer is a confidential resource available for students, staff and faculty, including matters concerning “Gender-based Misconduct”. “Gender-based misconduct” includes sexual assault, stalking, sexual harassment, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual exploitation, and gender-based harassment. For more information, see <http://sexualrespect.columbia.edu/gender-based-misconduct-policy-students>. The TC Ombuds Officer may be reached at ombuds@tc.columbia.edu or 212-678-4169.

Emergency Plan: TC is prepared for a wide range of emergencies. After declaring an emergency situation, the President/Provost will provide the community with critical information on procedures and available assistance. If travel to campus is not feasible, instructors will facilitate academic continuity through Canvas and other technologies, if possible. It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that they are set to receive email notifications from TC and communications from their instructor at their TC email address. Within the first two sessions for the course, students are expected to review and be prepared to follow the instructions stated in the emergency plan. The plan may consist of downloading or obtaining all available readings for the course or the instructor may provide other instructions.

Academic Integrity: Students who intentionally submit work either not their own or without clear attribution to the original source, fabricate data or other information, engage in cheating, or misrepresentation of academic records may be subject to charges. Sanctions may include dismissal from the college for violation of the TC principles of academic and professional integrity fundamental to the purpose of the College.

CLASS SCHEDULE

WEEK ONE: January 12: Orientation

We will review the syllabus, assignments, class guidelines, and policies. We'll then kick things off by visiting some key debates about the role of arts evaluation in arts practice, anchored in our reading for the day:

Pre-Work: Pre-course survey, available [here](#)

Readings:

Le, Vu. 2016. "Capacity Building 9.1: Give Someone a Fish, Let Them Focus on Carpentry." Available online: Nonprofit AF,
<http://nonprofitaf.com/2016/10/capacitybuildinggivesomeoneafish/>

WEEK TWO: January 19: Mapping the Field: What is Arts Assessment?

Today we will map the field of arts assessment. Main questions for the day: What does this field look like, and what does it include? How do different forms of assessments answer different goals for the arts manager? How do evaluation and research -- as assessment traditions -- inform one another, and where do their goals differ?

Pre-Work: Syllabus quiz, available [here](#)

Readings:

Pankratz, David B. 2011. "Evaluation in the Arts." Pp. 319-347 in: *The Arts Management Handbook: New Directions for Students and Practitioners*, eds. Meg Brindle and Constance Devereaux. Routledge.

Map of Arts Evaluation and Research (developed by Sarah Lee, formerly President, Slover Linett Audience Research, presently Principal of [Sarah Lee Consulting](#))

"Who's Coming? Respectful Audience Surveying Toolkit." Of/By/For All with SloverLinett Audience Research. Available online [here](#). **Pages 1-29; don't worry about Part 2, though you can read it if of interest.**

Recommended as Background (Not Required Reading):

"Getting Started with Program Evaluation: A Guide for Arts Organizations." 2007. Georgia Council for the Arts and the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. **Available online:**

<https://nasaa-arts.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Getting-Started-with-Program-Evaluation.pdf>

Korn, Randi. 1994. "Studying Your Visitors: Where to Begin." *History News* 49 (2): 23-26.

Callahan, Suzanne. 2005. Chapter 6: "Resources." In: *Singing our Praises: Case Studies in the Art of Evaluation*. Commissioned by the Association of Performing Arts Presenters, Washington, D.C. 2006.

WEEK THREE: January 26: Why Are We Evaluating Art, Anyway?

How did the emphasis on “proving” art’s value (or “proving” the worth of arts organizations) become so ubiquitous in art worlds? How does this relate to a broader shift toward evaluation as a form of field-level accountability, and what are some of the effects of this shift? Should we embrace the “evaluative turn”? Should it make us suspicious? Or both?

Peterson, Richard A. 1986. “From impresario to arts administrator: Formal accountability in nonprofit cultural organizations.” Pp. 161-183 in: *Nonprofit enterprise in the arts: Studies in mission and constraint*, ed. Paul DiMaggio, New York: Oxford University Press.

Espeland, Wendy Nelson and Michael Sauder. 2016. *Engines of Anxiety: Academic Rankings, Reputation, and Accountability*. Russell Sage Foundation. **Read**: Chapter 2, “Accountability by the Numbers,” pp. 19-39.

Korn, Randi. 2007. “The case for holistic intentionality.” *Curator: The Museum Journal* 50(2): 255-264.

WEEK FOUR: February 2: Challenges and Opportunities in Execution

What organizational and operational challenges do arts administrators face implementing assessment projects? How do they relate to the norms and best practices in the broader field of arts evaluation? Today we will discuss these challenges and brainstorm how to get around them.

Brown, Alan. 2006. “An architecture of value.” *Grantmakers in the Arts Reader* 17(1): 18-25.

Galloway, Susan. 2009. “Theory-based evaluation and the social impact of the arts.” *Cultural Trends* 18(2): 125-148.

Davies, Maurice and Christian Heath. 2014. “‘Good’ organisational reasons for ‘ineffectual’ research: Evaluating summative evaluation of museums and galleries.” *Cultural Trends* 23(1): 57-69.

Johanson, Katya and Hilary Glow. 2015. “A virtuous circle: The positive evaluation phenomenon in arts audience research.” *Participations* 12(1): 254-270.

Recommended as Background (Not Required Reading):

Dhillon, Lovely and Sara Vaca. 2018. “Refining Theories of Change.” *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation* 14(30): 64-87.

Brown, Alan S. and Novak, Jennifer Leonard. 2007. “Assessing the intrinsic impacts of a live performance.” San Francisco, CA: WolfBrown. Chicago. **Read**: “Overview, Purpose & Summary of Findings,” pp. 5-21 and “Intrinsic Impacts,” pp. 40-64.

WEEK FIVE: February 9: Socially Responsive Evaluation

How does the process of assigning value to creative work vary across context and cultures? How can and should we adjust practice to create more inclusive evaluative designs?

Listen to the following podcast: "Decolonizing Data with Anna Rebecca Lopez and Vu Le." Available [here](#).

Watch the following video: Data Amnesty. "What is Bias?" Available online [here](#).

Read:

Cobb, Amanda J. 2005. "The National Museum of the American Indian as Cultural Sovereignty." *American Quarterly* 57(2): 485-506.

Diamond, Judy, Michael Horn, and David H. Uttal. 2016. *Practical Evaluation Guide: Tools for Museums and Other Informal Educational Settings*. **Read:** Pp. 7-9, Chapter 1, "Thinking Through an Evaluation Study."

WEEK SIX: February 16: The Arc of Evaluation: Getting Started

This week we begin discussing the arc of the evaluation process, with a specific focus on defining actionable goals and associated questions.

Diamond, Judy, Michael Horn, and David H. Uttal. 2016. *Practical Evaluation Guide: Tools for Museums and Other Informal Educational Settings*. **Read:** Pp. 4-7, Chapter 1, "Thinking Through an Evaluation Study."

Phillips, Tina and Rick Bonney. "Chapter 5: Planning for Success: Supporting the Development of an Evaluation Plan." Pp. 43-56 in: *Principal Investigator's Guide: Managing Evaluation in Informal STEM Education Projects*. Available online

<https://www.informalscience.org/sites/default/files/caisevsapi_guide.pdf>

Korn, Randi. 2018. *Intentional Practice for Museums: A Guide for Maximizing Impact*. Rowman and Littlefield. **Read:** Chapter 5, "Intentional Practice Exercises."

Recommended as Background:

Callahan, Suzanne. 2005. Chapter 5: "Try This At Home: A User-Friendly Guide to Evaluation of Arts Programs." In: *Singing our Praises: Case Studies in the Art of Evaluation*. Commissioned by the Association of Performing Arts Presenters, Washington, D.C. 2006.

Callahan, Suzanne. 2005. Chapter 2: "Case Study: Chicago Dancemakers Forum."

Patton, Michael Quinn. 2008. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation* (4th ed.) Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **Read:** Chapter 7, "Focusing on outcomes: beyond the goals clarification game," pp. 231-270.

WEEK SEVEN: February 23: The Arc of Evaluation: Outcomes and Indicators

This session we welcome Stephanie Downey, Director of RK&A, in a hands-on workshop about defining outcomes and indicators. (Spend time exploring in advance: <http://www.randikorn.com/about/>)

There are no readings for today. However, you will work in small groups in this session and **must**, in advance of class, coordinate with your group to select a program at an arts organization that is of interest to you. **Please email Dr. M. your group's selected program no later than Monday, February 22, by 12**

noon EST. You should thoroughly research all available public information on this program in preparation for our outcomes and indicators workshop and come to class with some understanding of its goals and objectives. This means the best program to pick is one in which there is at least some publicly available information on program design or, as a backup, a program with which one of your group members is very familiar and can share inside materials. As a reminder, group assignments are as follows:

- **Group 1:** Lulu, Natalie, Ruiqi
- **Group 2:** Lena, Jess, Yichen
- **Group 3:** Nina, Tianyi, Zi

NO CLASS MARCH 2: Spring Break

WEEK EIGHT: March 9: The Arc of Evaluation: Ethics of Evaluation

What responsibilities do we, as evaluators, have toward our “research subjects”? This week we discuss ethical considerations for evaluations as they relate to human subject research in and beyond arts settings. (Note: it looks like many readings! But they are all very short).

Pre-Work: Mid-term feedback survey, available in the Canvas module for Week 8

Readings:

Norris, Niles. 2005. “The politics of evaluation and the methodological imagination.” *American Journal of Evaluation* 26(4): 584-586.

The New York Times Editorial Board. 2013. “An Ethical Breakdown.” *The New York Times*, April 15, 2013. Available online
<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/16/opinion/an-ethical-breakdown-in-medical-research.html>

Murphy, Kate. 2017. “Some Social Scientists Are Tired of Asking for Permission.” *The New York Times*, May 22, 2017. Available at:
<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/22/science/social-science-research-institutional-review-boards-common-rule.html>

Heimlich, Joe E. 2015. “The Ethics of Evaluation in Museums.” *Journal of Museum Education* 40(1): 20-26.

Diamond, Judy, Michael Horn, and David H. Uttal. 2016. *Practical Evaluation Guide: Tools for Museums and Other Informal Educational Settings*. **Read:** Chapter 4, “Protecting Study Participants.”

ASSIGNMENT DUE: Assessment Background, submitted through Canvas

WEEK NINE: March 16: Methods: Interviews

The first of two methods-focused, interactive class sessions on common evaluation methods. Discussion will address best practices and practical

examples represented in course texts and move on to preliminary interview design and analysis experiments.

Diamond, Judy, Michael Horn, and David H. Uttal. 2016. *Practical Evaluation Guide: Tools for Museums and Other Informal Educational Settings*. **Read:** Chapter 7, "Interviews and Questionnaires."

Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene Rubin. 2005. *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data*. **Read:** Chapter 8: "Designing Main Questions and Probes."

WolfBrown. "Post-Performance Impact Assessment Interviewing Guidelines."

Available online

[<www.intrinsicimpact.org/new/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Guidelines_for_Post-Performance_Interviews.pdf>](http://www.intrinsicimpact.org/new/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Guidelines_for_Post-Performance_Interviews.pdf) and "Interview Protocol"

[<http://www.intrinsicimpact.org/new/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Post-Performance_Impact_Interview_ProtoExample.pdf>](http://www.intrinsicimpact.org/new/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Post-Performance_Impact_Interview_ProtoExample.pdf)

Recommended as Background:

Hermanowicz, Joseph C. 2002. "The Great Interview: 25 Strategies for Studying People in Bed." *Qualitative Sociology* 25(4): 479-499.

WEEK TEN: March 23: Methods: Surveys and Questionnaires

This session we welcome Amanda Krantz, Managing Director of RK&A, in our second methods workshop: a hands-on workshop on effective survey design and practice.

Pre-Work and Readings TBD with our guest facilitator

WEEK ELEVEN: March 30: Methods: Instrument Workshop

In-class workshop, focused on workshopping our preliminary instruments.

ASSIGNMENT DUE: Draft of assessment instrument. **Please have available** the file with your draft to screenshare/to email for class workshopping, in addition to submitting your draft to Canvas by the start of class.

WEEK TWELVE: April 6: RFPs

We will welcome our guest speaker, Sarah Lee, Principal at Sarah Lee Consulting, to discuss best practices for developing Requests for Proposals, building on exercises from prior weeks and examples sourced from the field.

Punt, Barbara. 2019. "To RFP or Not to RFP: That is the Question." *Exhibition* 38(1): 69-76.

RFP: Audience Research with the Silicon Valley Latino Community, for MACLA.

ASSIGNMENT DUE: RFP example by **12 noon, April 5. Please upload to Canvas by start of class but also have available the file with your draft to screenshare/to email for class workshopping.**

WEEK THIRTEEN: April 13: Grab Bag Week: Course Content decided based on students' interest.

ASSIGNMENT DUE: Revised assessment instrument (can **submit through 4/16 9 a.m. EST**).

WEEK FOURTEEN: April 20: The Arc of Evaluation: Working with Funders

In this class, we will focus on the presentation of data findings, with a specific discussion of the expectations of funders and the relationship of evaluation to funding.

Diamond, Judy, Michael Horn, and David H. Uttal. 2016. *Practical Evaluation Guide: Tools for Museums and Other Informal Educational Settings*. **Read:** Chapter 11, "Making Evaluation Count."

O'Neal-McElrath, Tori and Mim Carlson. 2013. *Winning Grants Step by Step : The Complete Workbook for Planning, Developing and Writing Successful Proposals*. The Jossey-Bass Nonprofit Guidebook Series. Step 6: Preparing the Evaluation Component.

Quick, James Aaron and Cheryl Carter New. 2000. "Chapter 15: Evaluation: How to Create an Evaluation Report." Pp. 293-304 in: *The Grant Winner's Toolkit: Project Management and Evaluation*. Wiley.

ASSIGNMENT DUE: 4/22: Final paper (RFP for a proposed study), submitted through Canvas by **12 noon EST**.

APPENDIX A: RELEVANT RESOURCES

As you continue to explore the world of arts assessment, I encourage you to meet with me or reach out about topics of particular interest, as I am happy to provide recommendations for supplementary readings aligning with course themes, and on topics beyond them. Callahan's chapter of "Resources" is useful here, though some parts of it are outdated. You can also look at resources available to you through professional organizations like the Visitor Studies Association (VSA, and their journal *Visitor Studies*) and the American Evaluation Association (*American Journal of Evaluation*, or AJE). You might also consider:

More general eval journals beyond AJE (listed above):

Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis
Evaluation
Evaluation and Program Planning
Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation
New Directions for Evaluation
Studies in Educational Evaluation

Blogs:

- RK&A "Intentional Museum" (<https://intentionalmuseum.com/>)
- Slover Linett's "Asking Audiences" (<http://www.sloverlinett.com/blog>);
- Evergreen Data (Stephanie Evergreen): one of the most read blogs in the field <http://stephanieevergreen.com/blog/>
- WolfBrown "On Our Minds" (<http://wolfbrown.com/insights>)
- List of blogs, evaluators tweeting, and lots of other goodies on the American Evaluation Association's website (<http://www.eval.org/page/blogs>)
 - o Here's the blog posts focused specifically on the arts: <http://aea365.org/blog/category/arts-culture-audiences/>

Further Resources on Socially Responsive Evaluation:

- How Not to Use Data Like a Racist: webinar from Heather Krause (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1ymCmauANUc>)
- Of By for All Toolkit (<https://www.ofbyforall.org/resources/survey-toolkit>)
- We All Count (<https://weallcount.com/tools/>)

APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENTS

Discussion board assignments will take place in Canvas, and all writing and instrument assignments should be uploaded to Canvas through their established respective assignment links. Please upload files to Canvas **as a Word document**.

As you have seen in the syllabus, we will have workshop days where you will also be expected to have that file “on hand” for screensharing and/or emailing to your classmates.

Finally, your assessment background and draft instrument should relate to the same study (though you may write your RFP for a different study). For the kind of training this class offers, it will be best to study a program, exhibition, or performance. Developing *one* study offers you the opportunity to write and revise materials for a specific study you know you would like to do. If you are unsure about which path you would like to take, I encourage you to come to office hours early in the semester/in advance of the assessment background assignment due date to talk through your ideas.

Discussion Board Engagement (20% of grade; due dates variable): In conjunction with four sessions of term (**January 19, January 26, February 2, February 9**), you will have discussion-related assignments. By 5 p.m. EST the day following our synchronous session on those dates, I will pose a discussion question, which may or may not be related to a current arts administrative program, practice, or trend (captured in a news article; a blog post; a white paper or policy report; a video; an innovative program) that is relevant to the given session’s themes and readings.

Each week **by Monday at 5 p.m. EST (before Tuesday class)** log in and respond to the evolving discussion. This will require you read **the entire thread** before responding. Your first responses should be approximately 300-350 words, and should reflect your best understanding of the week’s readings and ideas and the discussion leaders. You are only required to respond once, though you may post throughout the week as much as you like at whatever word count you like, especially if people send you follow up comments. Good posts can do one or all of the following:

- Respond anew to a specific question posed
- Build upon (extend) points made by the original poster or a response to the OP (original poster) with new ideas
- Offer a counterexample/alternative explanation to the OP or respondents
- Provide supplementary resources relevant to a given post that may extend, critique, or otherwise enhance the conversation

Hi! This is the secret ninja question I mentioned. What's your favorite candy?!

Assessment Background (15% of grade; due 3/9 -- submitted through Canvas portal):¹ For this assignment you are asked to develop a preliminary project background, define assessment goals, and provide an associated question/s for an assessment study of visitor/audience member experience. **You are not required in this assignment to specify a research design, methods, or relevant indicators.** This may be a study you are personally interested in conducting, or one you feel would benefit an organization with which you are familiar. The assignment should include the following components, but all components should work together in a cohesive narrative:

- **Project Description:** Approximately 500 words describing the **purpose and context** of your evaluation (see the five questions on pg. 107 of Callahan, Chapter 5, a recommended reading from Week 6; you can also be guided by Phillips and Bonney's notion of a "project overview, intended audience, and stakeholders," pg. 45; Diamond et. al's discussion for a "written plan" (Chapter 1); and Korn's Textbox 5.6 (pg. 112, Chapter 5). This section should describe the program you are interested in evaluating, so the structure of the program is clear to an unfamiliar reader and the broad purpose of the evaluation. One guideline for making sure you do this well is potentially addressing in brief the components of a logic model relevant to a program's background (inputs; activities; and outputs); no need to discuss outcomes/impact here.
- **Assessment Questions:** Preliminary evaluation question/s emergent from those project goals and outcomes. What do you want to know? Sarah Lee's mental mind map will help you here, as will Phillips/Bonney's discussion of how different kinds of evaluations (front-end, remedial summative) answer different general categories of questions.
- **Assessment Needs:** This includes two components: project goals, and project outcomes. You can provide goals and outcomes in narrative or bulleted formats, but they should be listed separately. Our workshops on 2/16 and 2/23 provide the best framework for drafting successful goals and outcomes. Remember, outcomes document change to a participant -- what they take away from participating in your program and *should be written from the perspective of the participant*. Goals reflect ambitions of a program: what it intends to do overall.

Assessment Instrument (30% of grade; draft due 3/30 -- please also have the file readily available to you for screensharing or emailing to peers on that day -- and revised instrument due 4/13 9 a.m. - 4/16 9 a.m.). Both submitted through Canvas portal: This assignment offers you the opportunity to design an assessment instrument -- either a brief survey questionnaire or an interview guide -- for an evaluative study of visitor/audience experience. Again, you may continue with the study proposed earlier in the semester if it is

¹ Please note: you are not required to develop a logic model, but you may wish to as an exercise; if you do so, please include it in an appendix.

appropriate for this assignment, or introduce a new one. Both the draft and final version of this assignment must include:

- a revised summary of your assessment background (project background, project goals and outcomes, evaluation questions);
- **the indicators captured by your proposed instrument:** this can be narrative or bulleted, but it should introduce your instrument and what it's supposed to measure. You should explain what your survey or interview guide is measuring (the indicators), and how the structure of it will effectively measure those indicators.
- one survey or interview instrument that includes an appropriate introductory script, following guidelines from our ethics session

Project RFP (25% of grade: RFP example, due 4/5 by 12 noon; final paper, due 4/22): For this assignment, you will develop a comprehensive RFP (Request for Proposals) for a proposed study. This assignment has two components:

1. First, you must source an RFP developed by an arts or cultural organization that had the objective of finding an external evaluator/evaluation or audience research firm with said RFP. This is an up or down, you brought it or you didn't, but you should be intimately familiar with its contents and particularly its structure, as you will be expected to discuss it in class. **Please upload to Canvas by noon, April 5 (day before class) but also have available the file with your draft to screenshare/to email for class workshopping.**
2. Second, you will develop your own RFP and **submit via Canvas by 4/22 at 12 noon EST.** Your RFP must include all components determined at end of our RFP workshop on 4/6 as necessary for successful RFPs in arts assessment. However, you may include in your RFP additional components you feel are necessary based on lecture, the background reading and examples posted to Google Drive, and relevant peer examples. **Please include with your RFP proposal a 300-500 word reflection on why you made the choices you did, ideally supported by course readings, discussion, and workshop activities.**

APPENDIX C: GRADING POLICY AND RUBRIC

Participation (Including Discussion Participation Assessment)

We do not have a traditional participation grade in this course, but here's some benchmarks for effective synchronous and asynchronous engagement.

Synchronous Participation: Weekly Sessions

Students participating synchronously are expected to partake in in-session discussions, group work, and individual exercises. I intend to remain multi-modal (combining individual writing, pair/share, small group, and large group discussion) in our synchronous sessions to offer participation opportunities to diverse learners. I promise to keep things lively. It goes without saying that other uses of technology/the Internet during class (e-mail, texting, chatting, tweeting, online shopping) will make all of us very sad! More importantly, they will likely have a negative impact on both the strength of your assignments and your overall learning experience. Thus they are discouraged.

Asynchronous Participation: The Discussion Board

In addition to our weekly synchronous sessions, we will be relying on asynchronous forms of online instruction to promote peer-to-peer exchange. [Data](#) from an international survey of college and university students responding to COVID-19 found 68% of students struggled with “no longer hav[ing] regular access to classmates;” it’s my goal that continuous discussion board participation can facilitate more interactive engagement and points of connection across our various time zones and continents. While I will be reading and monitoring posts throughout the week, this is a space for you to interact with one another as colleagues around some of the main issues facing arts administrators around data monitoring and evaluation.

A reminder that discussion boards, like weekly course sessions, are learning communities. Participation means contributing in the required way and not simply reading your peers’ contributions. Once the posting due date has passed, you essentially have missed the opportunity to engage with your peers, since the group will have moved on. By participating regularly in the course, you are establishing your online presence in our class community.

Below is a valuable list of “Do’s” and “Don’ts” to guide discussion board participation and to give you a sense of what is expected of you and will guide my grading. I have adapted this list from materials provided by the Teachers College program in Digital and Online Learning. As you’ll see, there are many more “Do’s” than “Don’ts”, highlighting there’s lots of possibilities for learning in this format!

| Here are some “Do’s” for Online Discussion | A Few “Don’ts” for Online Discussion |
|--|--|
| <p>Post your comments on time (on a rolling basis, but no later than Monday 5 p.m. EDT before the start of the next class)</p> <p>Show consistent and timely involvement with the discussion (that is: one, don’t everyone wait until the day before to log in and post; two, unless you’re the first to respond, you should read and engage all relevant posts that came before yours)</p> <p>Consider raising new, interesting, and even appropriate provocative topics as relevant to the flow of conversation</p> <p>Provide support for your view: avoid sweeping generalizations (i.e. “everybody knows that museums are crummy”)</p> <p>Be willing to listen and learn from others</p> <p>Be respectful and tolerant of differences</p> <p>Show tenacity when you feel right and a willingness to change when you don’t feel so right</p> <p>Show clarity and eloquence in expression: proofread for grammatical and spelling errors; aim for effective syntax to promote comprehension</p> <p>Show signs of intellectual growth: a willingness to accept and even welcome new ideas and viewpoints</p> <p>Check whether your entries can be misinterpreted. We all know how easy it is for humor to be misinterpreted when there are no face-to-face cues. For example, you can use emoticons ;) :-(to augment your communications. Capitalization can be used for emphasis, but too much is generally viewed as SHOUTING!</p> | <p>Don’t just agree or disagree.</p> <p>Don’t forward someone else’s messages or class work outside of the class without their permission.</p> <p>Don’t post on the discussion board if you haven’t read the entire thread</p> <p>Don’t write an essay for a discussion post</p> |

Written Work

This grading rubric modifies Dr. Jennifer Lena's rubric for written research assignments in ARAD at TC. It has been reflected to acknowledge you are largely developing administrative deliverables relating to evaluation, rather than more traditional research-based writing. I assign grades for my courses numerically (for example, 28/30, 7/10) to allow for more variation within these categories. Dividing the top by bottom number results in the numeric percentage. An A+ is 98 and above; an A, 93-97; an A-, 90-92; and so forth. Grades of 0.5 or higher are rounded up. The weight of assignments for the total grade are available on the course syllabus. In general, I evaluate student work in terms of content (what you say); integration of ideas central to the class and prompt (what you say it with); and style, clarity, and form (how you say it).

| Grade | Meaning |
|--------------|---|
| A+ | Creative new questions and ideas posed; extraordinary facility with one or several aspects of research, design, and execution; mastery of course concepts and requirements of assignment prompt; in dialogue with the most relevant, interesting, and impactful thinking on the topic, including and especially course readings, workshop exercises, and guidelines |
| A | An obvious attempt to produce an A-level assignment, marred by minor problems with organization, evidence, research, or the written text |
| A- | Several aspects of the text or argument is above-average |
| B+ | Meets expectations. Reasonable, empirically supported assignment design; appropriate response to assignment prompt; reflects current thinking on the topic; makes use of course readings, class discussions, instructor and peer feedback, and workshop best practices; assignment is well-organized and written |
| B | Does not meet expectations, but does not fall that far short. E.g., scope of project may be too large for what the design and data can support; components of the assignment may be too vague; organization of the argument may be very weak in places |
| B- | The equivalent of a “rough draft:” easily preventable problems like not responding to requirements specified by the prompt; assignment that does not engage or attempt to reflect standards established by course readings, discussions, and exercises; substantial unrevised content in response to prior instructor or peer feedback. |
| C+ and below | Shows disregard for the reader and the author’s own reputation. Messy, imprecise, disorganized, missing a focus, inattentive to prompt requirements, and to course materials, guidelines, and feedback that would support fulfillment of the assignment. |

