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Abstract

Developmental evaluation (DE) is an evaluation approach that aims to support the development of an innovation\(^1\) (Patton, 1994, 2011). This aim is achieved through supporting clients’ information needs through evaluative inquiry as they work to develop and refine the innovation. While core concepts and principles are beginning to be articulated and refined, challenges remain as to how to focus a developmental evaluation beyond those knowledge frameworks most immediate to clients to support innovation development. Anchoring a DE in knowledge frameworks other than those of the clients might direct attention to issues not yet obvious to clients, but which might further the goal of supporting innovation development if attended to. Drawing concepts and practices from the field of design may be one avenue with which to inform developmental evaluation in achieving its aim.

Through a case study methodology, this research seeks to understand the nuances of operationalizing the guiding principles of DE as well as to investigate the utility, feasibility, and consequences of integrating design concepts and practices into developmental evaluation (design-informed developmental evaluation, “DI-DE”). It does so by documenting the efforts of a design-informed developmental evaluator and a task force of educators and researchers in a Faculty of Education as they work to develop a graduate-level education program. A systematic review into those purposeful efforts made to introduce DI-DE thinking into task force deliberations, and an analysis into the responses and consequences of those efforts shed light on what it had meant to practice

\(^1\) An innovation is defined broadly in the context of developmental evaluation to include programs, services, organization change initiatives, policies, and other planned social interventions (Patton, 2016a, 2011)
DI-DE. As a whole, this research on evaluation is intended to further contemporary thinking about the closely coupled relationship between program development and evaluation in complex and dynamic environments.
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Prologue

As quickly as my collaboration began, it ended. The Task Force would receive the last of the files I had prepared for them: the print-out of the exit presentation I had delivered for the group on the findings of the developmental evaluation (Figure 1), along with worksheets for various design exercises I had tailored for them (Figure 2) (Files 259-261). Structuring my final deliverables as practical exercises was intentional. I hoped this would encourage the Task Force to review what we had learned from the evaluation, and be in a position to act upon the insights we had learned following my exit.

Figure 1. A slide taken from the Exit Presentation slidedeck. This slide exemplifies attempts to frame the exit presentation in an actionable way so to promote use.

I delivered my exit presentation on December 4, 2014, to members of the Task Force. Evaluative feedback was paired with specific design exercises intended to stimulate evaluation use and action. It presented observations and findings from various
developmental evaluation activities, as well as an overall analysis and evaluation into the whole developmental evaluation.

Figure 2. A Business Model Canvas diagram of the DEI program. This was an example of design exercise introduced during the exit presentation intended to facilitate evaluation use and further program development post-evaluation.

In this developmental evaluation, my goal was to infuse an attention to design into the developmental evaluation. I had done so because of the challenges that had surfaced over the course of developing and preparing the program for launch. I could see how design (Chapter 2, this dissertation) could contribute to the developers’ efforts. I wasn’t always successful; this email would be my final attempt to infuse a design orientation into the process. I had wanted to involve the Task Force in working through various
design exercises. I had expected that we could spend more time on unpacking issues and examining possibilities. And I had expected that I would have had more latitude in inviting members of the Task Force to examine their evolving program in a more designerly\(^2\) fashion.

Now, looking in retrospect, perhaps my expectations were naïve—not that I didn’t approach the evaluation with due diligence, but on the basis of what I had known, that I couldn’t have anticipated the challenges any better.

For the past eighteen months I led a developmental evaluation that supported the design and implementation of an educational program in professional inquiry at one Faculty of Education in Canada. But as any evaluator would admit to you, work on a program never truly finishes, even when formal engagement draws to a close. The program continues on, and you remain invested. You can only hope that the evaluation has left a meaningful mark on the program.

I am still replaying the many conversations and turn of events that had happened. Much of it still bewilders me. Just how did I navigate and shape a design-informed developmental evaluation? And, what contribution, if any, did the designerly stance that I adopted make it to the evaluation? What is there to be learned from this case that can inform the broader community of evaluators?

This developmental evaluation was my most challenging yet. But not for the usual reasons. As you shall see, it was complicated by the very real pressure to ready a program

\(^2\) The term *designerly* is attributed to design scholar, Nigel Cross (2001), whose early writing on the distinct ways designers engage in design tasks stimulated today’s contemporary movement around design thinking. I use the term here to refer to the borrowing and use of design concepts and practices to approach a design task (program development) in a manner a professional designer might.
in time for launch, the complexity of the undertaking masked in ways only apparent in retrospect, and perhaps above all, a genuine commitment to the task that quickly turned into frustration as our visions for the program came up against reality.

Eighteen months, it turns out, was not a lot of time to transform a program from a nascent idea to concrete reality—at least, not to the extent I first imagined. (I first started the developmental evaluation in late June of 2013. The developmental evaluation then transpired over an 18-month period, concluding in December of 2014.) The complexity of the undertaking was great. And it would take me another 15 months (5 to analyze the case, and another 10 to analyze and integrate my analysis into a coherent understanding) to come to an understanding of what had happened. The developmental evaluation, as I would later come to realize, helped pick out those promising ideas and concepts among seemingly equally-good options, the gems among the stones, and in the process, pare down the complexity. And how design would get played out in this evaluation—unique to this particular developmental evaluation, and the first documented attempt among evaluators—was unlike anything I could imagine at the outset.

From this evaluation, I have learned a great deal about what design could do for program development and how one might go about integrating it more meaningfully into developmental evaluation moving forward. (And it’s not how people say you could do it, despite what designers-turned-organizational-consultants would say). I have also learned more about power dynamics that can enable or hinder design efforts in program development or that the prevailing organizational culture at a site could have disproportionate power in shaping program decisions. Above all, I have learned about what it took me to try and shape a design-informed developmental evaluation. What I
have gained, as a consequence, is a budding perspective into how design might support the development and design of programs more meaningfully and more purposefully. All this would not have been possible had I not undertaken this journey.

This dissertation represents my quest to inquire into the meaning of my experience and the potential of a design-informed developmental evaluation. I would like to share with you what happened, the reasons why I wanted to approach the evaluation from a designerly stance in the first place, my own journey into unpacking that experience, and what I took away from it all. I share this in earnest hopes that my story and those of my program developers, as well as those lessons I learned from collaborating with them may inform evaluation practices in service of social innovation.
Chapter 1: Introduction and Overview

Developmental evaluation is a novel evaluation approach that aims to support the development of an innovation (Dozois, Langlois, & Blanchet-Cohen, 2010; Gamble, 2008; Lam & Shulha, 2014; Patton, 2011; Patton, McKegg, & Weihipeihana, 2016). This is achieved through supporting clients’ information needs through evaluative inquiry as they develop the innovation. An innovation is defined broadly in the context of developmental evaluation and can take place in the context of programs, services, organizational change initiatives, policies, and other planned social interventions. This broad focus makes developmental evaluation applicable across the many contexts in which evaluators operate.

Developmental evaluation advances development as a bona-fide purpose to conducting an evaluation (Patton, 2011). This developmental purpose underscores an emerging preference by stakeholders towards using systematic evaluative inquiry in contexts to enable the ongoing and continual shaping and re-shaping of a program in response to changing conditions and emerging evidence. Developmental evaluation offers evaluators and users of evaluation a third alternative to evaluating a program beyond the two basic approaches to evaluation. While summative evaluation produces an overall judgment of a program’s merit, worth, and significance (Scriven, 1991) and formative evaluation has been key in helping personnel identify aspects of their programs that are need of improvement (Patton, 2008), the purpose of developmental evaluation is to inform program developers as they work to develop their response to an identified need (Patton, 1994, 1996, 2011). Specifically, Patton (2016a) advanced the following definition to the approach, itself an evolving, developing matter:
Developmental evaluation provides evaluative information and feedback to social innovators, and their funders and supporters, to inform adaptive development of change initiatives in complex dynamic environments. Developmental evaluation brings to innovation and adaptation, the process of asking evaluative questions, applying evaluation logic, and gathering and reporting evaluative data, to inform and support the development of innovative projects, programs, initiatives, products, organizations, and/or systems change efforts with timely feedback. (p. v)

In repurposing evaluation to support program development, developmental evaluation challenges long-standing conventions in three significant ways:

1) The primary objective of the evaluation shifts from one of ascertaining program quality to one of facilitating program development (Patton, 2011);

2) Both program activities (what a program does) and program logic (why a program is expected to work) are expected to evolve over the course of a developmental evaluation as program staff learn more about the context in which the program operates and the users it serves (Patton, 2011); and, finally,

3) The role of the evaluator expands from one of leading and lending of evaluation expertise in support of conducting an evaluative inquiry to leveraging evaluation expertise in service of program development (Patton, 1994, 2011).
Developmental evaluation is not intended to be a replacement for existing approaches or be applicable to all program situations. It is recommended for, but not restricted to, contexts where there is an expectation for intentional and purposeful change in the program logic and activities. This context has been identified in the literature as “the innovation and adaptation niche” for developmental evaluation (Patton, 2011, 2016a).

Collectively, these shifts in evaluation conventions give rise to a broadening repertoire of practice, while at the same time, challenge how evaluation, on the whole, is to be envisioned as a form of inquiry to service of decision-makers and users of social programs.

The introduction of developmental evaluation as a credible addition to the field of evaluation practice was shepherded by Patton (1994). It was not until 2011, however, with the publication of a full-length text on the approach that Patton’s ideas began to attract mainstream attention. In this publication, Patton expanded on the reasons why a developmental orientation fit within the framework of evaluative inquiry. He also expanded upon the methods most suitable within the approach for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. His goal here was to demonstrate how rigour and credibility could be built into a developmental evaluation.

In the short time that the ideas of developmental evaluation have been published, the approach has shown promise for both evaluators and program personnel (e.g., Dickson & Saunders, 2014; Dozois, Langlois, & Blanchet-Cohen, 2010; Gamble, 2008; Lam & Shulha, 2014; Patton, McKegg, & Weihipeihana, 2016; Poth, Howery, & Pinto, 2011). These evaluators and their clients have reported working in contexts that
demanded innovative program responses to persisting social problems (Westley, Zimmerman, & Patton, 2006). Approaching evaluation developmentally offered them a way of grounding program decision-making in cycles of action and learning; it freed them from committing to operating a program on assumptions and logic that may not be stable over time. Importantly, developmental evaluation afforded the program developers in these reported studies a way of grounding program decision-making in emerging evidence beyond their tacit understandings and beliefs.

Developmental evaluation has also demonstrated utility across a variety of program contexts. For example, Dickson and Saunders (2014) examined the evaluation processes conducted in a continuing professional development program for healthcare professionals. They offered empirical illustrations that showed how principles of developmental evaluation were operationalized in practice and concluded that developmental evaluation enabled substantive program changes. Similarly, Lam and Shulha (2014), in their case study on the development of an educational program, illustrated how the developmental evaluation principles of fast-cycle feedback and rapid development supported the conceptualization, planning, and execution of a new program. In addition, Poth, Howery, & Pinto (2013) conducted a developmental evaluation to support the implementation of a three-year educational technology leadership project funded by the Alberta provincial government. They reported that developmental evaluation addressed two purposes identified by the evaluation client: inform ongoing programmatic decisions and measure change in practice. As a set, emerging research and literature into developmental evaluation is beginning to offer credible evidence in
confirming its veracity in supporting program development across diverse and varied contexts.

Growing interest in developmental evaluation is also reflected in the increasing number of conversations taking place around the approach. Two recent conferences of the American Evaluation Association (2013, 2014) registered at least 30 conference presentations on the topic in the program in each year. The field is also seeing a steady increase in calls for developmental evaluation services from program clients. The most compelling examples are not only the range of conversations arising around developmental evaluation, but also of the diversity of contexts where program clients are seeking out this kind of service can be found in the recently published casebook *Developmental Evaluation Exemplars: Principles in Practice* (2016). Evaluators and their clients reported on their experiences with developmental evaluation in contexts as diverse as from supporting the development of a national sports and recreation strategy for indigenous Māori people of New Zealand (Weihipeihana, McKegg, Thompson, & Pipi, 2016), to evolving a poverty-reduction initiative which was operating across local communities within Canada (Cabaj, Leviten-Reid, Vocisano, & Rawlins, 2016); and from mounting a response to the social problems created in the face of homelessness (Murphy, 2016), to buttressing the ongoing efforts toward facilitating educational system change in Ontario, Canada (Kuji-Shikatani, Gallagher, Franz, & Börner, 2016). This addition to the growing body of case reports demonstrates the global relevance and worth of developmental evaluation in addressing a genuine need among program decision makers.

While program developers appear to have much to gain in adopting a developmental evaluation stance, and while evaluators, especially those more interested
in supporting program planning than tackling issues of improvement and accountability, may now have a new venue for practice, enthusiasm for the approach needs to be tempered. Developmental evaluation, in its nascent state today, remains loosely defined in both theory and in practice. The current understanding around developmental evaluation remains largely influenced by Patton’s thinking and writing on the subject. There is a need for many more evaluation scholars to conduct research on the assumptions and outcomes associated with this approach.

One aspect of developmental evaluation that warrants further attention concerns the claim that developmental evaluation can be a catalyst for innovative program development. This claim is often cited as the central rationale for conducting developmental evaluation (Gamble, 2008; Patton, 2011, 2016a; Preskill & Beer, 2012). In investigating this claim, a useful focus of attention may be on the quality of inquiries that are raised during the program development process. Developmental evaluators can certainly contribute to the creation of programs using conventional forms of evaluative inquiry, that is, by addressing the explicit information needs of program personnel involved in the planning process. However, such contributions are inherently reactive in nature, answering only those questions and curiosities made obvious to program developers by the planning and implementation process.

Limiting developmental evaluation in this fashion carries a significant downside. Questions, which may be important to raise if the program were to be truly innovative—that a “radical rethinking of the underlying [program] logic” (Lam & Shulha, 2015, p. 359) is advanced—may never get raised because they fall outside of the knowledge frameworks developers typically bring to the process. Put simply, developers may not
know what they do not know. When this happens, it is more than likely that the contribution of developmental evaluation will be attenuated, and the overall potential for developing an innovative response to a social or educational need minimized.

If this were to be the case, part of the responsibility of the developmental evaluator may be to use the collaboration as a way to anticipate and explore questions, which may be germane to a situation but not yet obvious to the clients. Doing so in a developmental evaluation would allow for a more targeted inquiry, and as a consequence, yield richer, more meaningful insights. In this fashion, developmental evaluators can stand to be in a better position to respond to the expressed calls to support program development, adaptation, and innovation, as stipulated by the developmental evaluation theory (Patton, 2011); developmental evaluators will also stand to contribute to developers’ efforts at building more evolved, robust programs in service of social betterment.

One possible source for insights into how to conceptualize user needs and focus a developmental evaluation is the literature dealing with the mindset, activities, and reasoning which professional designers employ in their practice. Given that there are some important parallels between program development and the task of design, their specialized questioning and problem-solving practices may offer insights into how developmental evaluation could be approached differently to purposefully promote an innovative response to a social or educational need; Chapter 2 examines some of these parallels. I refer to this purposeful integration of design into developmental evaluation practice as design-informed developmental evaluation.
Embedding one or more design practices into developmental evaluation, as I have done in this study, may provide insights into the scope of developmental evaluation practice, and enhance the likelihood that the resulting program is innovative. Studying evaluation through its implementation in the field constitutes a form of research on evaluation (Alkin, 2003, 2013; Christie, 2012; Henry & Mark, 2003; Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, 1991). The goal of this kind of research is not to generate immutable laws of practice but to identify, document, and analyze the complexities, contextual exigencies, and consequences that evaluators considering this approach are likely to face. In conducting a design-informed developmental evaluation, the system of ideas or theories underpinning both practices are put into sharper focus. Such inquiries result in codifying the events, actions, and reasoning that underpin a particular evaluation, or what Tom Schwandt (2008) calls “practical knowledge” (p. 29), which can guide and inform other evaluators’ decision-making when conducting similar types of evaluations. For these reasons, the present study seeks to understand the contribution of design concepts and practices to a particular developmental evaluation.

**Research Purpose**

The purpose of this study is twofold: The first is to understand the complexity of implementing a developmental evaluation for the purpose of program innovation. The second is to understand the influence that design thinking can have during a developmental evaluation when the evaluator makes a conscious effort to bring such thinking into play.

This study responds to the call for research on developmental evaluation in both theory and practice. In adding to the case study literature on developmental evaluation,
this research extends what is known about the guiding principles of DE (Patton, 2016a). Second, this research investigates the utility, feasibility, and consequences of integrating design concepts and practices into developmental evaluation. As design-informed developmental evaluation (DI-DE) is yet to be fully documented as an extension of developmental evaluation theory, significant attention will be paid to investigate whether a strong argument can be made for the approach, including the extent to which there is evidence that DI-DE contributed to an innovation program response.

**Research Questions**

The following questions frame my inquiry:

1. To what extent is there evidence from the case to qualify this particular evaluation as a developmental evaluation?

2. How might a developmental evaluator navigate and shape a design-informed developmental evaluation?

**Research Context**

In this study, I examined the processes and consequences of a design-informed developmental evaluation undertaken at the Faculty of Education of one mid-size, research-intensive Ontario university. This particular developmental evaluation was initiated to support the development of the Diploma in Educational Inquiry (DEI)\(^3\) graduate program in the field of education. Development of the DEI program was initiated to respond to a growing need for further professional learning and graduate-level

\(^3\) pseudonym
education for working professionals with educational responsibilities. The intention of this program was to enhance professionals’ capacities to address educational issues, problems, and dilemmas encountered in their context of practice.

The undertaking of this program development came at a time when the Faculty was eager and ready to expand its portfolio of programs. For some time, the Faculty had been offering two research-intensive graduate degree programs (MEd, PhD) in education. From these programs, the Faculty’s administration determined that there was enough organizational capacity and academic expertise to promote this expansion. However, this capacity and expertise would not be immediately transferable because of the DEI had a professional-learning focus. The program would require fresh thinking both in program logic and delivery. It would require a curriculum and supporting courses that cater to the needs of those primarily interested in improving their professional practice. This also meant considering a novel approach to organizing teaching and learning so as to suit the needs of those working full time.

The DEI developmental evaluation focused on:

- Mounting an inquiry framework to generate emergent learning useful in informing ongoing program decision-making;
- Elucidating the process of innovation and program development; and,
- Tracking those deliberations and decisions made about the program.

This application of developmental evaluation is known in the literature as preformative development of a program, one of five currently recognized applications of developmental evaluation (see Patton, 2011, for descriptions of all five applications). This evaluation also provided the opportune context to integrate design concepts and
embed design practices into developmental evaluation as a way to promote an innovative response to the program development challenge.

In entering this context, I grounded my involvement and behaviour in:

- the principles of developmental evaluation (Patton, 2011);
- the Program Evaluation Standards (3rd edition) (Yarbrough, Shulha, Hopson, & Caruthers, 2011); and,

As a set, these criteria for evaluator practice anchored my evaluator behaviour, reasoning, and professional decision-making during the evaluation. In doing so, they provided a basis for reexamining my practice and providing assurance that design informed thinking would not compromise the ethical and quality expectations for my work.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The emergence of developmental evaluation theory reflects the evaluation community’s ongoing quest to enhance the utility of evaluation (Patton, 2008). This chapter examines in depth the current state of developmental evaluation theory, and in doing so, identifies the gaps in knowledge a design-informed orientation could address.

Developmental Evaluation Theory

Developmental evaluation was first proposed in 1994 by evaluation theorist, Michael Patton, in an article published in the *American Journal of Evaluation* (then *Evaluation Practice*). Patton recounted his encounters with some program personnel who carried an unconventional attitude toward evaluation. They saw evaluation not as an end but as a means to managing programs. They posited evaluation as a learning process, and not an exercise in mere measurement and judgment making. Those adopting this unconventional stance defined themselves not narrowly as managers of program operations but as agents of broader social change; the programs they managed were only an instrument to that end. They wanted evaluation to inform decision-making around how differently, if at all, they ought to organize and manage a program. And they looked to maneuver around emerging obstacles by adapting their program on the bases of action, evidence, and reflection.

But, unlike sculptors who have opportunities to step back to evaluate the quality of emerging work against their vision, program personnel had few strategies at their disposal to evaluate the quality of their programs in action. They struggled to assess the implications of their decision making. It was natural for them to turn to those with expertise in evaluating programs. But as Patton observed in 1994, the way evaluation had
conventionally been approached proved incompatible with both the needs of program personnel as they planned their programs and the way these program personnel preferred to work.

The orientation of program personnel, he argued, was forward-looking (concerned with what-can-be), whereas evaluation’s orientation was backward-looking (preoccupied with what-had-been). He argued that this more retrospective approach to evaluation, failed to account for the information needs these program personnel were encountering when managing their programs. In other words, Patton invoked a utilization-focused argument (Patton, 2008) to explain the situation: program evaluation as it had conventionally been approached failed to serve the utility needs for a significant subset of potential evaluation clients. There was not an evaluation approach that could address these needs, at least not one that was robust and sanctioned. Hence, the genesis of developmental evaluation.

It would be almost two decades before more conceptual and practical issues would come to be articulated, clarified, and resolved. In its current form, developmental evaluation (Patton, 2011) employs systematic evaluative inquiry to support program development (Gamble, 2008; Dozois, Langlois, & Blanchet-Cohen, 2010; Patton, 2011). Developmental evaluation posits that evaluators can and should attend to the utility needs of program personnel during program development—a utilization-focused argument (Patton, 2008)—by bringing to bear a different orientation to conducting evaluation (Patton, 2011). This developmental orientation emphasizes establishing strong working relationships between the evaluator and program developers, and keeping a strong eye on stakeholders and potential program users. The evaluation itself is tailored to attending to
the unique demands of the program development task. Developmental evaluation is, therefore, not presented as a model with methodological, methods, or procedural specifications (Patton, 1994, 2011). Instead, it is guided by a set of guiding principles, which ought to be considered, operationalized (if appropriate to context), and adapted to optimize the needs of program developers (Patton, 2016a).

Developmental evaluation is especially appropriate in dynamic program contexts where the planning process is unable to identify or trust the value of well-established program patterns. Uncertainties during planning typically persist around how to select program activities, specify clear, specific, measurable outcomes, and create a stable program logic (Patton, 1994, 2011). In such program contexts, program activities, outcomes, and evaluation criteria by which to judge success, may change, emerge, or become evident only over time.

A closer look at developmental evaluation reveals how it departs from conventional evaluation in its ontology, epistemology, and axiology.

Ontology. Developmental evaluation ascribes to social programs a propensity for change. The ontological assumption of the program shifts from a static, mechanistic framing to a dynamic, fluid system that can adapt to both context and users through emerging evidence. Through purposeful adjustments, the program is expected to develop and mature along the “program life cycle” (Scheirer, 2012, p. 264). Although a program’s form and function may change over time, the program retains its constitution. As the program develops, regularities in program processes and stability in outcomes may come to be developed. The program, at that stage, may be subjected to conventional evaluation for the purpose of identifying improvement or rendering a summative judgment.
**Epistemology.** Developmental evaluation operates within a pragmatic epistemology (Patton, 2011). Developmental evaluation as pragmatic inquiry would therefore emphasize the inquiry process over the products as a mechanism for “knowing” (Biesta, 2010, p. 110). Truth and falsity are concerned about the meaning of experiences, or in other words, “whether what we expected of the situation to be was indeed the case” (Biesta, 2010, p. 110). So, for instance, educational program developers might expect its program users to “feel connected” to its community of learners as a result of intentional programming efforts. The developmental evaluation question framed in a pragmatic tradition is concerned with the extent to which feelings of connectedness were indeed experienced by its users. This epistemological stance suggests that what counts as useful knowledge is a function of the discrepancy between what was expected and what was experienced; what is useful about knowledge generated in this way is that it has direct utility informing decisions.

It is important to remember that social and educational programs are immaterial, i.e., building a program results in purposeful human endeavour rather than having a concrete physical manifestation. It is only through implementation and execution that the value of decision-makers’ intentions can be become known and assessed. Developmental evaluation, therefore, provides a systematic approach to inquire into emergent program effects, program decisions, and their resulting implications. Evaluative learning derived from developmental evaluation can inform program development decision-making in a just-in-time fashion. Thus, the process of engaging in developmental evaluation enables the planning process to yield knowledge that is meaningful, educative, and useful (Patton, 2008).
Axiology. Finally, developmental evaluation implores the developmental evaluator to inquire into the values and assumptions, both explicit and implicit that may be shaping program negotiations and decisions. These values, as they are identified, become the anchors against which emerging evidence is interpreted. In this regard, developmental evaluation is not all that different from conventional approaches to evaluation. In contexts of developmental evaluation, however, values clarification can be more problematic because the notion of a program is still developing. Developers are still learning the dynamics of a particular program context (Lam & Shulha, 2014). Trying to answer the questions “what makes something good” and “how good is good” can be incredibly difficult. To approach the task of valuing, the developmental evaluator is expected to work collaboratively as part of the program team to (1) elicit their value stances and perspectives, (2) explore the information needs that will frame the inquiry, and (3) to assist in interpreting emerging evidence in a process sometimes referred to as sensemaking (Dozois, Langlois, & Blanchet-Cohen, 2010). The onus is on the developmental evaluator to direct and focus the evaluation along lines of inquiry that might prove useful in furthering program innovation and adaptation. This as we shall see below is a conceptually difficult task and an underdeveloped area of developmental evaluation theory that warrants attention.

Developmental Evaluation Practices

The task of directing and focusing a developmental evaluation is made challenging because no two program contexts are alike. Developmental evaluation is necessarily situational. Critical situational analysis and foresight is essential to developmental evaluation (Patton, 2011). What may be a worthy question to investigate
in one developmental evaluation may not be important to another. Because the resources in any evaluation are finite, the ability both to anticipate relevant questions—especially those not naturally apparent to the program developers—and keep the inquiry focused is critical. For these reasons, the expertise, experiences, and energy an evaluator brings to the inquiry matter. This is referred to in evaluation literature as the “personal factor” (Patton, 2008, p. 69).

The developmental evaluator is permitted to draw on “eclectic traditions and diverse approaches to get the job done usefully” (Patton, 2011, p. 19). However, this built-in flexibility is not an invitation for sloppy thinking or action. The evaluator must apply evaluative thinking, i.e., critical thinking as it is applied to program situations, as an overarching orientation and framework concerning the role of evaluative inquiry, its process, and its contribution to innovation and adaptation within program development (Patton, 2011).

The tasks of guiding and focusing a developmental evaluation are especially challenging because this work is intended to support programs that are typically responding to complex conditions. Fortunately, there are scholars who have teased out the contributions that complexity theory can make to the framing of social and educational systems and problems (e.g., Cilliers, 1998; Davis, Sumara, & Luce-Kapler, 2008; Eoyang & Holladay, 2013; Glouberman & Zimmerman, 2002; Holland, 1995; Patton, 2011; Westley, Zimmerman, & Patton, 2006). Thanks to their efforts, both program personnel and developmental evaluators are now able to understand that the need that they are attempting to address have multiple and often interrelated, but poorly-defined, underlying causes; and, that the program will likely exist in a context where
there is little predictability in the ways a planned situation or program decision will play out. These conditions together contribute to the absence of a clear path to resolving the program planning challenge.

The conventional view of program planning is logical, rational and mechanistic. It asks program personnel to establish concrete inputs, activities, products, and outcomes. These steps become less useful in light of complexity (Funnel & Rogers, 2011; Rogers, 2008). Conventional hallmarks of program effectiveness—standardization of the intervention across participants, consistency in execution, predictability of outcome, and stability of program logic over time—become suspect against a backdrop of complexity and emergence. Even when a program may appear effectual, program personnel operating with a complexity lens realize that the underlying logic may be transient. When program planning is done taking into account all that may be unstable, the quest for working towards a singular, definitive program solution becomes moot (Rittel & Webber, 1973).

A realization of the complexity that belies complex social and educational problems has led some program personnel to adopt an innovative stance in their approach to planning and managing programs (Davies, Caulier-Frice, & Norman, 2012; Mulgan, 2006; Westley, Zimmerman, & Patton, 2006). These program personnel, oftentimes referred to as social innovators, are resolute in developing fresh approaches to addressing the complex social or educational problems before them. These social innovators readily acknowledge the limitations (and deficiencies) to existing approaches. Their yardstick for success goes beyond the traditional approach of demonstrating program success, and instead, focuses on their progress in ameliorating the problem. The program is simply a
vehicle to bring about change. This orientation to complex social problem-solving is a call to action to the evaluation field to reconsider the kinds of inquiry evaluators may need to bring to their clients. Table 1 below summarizes the general features to conventional evaluation and developmental evaluation.

Table 1

*A comparison of the general characteristics of conventional evaluation to developmental evaluation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Summative/formative</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Program development (innovation and adaptation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program improvement</td>
<td>Collaborator on program team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly neutral (arms-length)</td>
<td>To support program development decision-making through evaluative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Roles &amp; Evaluator-Client Relationship (Skolits, Morrow, Burr, 2009)</td>
<td>Often participatory, collaborative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes internal to organization, but often external</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical expert on evaluation; brings evaluation expertise and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Underpinnings</td>
<td>Logic of evaluation (Scriven, 1991)</td>
<td>Complexity concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement/valuing/judgment-making (Guba &amp; Lincoln, 1987)</td>
<td>Emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program theory (Funnell &amp; Rogers, 2008; Chen, 2005; Donaldson, 2007)</td>
<td>Innovation and adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanistic framing of programs</td>
<td>Organic framing of programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context-input-process-</td>
<td>Sensemaking (Weick, 1995; Weick,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At present, developmental evaluation theory (Patton, 2011) articulates a maturing methodological basis and approach to conducting developmental evaluation in support of program development. Much less is known practically or conceptually, however, about how the coupling of developmental evaluation to program development actually works. This is a significant issue for it gets at the core of developmental evaluation, i.e., to support the development of programs. For any evaluation theory to be sufficiently robust, it ought to identify those contingencies that may arise during the evaluation process and offer guidance for navigating these challenges toward desirable ends. Hence, a significant area in developmental evaluation theory prime for theoretical development and expansion is around directing and focusing developmental evaluation inquiry in ways that further program development. For this reason, it is important to continue learning how, given the goals of enabling an innovative response to a complex social or educational problem, a developmental evaluator might collaborate with program personnel.
Design Concepts and Principles

Program evaluation is not the only field perplexed by the demands of solving complex problems and the challenges around innovation and adaptation. The cognate field of design and its body of scholarship have long examined the theory and practices of solving complex problems. As such, design thinking may yield insights into the task of program development. Designers routinely tackle complex problems for which innovative solutions are needed (Brown, 2008, 2009; Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Martin, 2009). Learning how designers approach the task of developing innovative solutions to complex design problems may prove informative toward developing innovative programs that respond to social and educational problems. In understanding this relationship, developmental evaluators might learn more about operating in a design-informed fashion and thus become more adept at supporting their clients’ goals for developing innovative programming.

Design, as a form of professionalized activity, is understood to be an iterative, non-linear, non-sequential process by which initial concepts and ideas become increasingly concrete and refined for mass-scale production. The activity is characterized by heavy conceptual thinking, “involving a period of exploration in which problem and solution are evolving and are very unstable, until they are (temporarily) fixed by an emergent idea which identifies a problem-solution pairing” (Lawson & Dorst, 2009, p. 38; see also Dorst & Cross, 2001). Designers are known to generate potential concepts early in their engagement of a design problem as heuristic devices (Darke, 1979). Applying this technique to the task of program development might mean devoting time to
positing several plausible program theories, instead of locking-in on just one prematurely and work to understand the viability of the posited program theories.

At the core of the iterative design process is prototyping (e.g., Bernobich & Chirone, 1982; Cross & Cross, 1996; Gerber & Carroll, 2012; Sass & Oxman, 2006; Yang, 2005). When prototyping, ideas about plausible solutions, however fuzzy, are rendered real to evaluate their tentative value and to learn about the merit of how the task has been approached. Such prototypes generally represent only the most essential and elemental aspects of a design to promote further learning. As elements of a design become clearer, designers can generate a more elaborate and detailed prototype. The success of a design depends upon the accretion of action-derived knowledge (Cross & Cross, 1996).

Designers generally reject a problem as presented, instead preferring to problematize it (Cross, 2011; Dorst, 2011; French, 1994). For example, a designer tasked with creating a new automobile might prefer to re-frame the problem as one of enhancing urban mobility (Cross, 2011). Designing from first principles allows designers to look at problems anew, uncover the kernel of the issue, and broaden the scope of inquiry. Suppose a Science-Technology-Engineering-Mathematics (STEM) education provider begins with the observation that many primary school teachers feel uneasy about teaching math. And so, they posit that to address that uneasiness, the STEM education provider could provide ready-made lesson plans to teachers that are engaging for the students and easy-to-implement for the teacher. In this case, the STEM education provider may be assuming that teachers unease may stem from having to design their own teaching material. Employing a productive problematizing stance, the developmental evaluator
might strike up a dialogue with the education provider and probe their assumptions. Is it really the case that teachers feel uneasy designing their own teaching material? Could they feel uneasy about teaching math from a lack of practice? Could the uneasiness come from a place of incomplete understanding about the subject? The answers to these questions suppose different courses of action.

Design involves both analysis and synthesis (Lawson & Dorst, 2009). In analysis, aspects of the problem or the tentative solution are examined, interpreted, and evaluated against the requirements of the task. Designers are encouraged to adopt a researcher stance and employ social scientific methods to engender a deep understanding of the intended users’ circumstances, needs, and behaviour (Crouch & Pearce, 2012); such understandings enrich the problem space. Designers are asked to ‘empathize’ with the users for whom they are designing; i.e., develop in themselves a deep understanding of challenges users face in completing a particular task (e.g., Cross, 2008; Postma, Lauche, & Stappers, 2012). In a context of program design, the developers might want to adopt an inquiry stance to develop a deep understanding of their intended users’ circumstances. Evaluators can help by facilitating that learning by supporting developers’ inquiries on how that knowledge can be generated.

In synthesis during a design task, information about the problem, tentative solutions, and any emergent learning are integrated into a plausible model. A central task at this stage, as articulated by design scholars Bryan Lawson and Kee Dorst (2009), is to conceive coherence in a solution:

Coherence describes the extent [to which] a design is ‘unified’, free from inner contradictions and can be perceived as a whole; a single entity. Well-integrated
and coherent designs are characteristically simple, elegant, and give the feeling that everything has been taken into consideration and is as it should be. (p. 44)

It is, perhaps, due to coherence that we experience simplicity in the expression of a well-designed object.

In proposing possible solutions, designers engage in both divergent thinking and convergent thinking (Lawson & Dorst, 2009). Divergent thinking refers to reasoning that generates multiple possible solutions. This is sometimes referred to as ideation (Brown, 2009; Jonson, 2005). Framing, brainstorming, or random associations are examples of creative techniques that promote divergent thinking. Divergent thinking enriches the solution space; thus, critique and judgment are suspended so as not to prematurely stop creative exploration (Brown, 2009). Convergent thinking, on the other hand, refers to reasoning used to select the most plausible solution(s) that satisfy the problem as conceived. At any stage of development, certain elements of the design might be consolidated in order to move the design forward.

Design, as discussed so far, may appear unwieldy and anything-goes. To help keep the task manageable and ensure the solution is most appropriate to the problem, designers impose constraints upon their thinking. Constraints may be specified as part of the design task or be inherent to a particular situation (Martin, 2009; Dorst, 2011). In a context of program development, constraints may take the form of limited financial resources, human resources, physical infrastructure, the amount of time a program may engage with its participants, among others. Also, constraints may also take the form of knowledge. Program developers may find themselves compelled to organize a program
under limited time constraints without fully understanding the potential implications of their activities and program logic.

Finally, the pragmatic nature of design emphasizes the importance of designing for particular users, a dominant approach known as user-centered design (Brown, 2008). In other words, the success of a solution is to be judged by its intended use by intended users. It would be the designer’s responsibility to explicate both intended use and intended users. Such explications inform the construction of constraints.

**Design-Informed Developmental Evaluation**

These ideas and practices from the field of design are novel to evaluation and have yet to enter the discourse surrounding developmental evaluation. Design ideas and practices, when juxtaposed against existing developmental evaluation practices, offer a new stance through which to undertake a developmental evaluation. Fleshing out how developmental evaluation can implicate and integrate these design concepts may be a valuable exercise, leading to what might be more powerful or effective practices in support of developmental evaluation.

Adopting a design lens when conducting a developmental evaluation is expected to open up unique opportunities to make explicit the ways in which the program is being conceptualized and valued and how the inquiry may be better directed, focused, and tailored to promote program development. Being design-informed is not expected to change the role of the developmental evaluators or the functions of the evaluation. Instead, it will be important to learn whether the design-informed orientation offers a particular lens that can make a unique contribution when approaching the task of evaluating and developing programs in support of innovation and adaptation.
This research documents a developmental evaluation during which the evaluator paid particular attention to design thinking. Specifically, as the evaluator, I kept in mind:

1. Design is an iterative, non-linear process by which initial concepts and ideas become increasingly concrete and refined for production (Lawson & Dorst, 2009, p. 38; see also Dorst & Cross, 2001).

2. At the heart of the iterative design process is prototyping (Bernobich & Chirone, 1982; Cross & Cross, 1996; Gerber & Carroll, 2012; Sass & Oxman, 2006; Yang, 2005).

3. Designers generally reject a problem as presented, instead preferring to problematize it (Cross, 2011; Dorst, 2011; French, 1994).

4. Design involves both analysis and synthesis (Lawson & Dorst, 2009). In analysis, aspects of the problem or the tentative solution are examined, interpreted, and evaluated against the requirements of the task. One key analysis is around empathizing with the users for whom they are designing (e.g., Cross, 2008; Postma, Lauche, & Stappers, 2012). In synthesis, information about the problem, tentative solutions, and any emergent learning are integrated into a plausible model.

5. In proposing possible solutions, designers engage in both divergent thinking and convergent thinking (Lawson & Dorst, 2009).

6. To help keep the design task manageable and to ensure the solution is most appropriate to the problem, designers impose constraints upon their reasoning (Dorst, 2011; Martin, 2009).
7. Design decisions are made with end-users in mind, a dominant approach known as user-centered design (Brown, 2008).

**Positing the program as a designed object.** First and foremost, adopting a design-informed orientation encourages the evaluator to regard the program as an object of design. Thus viewed, a program becomes the conceptual output of a series of decisions—intentions—that are imbued with functional characteristics. These characteristics, however, remain ‘in theory’ as they have yet to be implemented. The quality of a program-in-theory is dependent upon the quality of the decisions, the decision-making process, and the sophistication of knowledge frameworks informing those decisions. Observing this set of relationships might invite developmental evaluators to focus a developmental evaluation on these particular issues.

As developmental evaluation already encourages the evaluator to track the decision-making process, being design-informed might invite the evaluator to go one step further and adopt different frames to enrich decision-making. How might a decision be approached differently? What different perspectives might inform a decision? What advantages or disadvantages might clients gain from approaching a decision in a particular fashion? The design-informed evaluator is in an excellent position to critically evaluate the adequacy of the information derived from particular frames using evaluative reasoning.

When the evaluator sees opportunities to enrich the client’s decision-making with design-informed ideas or methods based on design-informed understandings, the evaluator should do so strategically and help the client make sense of the consequences of such actions. The design-informed developmental evaluator might consider ‘designerly’
strategies like questioning the premise of the issue presented, rejecting information as presented on its face value, and problematizing productively. These techniques will encourage the design-informed evaluator to stay nimble and adaptive, and remain inquisitive and evaluative in service of clients and program users.

**Program development.** Beyond conceptualizing the program as a designed object, the design-informed developmental evaluator might approach the task ahead as a design process. A designerly approach emphasizes the program developer’s function in solving and remediating social and educational problems. This is especially valuable given the intractable nature of some complex problems. The design approach frees program decision-makers from dwelling on developing complete understandings about the problem or the solution space at the outset; program development then shifts from problem-solving to solution-making. Through iterating the program, the design-informed developmental evaluator can render data that enrich understandings of the problem, which in turn will inform possible solutions. Prototyping permits a rapid, ongoing action-based learning that advances a low-resolution program concept to increasing sophistication. A program so viewed is in perpetual prototype, reinforcing its developmental framing.

In fact, being design-informed suggests that we need neither to confirm nor deny the existence of root causes of a problem, focusing instead on its solution—e.g., we need not know all the reasons Billy appears malnourished and ill-prepared for school, but need only to explore ways to help Billy get the nutrients he needs for learning and well-being. Design-thinking implores us not to fixate on the problem or on reaching for the root-causes of a problem. Inquiry into problems and their nature is only helpful if it offers us
insights into its resolution. Being solution-focused offers a counterpoint to conventional problem-focused approaches. Within a complex program situation, the solution takes on the form of understanding and developing generative mechanisms, i.e., the enabling conditions that help promote program participants toward desirable social change.

Seen this way, the program as a designed object becomes an “interface” (Simon, 1996, p. 6) that mediates the outer environment of social realities and the inner environment of the program users’ interpretation of the world. The program as an interface would need to meld with individuals’ needs and circumstances in flexible and malleable ways, just like a chair might be designed to accommodate the shapes of a variety of users. This notion echoes Weiss’ (1998) definition of program theory as the mechanism that mediates between the delivery (and receipt) of the program and the emergence of the outcomes of interest.

As a program has no physical manifestations itself, program development can be challenging for both evaluators and program decision-makers. One simply cannot see a program under development as one would a car or a chair. To facilitate program conceptualization, the design-informed developmental evaluator might consider modeling and visualizing the program elements and logic (e.g., Funnell & Rogers, 2011). These exercises provide the language and visual schematic to help evaluators communicate and understand the composition of a program.

**Valuing and centering the users’ perspective in development and evaluation.**

Finally, approaching developmental evaluation in a design-informed fashion would emphasize the importance of the ultimate program users in the processes of developing and evaluating programs. We ought to focus on how individuals come to
experience the program and the meanings they make of it. This offers a counterpoint to more conventional valuing procedures that tend to privilege program-level perspectives when determining program performance (e.g., determining program attribution or contribution to outcomes) users’ perspectives are typically aggregated and secondary. This matters because the kinds of conclusions we draw depend on the evidence we render. For example, such an issue often plays out in resource allocation within programs. The most efficient way to provide education en-mass is to lecture in large groups. Such a delivery mechanism largely assumes that learners can learn at equal pace and start with equal footing. If we value program-level performance indicators, then we ought to be delighted that a program can ‘educate’ 600 students at a time, and that on balance, all students have met the prescribed standards. If we start to listen to participants experiences, and avoid the tendency to aggregate individuals, we may learn about different aspects of the program that are less than effectual for different individuals. The question for program developers then becomes what sort of experiences are desirable and acceptable within a program, what sort of experiences are not desirable but tolerable, and what sort of experiences are not desirable and not tolerable. Adopting a design-informed stance suggests that both perspectives (program-level considerations and user-level considerations) are equally important considerations. It may be a role for the design-informed developmental evaluator to engage program developers in dialogue about resolving this tension.

In design, the human-centered or user-centered orientations emphasize the role of humans as end-users within whatever system is being designed (Norman & Draper, 1986). A design-informed developmental evaluator might consider and inquire about
users’ experiences interacting with the program. Journey-mapping a user’s experience may be a productive way of mapping user interactions within a program (e.g., Stickdorn & Schneider, 2011). Designers are encouraged to empathize with intended end-users in order to acquire a deep understanding of their situations and needs. To engender this knowledge, designers typically conduct field ethnographies and other observational studies (Crouch & Pearce, 2012). What designers often find challenging, and where evaluators stand to make a strong contribution, is conceptualizing, and subsequently determining, the extent to which social realities have transformed. In other words, while designers find themselves capable of devising novel means to tackling a problem, they find it nevertheless challenging to answer the question of merit (how good is it really?) or the question of significance (how meaningful is this really?). Evaluators are well positioned to facilitate these inquiries.

Similarly, evaluation can help generate such knowledge for the purpose of developing programs; needs assessments provide such an opportunity. It is important, however, that a design-informed needs assessment not only establish a need (or lack thereof), but also foster a deep, empathic understanding of users’ needs for program decision-makers. What is it that people require in order for them to realize a goal?

As the developmental evaluator shifts the focus of evaluation inquiry from the program to the user, there are implications for valuing. Evaluation becomes less a matter of privileging fidelity in program implementation and viewing program failure as a matter of user non-compliance to intervention, and more one of promoting program adaptation and building in support mechanisms that allow non-standard “routes” toward success. This argument parallels the educational paradigm shift from one of teaching-
centered to learning-centered: that is, it is less a matter of fidelity to lesson execution or established pedagogy, and more of planning meaningful learning activities and engaging students authentically.

Thus, the evaluation of programs should consider not only the effects or consequences of program activities in a normative sense, but also the use of evaluation as a means for learning about users’ change trajectory. What developmental trajectory might a program participant go through in learning and internalizing new knowledge or behaviour? What might be reasonable starting and end points? In what ways and in what contexts might program activities promote development along the change trajectory? Unpacking the change trajectory provides a starting point for anchoring the program activities in some meaningful logic about how participants might plausibly change. A change trajectory can be seen as the user-centered counterpoint to the program-centered theory of change (Funnell & Rogers, 2011). A theory of change provides a functional explanation of the causal linkages behind program activities and is used as a device for focusing an evaluation. In addition to considering what promotes development, a theory of change also analyzes the barriers to development. These may take the form of activity barriers (implementation failures), barriers in the program’s change model (theory failure), or a mismatch between program activities and users’ latent needs (Weiss, 1998). Might there also be critical concepts or experiences along the change trajectory or threshold, which users must cross before advancing to a different level of functioning? Understanding users’ change trajectory associated with the change might yield insight into how to better develop a program.
Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented a case for integrating design concepts and principles into developmental evaluation. This case was grounded in the expressed call for developmental evaluators to support program development and in response to the identified challenge of focusing a developmental evaluation in knowledge frameworks beyond that of the program developers. Design concepts and practices were introduced and explored as one way to respond to this challenge. In making the connection between developmental evaluation and design, the concept of design-informed developmental evaluation was advanced and its implications to practice explored.
Chapter 3: Research on Evaluation—Methodology, Context, and Methods

This research is situated within the traditions of qualitative case study methodology (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2005; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2009) and narrative inquiry (Clandinin & Caine, 2008; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clandinin & Huber, 2010). Together, they offered a robust means with which to frame, inquire, analyze, and interrogate the case, and in the process, draw insights into the potential of design-informed developmental evaluation.

In this research, qualitative methodologies mandated the creation of detailed descriptions that were then used to construct a deep understanding of the complexity inherent in developing a program in concert with a design-informed approach to developmental evaluation. The reader is invited to see design-informed developmental evaluation in action, and as a consequence, draw their own interpretation about its applicability and transferability to their own contexts. In this way I sought to contribute to the building of both theoretical and practical knowledge in evaluation. Aiding this goal are the specific features and warrants associated with the respective techniques.

**Qualitative Case Study Methodology**

The case study approach focuses research efforts on the particulars associated with the case—a single instance of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). The aim in conducting case study research is to inquire deeply and comprehensively into the processes, inter-relationships, and activities of the case as these are bounded by both time and place (Stake, 1995). From the intensive analytic work associated with studying a case deeply, insights into the case emerge, revealing new patterns and knowledge about the phenomenon being studied (Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995).
Case study research is unique in emphasizing the value in studying the particulars and exigencies associated with a single instance within a class of a broader phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2009). As such, the issues of casing and case identification are of primary considerations when pursuing case study research (Stake, 2005).

A case is conceptually defined as a single instance of a “specific, unique, bounded system” (Stake, 2005, p. 436). Bounding a case involves defining what is to be included and what is to be excluded. For this study, I take the natural boundaries of the DEI design-informed developmental evaluation—the clearly time-bound beginning and end of the developmental evaluation, the actors that did (and did not) participate in the developmental evaluation, and the changes in program situations—to be the boundary of the study. Such a definition establishes at least three dimensions—people, time, and place—that define the overall case, a distinction that will become clear momentarily.

Given that there is no current literature of any other developmental evaluation using a design-informed approach, the present case has the potential to yield illuminating insights owing to its uniqueness. Such an approach to case selection is referred to as critical case selection (Yin, 2009). And because this case study is initiated to generate insights into this one unique case, this case study can be referred to as an instrumental case study (Stake, 2005).

Within the case study framework, I pursued two modes of inquiry: understandings and explanations. According to Biesta (2011), understanding “aims to identify intensions of and reasons for (social) action” (p. 112). Explanation, on the other hand, aims “to identify causes or, in more open definitions, find co-relations between events” (p. 112).
These are achieved through 1) presenting a detailed case description of a design-informed developmental evaluation including systematic real-time reflections on how the efforts of the evaluator may or may not have been supporting program development (understanding), and 2) positing the meaning and significance of design-informed developmental evaluation activities and their contributions to program development as these are gleaned from the perspectives of both the program personnel on the design team and the evaluator (explanation).

While case studies necessarily deal in the contingencies of single instances, case studies can and do offer knowledge of interest to a wider audience which can contribute to theory development (Flyvbjerg, 2011). Transferability of case findings, termed naturalistic generalizations, can occur when contextualized claims converge into meaningful patterns across case observations (Stake, 2005). As well, Yin suggests that case studies “are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes” (Yin, 1989, p. 21). In other words, it would be wrong to expect other design-informed developmental evaluation to proceed with the same patterns as we had observed in this one. We should, however, expect that whatever abstractions or insights we draw from the case to hold. For these reasons, the case study methodology alleviates the charge that the study of a single instance is idiosyncratic, offering little value by way of knowledge generation.

In sum, these qualities of case study research make it a viable strategy for studying the potential of design-informed developmental evaluation from one instance of it. Abstractions made of this research study may transfer to other similarly conducted
design-informed developmental evaluations, informing and broadening the knowledge base of the discipline.

**Narrative Inquiry Methodology**

Narrative inquiry focuses research efforts on understanding the lived experiences of participants as narrated by the actors themselves (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Chase, 2013). The goal in conducting narrative inquiry is to understand human experiences and/or a social phenomenon through the stories people tell, and in turn, analyzing the form and content of stories (narrative data) as textural units for their deeper significance (Chase, 2013; Clandinin & Huber, 2010).

Narrative inquiry is used principally in this study to access the multiple perspectives held by program personnel within the case study. Because the program is understood to have emerged from deliberations and decision-making, the experiences and perspectives of the personnel who participated in the decision-making—including that of the evaluator—were important to make explicit. Narrative inquiry provided the means to study their perspectives within the broader case study.

Approaching the case study narratively is purposeful on multiple levels. First, it honours the program personnel’s individual voices, perspectives, and emotions (of hopes, desires, anxieties, and desperations) as they had experienced them over the course of readying a program for launch and in participating in the design-informed developmental evaluation. Second, narrative inquiry helps with modulating the power dynamics between the evaluator and the program clients through the storytelling of individual account. Finally, narrative inquiry recognizes the creative agency among program personnel in the
shaping of their narratives. In uncovering their perspectives, the study can better speak to
the value of design-informed developmental evaluation.

Moreover, narrative inquiry is sensitive to the complexity of social life (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). One of the ways narrative inquiry achieves this is through emphasizing the relationality and multidimensionality of experiences. In practical terms, narrative inquiry implores researchers to “think narratively” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 21) by attending to temporality, people, action, certainty, and context. Narrative inquiry into experiences can be focused upon three commonplaces (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000): temporality (the temporal sequence and relations that may exist within it); sociality (the personal conditions and the social conditions under which events unfold); and finally, place (the physical spaces in which events unfolded). The fact that design informed developmental evaluation was embedded in a defined program development agenda, which engaged the ideas and aspirations of both the evaluator and the development team, makes narrative inquiry a suitable methodology for this study.

In thinking narratively and in attending to the three narrative commonplaces, narrative inquiry allowed for inquiry into the meaning and significance that the program personnel made of the situations in which they found themselves in. This was achieved by inviting program personnel to narrate their experiences of participating in the design-informed developmental evaluation, generally, and by probing about significant episodes of the development, specifically. Their narration, elicited through in-depth interviewing, yielded an entry into the constructed meaning of their participation over the course of the evaluation, the relative contributions they saw themselves and others making, and the relationships, if any, they saw in the course of events that had transpired.
In addition to inquiring about program personnel’s narratives, narrative inquiry permitted inquiry into my own participation (the self perspective) in this developmental evaluation (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The self-perspective is important to make explicit for I was an active agent in shaping the evaluation and program. I was able to inquire into my own experiences, through reflective journaling, as I conducted the developmental evaluation. I was able to inquire into my own experiences again through the act of researching the case, yielding additional insights that did not become apparent until the evaluation activities were completed. Thinking narratively provided the distance I needed to revisit the events as the researcher. I found that my history with the participants and my sensitivities to the context were assets in helping me to see the events in a new light.

Beyond guiding the inquiry, narrative inquiry methodology offered a structure with which to understand and conceptualize the case. In particular, the three commonplaces—temporality, sociality, and place—served as analytic constructs with which to conceptualize and interpret program development, linking events to human intentions. Events are not discrete but interrelated by the plot, which in this study we can understand to be the process of program development. In this way, the case study is able to go beyond, from providing a description about what happened (a chronology) to providing an explanation about how design-informed developmental evaluation promoted program development.

Finally, narrative inquiry shaped how I approached the re-presentation of the case in this case study. Specifically, I drew on narrative techniques and structures—e.g., plot, narration, time, and voice—to construct my case presentation. As a result, the resulting
“case narrative” eases the reader into the complex world that was the design-informed developmental evaluation.

In sum, qualitative case study and narrative inquiry were the two methodologies used in a complementary fashion. By integrating narrative inquiry within the case study, I was better able to inquire into the multiple perspectives of the study participants. The resulting narratives provided a set of reference points against which I juxtaposed other narratives and case data. Doing so revealed important insights that would otherwise be missed had I not taken this complementary approach to interrogating the data. The result was a more comprehensive and robust account of the development from which to assess the potential of design-informed developmental evaluation.

**Research Questions Revisited**

The two research questions I am addressing are:

1. To what extent is there evidence from the case to qualify this particular evaluation as a developmental evaluation?

2. How does a developmental evaluator navigate and shape design-informed developmental evaluation?

**Context of Case Study: The DEI Developmental Evaluation**

To answer my research questions, I conducted a case study on one developmental evaluation informed by design. This design-informed developmental evaluation supported the development of an online, graduate-level professionally oriented education program. This evaluation took place at one Faculty of Education of one mid-size, research-intensive Ontario University. I was invited to participate in the development in June 2013 by the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. Acting in the
capacity of a developmental evaluator, I worked with a core group of seven program personnel (the “Task Force”) to steward program conceptualization, implementation, and launch.

It is possible that the expectations underpinning an invitation to participate as a developmental evaluator in a program development process had a significant influence on the status and role of the evaluator, the proposed evaluation processes, and the sway of these processes in shaping the program. In this case, the invitation represented the confluence of needs and resources. The Task Force had a need to develop an innovative program that would be unique yet highly attractive to working professionals with educational responsibilities. The Associate Dean was aware that as a doctoral student at the Faculty I was doing research in area of developmental evaluation. A discussion among the Associate Dean, my supervisor, and me resulted in a decision that developmental evaluation had the potential to make a contribution to the development process. My participation thus had the potential to contribute to that process. That being said, my primary identity at the Faculty and with members of the task force was as a graduate student. Working with this student/evaluator identity was certainly a contrast to the ‘outside expert’ identity that most current developmental evaluators carry with them into workplace settings (see for example, Patton, McKegg, Weihipeihana, 2016). For that reason, this study will reflect on the influence that the status of the evaluator had on this case.

My invitation came early enough to provide me with an early entry into the development process. I joined when the estimated launch of the program was still 13 months away. The program had just received university senate approval. As part of that
process, an initial program framework had been laid, identifying broad program outcomes, the needs the program aspired to address, and a proposed set of courses to be developed. Beyond that, few details had yet been worked out.

Over the next 16 months (ending in October, 2014), I worked to support program design through developmental evaluation. I based my collaboration on developmental evaluation theory. I drew on design-informed thinking to support developmental evaluation processes when this thinking appeared to add insight or clarity to the process. I approached the evaluation with a principled stance, i.e., I grounded my interactions, behaviour, and attitude carefully in evaluation theory and the principles and standards of practice. In this way, I embodied the “researcher as instrument” notion that Patton (2008) discusses in his qualitative text.

Within the evaluation, and as an integral practice to the developmental evaluation, I documented how the program took shape, the events that led to decision-making about the program, as well as any apparent consequences of these decisions. This documentation evidenced the evolving program and the emerging program development process. For the present study, these documentations will serve as one rich source of data available for examination.

**Research Design, Rationale, and Methods**

This thesis is an example of empirical research on evaluation. Having conducted the evaluation, I began investigating the possible contributions that our collective efforts and experiences, including my orientation toward design thinking, might make to developmental evaluation theory and practice. The study proceeded through four stages
sequentially, alternating between two cycles of data collection and data analysis. Figure 3 offers an illustration of the research design.

This research design was purposeful to allow each phase of research to be informed by the preceding one. This meant I could use one method to clarify and elaborate upon the other; what Mark and Shotland (1987), and Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (1989) refer to as complementarity. Designing the research in this way also allowed me to discover any contradictions and convergences that could lead to reframing previous conjectures. In employing a multiple-method design, I came to produce a richer, more nuanced understanding of the case, and in doing so produce a synthesis—what mixed researchers call a meta-inference (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003)—concerning the value of design-informed developmental evaluation.

**Phase I: Case preparation.** Stage one of the research began with assembling the case file. The goal was to reconstruct the case in its entirety. This involved collecting all pieces of data relevant to the case, digitizing files if not already existing in a digital format (e.g., a hand-written note), converting proprietary file formats (e-mails and .docs files) into universal formats (.pdf format) suitable for data analysis (see Figure 4), and finally, importing and cataloguing the case files into the Qualitative Computer-Assisted Data Analysis software, ATLAS.ti (Figure 5). This work yielded a comprehensive docket of artifacts, all managed within the software that evidenced the ongoing deliberation, decision-making, and products of the developmental evaluation. This completed docket was ready to be analyzed.
Figure 3. Schematic of research design. The present research started with a design-informed developmental evaluation, which constituted the case for this study. The study then proceeded through various phases sequentially, alternating in analytical focus and objective.
Figure 4. A partial directory listing of files archived during the DEI Developmental Evaluation. All files were date-tagged and archived as individual files on my computer.

**Phase II: Initial case analysis.** Stage two began with an initial analysis of the case. The goal was to understand the events and actors involved in shaping the evaluation and the developing program. This involved establishing a timeline of key events that framed the evaluation.

I began by reviewing the case in its entirety, identifying what I have come to call developmental episodes (Lam & Shulha, 2014; Lam, 2012). To be considered a developmental episode the event must satisfy the following criteria: It must be

- evidenced in empirical artifacts,
- temporally bounded interaction between stakeholders (where the evaluator was a stakeholder as well),
- constrained by a time period that is sufficiently narrow, and
- thematically relevant to promoting program development.
Figure 5. Screenshot of the Document Manager view depicting case files being managed from within ATLAS.ti. Multiple types of file documents (PDF, audio, images) were tagged and coded within the software. Note: Image has been modified to mask program identity.

So, for example, a meeting held between the evaluator and the program developers would qualify as a developmental episode. An e-mail interaction between the evaluator and the program clients, simply for the purpose of scheduling a meeting, would
not qualify on the basis of it being irrelevant to the goal of promoting program development. This operation yielded a timeline consisting of 98 developmental episodes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Episode</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Task Force Meetings</th>
<th>Webinar</th>
<th>GDPVPMIE course designers meeting</th>
<th>Evaluation-Specific meetings</th>
<th>Notes on summary of Situation (Context, Issues and Topics of discussion, evaluation &amp; decision)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 4, 2014</td>
<td>20141224_1</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefed developmental evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 13, 2014</td>
<td>20141112_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Eval</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRESENTATION w/ instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 2014</td>
<td>20140732_2</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIRST TF after the summer: 1) Summer student experiences experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) program model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 23, 2014</td>
<td>20141023_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attended TF to learn about how they prefer to be debriefed; focus on evaluation use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 18, 2014</td>
<td>20140918_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cautioned about the existence of a timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 18, 2014</td>
<td>20140918_2</td>
<td>My with n and they work on journey map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We met with the team to work on a journey map — my intention was to capture the program as implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 15, 2014</td>
<td>20140915_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I met in my briefing an update of the evaluation, and a summary of the what has been learned from the Summer Institute Durham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 15, 2014</td>
<td>20140915_3</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We’re seeing all the policies in our program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. An excerpt of the chronology of the DEI Developmental Evaluation. This chronology sketched the major events in sequences, allowing for an overview into the evaluation.

The next step was to gain a rich understanding about what happened during each developmental episode. I analyzed the substance of each episode for moments of deliberations, which I referred to as “developmental moments”. The following criteria were used to identify a developmental moment: A moment must:

- be grounded in the data, evidencing a unit of discussion, deliberation, or decision-making of a certain topic;
- have obvious relevance to the immediate development; and
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• demonstrate a plausible a priori connection to other preceding or succeeding developmental moments.

Analyzing for developmental moments was helpful for they indicate either the topic of discussion at a particular moment (the substance of deliberation) or the action that was being undertaken (the function of the deliberation).

In analyzing the case for developmental moments, I came to understand the issues the team was wrestling with as planning progressed. From this, I was able to generate a chronology, identifying the events (Yin, 2009) that had contributed to the emergence of the program, and the kinds of deliberations and decisions that supported it and the actors involved. At this point in the analysis, I could pinpoint with precision what had happened and when.

These analytical operations were purposeful for three reasons. First, they reduced the complexity of data analysis to a manageable level. Second, they made apparent the developmental evaluation interventions and design-informed developmental evaluation interventions against a backdrop of program development. Finally, as I analyzed and worked with the data, questions naturally emerged. I became curious about program personnel intentions. I wondered what they had expected from their decisions. These questions underpinned the next stage of the research: conducting the post-evaluation exit interview.

**Phase III: Post-evaluation exit interviews.** In stage three, research efforts shifted from data analysis (stage two) to data collection. Stage three began with a round of interviews with the program developers. The goal was to inquire about their
experiences in developing the *DEI* program and in working with a design-informed
developmental evaluator. I conducted the interviews following a semi-structured protocol
(see Appendix F). I framed my questions to solicit a narrative understanding, and I drew
on the chronology and other artifacts as elicitation aids.

**Phase IV: Full case analysis.** Research efforts shifted back to data analysis in
this final stage. Having collected the interview data, my analytic goal was to incorporate
program developers’ perspectives into my case analysis to come to a fuller understanding
of the developmental evaluation, and in the process, begin to answer the research
questions. I began this stage first by analyzing the narrative data initially for differences
in accounts (i.e., how individuals had experienced the evaluation), and second, for
thematic convergence across the interviews on the meaning and significance they
attributed to developmental evaluation and design-informed developmental evaluation
interventions (which would have to be teased apart analytically). The interviews provided
clarification and explanation to what had happened, and provided an assessment into the
value of design-informed practices. With this new knowledge, I then re-read and
reanalyzed the entire case, clarifying and correcting previous interpretations as
appropriate.

**Stage V: Case synthesis.** Finally, by way of writing, I tackled the task of
synthesizing the many findings generated from previous stages. I re-situated myself in the
role of developmental evaluator and wrote. Drawing on narrative techniques, I retold the
story of how the program came to be and how I, the evaluator, sought to support the
process. In this way, my narrative entered the story, juxtaposed against that of the
program developers. In the process, I came to understand and appreciate the multi-
dimensions of our collective in participating in a design-informed developmental evaluation.

**Answering research question 1.** Research question one establishes the extent to which this particular developmental evaluation case qualifies as such. The answer to this question will establish a premise upon which forthcoming findings would be advanced. This determination is important because, as Patton (2016) reminded us, calling an evaluation developmental does not make it so. An evaluation conducted along a particular orientation or tradition ought to operationalize its key features. For that reason, it is important to validate the extent to which the present DEI Developmental Evaluation had operationalized on key features of developmental evaluation.

To perform this validation exercise, I drew on Patton’s (2016b) notion of *evaluation fidelity* as a standard. He defined evaluation fidelity as the extent to which an evaluation has been planned, conducted, and subsequently reported on while being mindful of the evaluation principles, as pertaining to the purported evaluation orientation, which underpin it. Patton advised that it is neither necessary nor expected that a given evaluation operationalize all principles, only that the evaluator had considered, and when appropriate, made a reasonable attempt to operationalize them.

Patton (2016a) recently identified eight guiding principles specifically for developmental evaluation. Table 4 provides a summary of these principles. Each guiding principle expounds a dimension of developmental evaluation, but they stop short of specifying methods or procedures. Patton claims that it is the responsibility of the developmental evaluator to determine the context-appropriate ways to put these principles into action.
Table 2

A summary of Patton’s (2016a) guiding principles for developmental evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developmental purpose</td>
<td>Illuminate, inform, and support what is being developed, by identifying the nature and patterns of development (innovation, adaptation, systems change), and the implications and consequences of those patterns. (p. 291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation rigour</td>
<td>Ask probing evaluation questions; think and engage evaluatively; question assumptions; apply evaluation logic; use appropriate methods; and stay empirically grounded—that is, rigorously gather, interpret, and report data. (p. 296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Utilization focus</td>
<td>Focus on intended use by intended users from beginning to end, facilitating the evaluation process to ensure utility and actual use. (p. 299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Innovation niche</td>
<td>Elucidate how the change processes and results being evaluated involve innovation and adaptation, the niche of developmental evaluation. (p. 301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Complexity perspective</td>
<td>Understand and interpret development through the lens of complexity, and conduct the evaluation accordingly. This means using complexity premises and dynamics to make sense of the problems being addressed; to guide innovation, adaptation, and systems change strategies; to interpret what is developed; to adapt the evaluation design as needed; and to analyze emergent findings. (p. 304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Systems thinking</td>
<td>Think systemically throughout, being attentive to interrelationships, perspectives, boundaries, and other key aspects of the social system and context within which the innovation is being developed and the evaluation is being conducted. (p. 306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Co-creation</td>
<td>Develop the innovation and evaluation together—interwoven, interdependent, iterative, and co-created—so that developmental evaluation becomes part of the change process. (p. 306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Timely feedback</td>
<td>Timely feedback to inform ongoing adaptation as needs, findings, and insights emerge, rather than only at predetermined times (e.g., quarterly, or at midterm and end of project). (p. 308).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Passages are excerpts drawn from Patton (2016a).

Using these guiding principles, I engaged in an interpretive process to establish the validity of the evaluation presented in this dissertation as a developmental evaluation. I brought evidence from the case to bear on each principle, remaining sensitive to both confirming and disconfirming evidence. On the bases of the evidence presented, I then advanced a claim about the extent to which the principles were operationalized in this case.

**Answering research question 2.** I answered research question two first by analyzing the case for patterns to how I had purposefully introduced design-informed concepts and practices into the design-informed developmental evaluation. I analyzed specific episodes where I had made a conscious effort to introduce design. As well, I buttressed my analysis with an understanding of my efforts as gleaned from the integration of the previous phases of research. In doing so, I was able to make explicit what had previously been a tacit practice to generate a protocol of how I had tried to bring design forward as a design-informed developmental evaluator.

Following that, I revisited the eight design concepts and practices, as presented in chapter 2 (pp. 31-32), and brought evidence from the case to bear on each principle in a manner analogous to the procedures used to answer research question 1. In doing so, I
advanced a profile of the extent to which design concepts and practices were realized in the case.

**Methods Considerations**

Each phase of this research employed a specific element of inquiry (data collection, analysis, or synthesis). Table 2 below presents a matrix that links each phase of the research to one of these tasks, while describing the outputs and deliberations that shaped the task.

**Phase I – Case preparation: Data sources and types available for analysis**

*from the evaluation.* The following types and quantities of data were collected and analyzed during stage one:

- **Documentations of Task Force meetings**
  - Audio recording (14 sessions, out of a possible 15 meetings; 24+ hours; averaging 1.5 hr each)
  - Written summaries of meetings (6 documents)

- **Documentations of other invited meetings (e.g., course designer meetings)**
  - Audio recording (5 meetings; total 6 hours, averaging 80 minutes each)
  - Written summaries of meetings (3 documents)
Table 3

The methods used and related considerations during each phase of the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Phases</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Inquiry Mode</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Methods Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Case Preparation</td>
<td>To reconstruct the case in its entirety, so it may be really analyzed</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>The completed case file managed within ATLAS.ti</td>
<td>Archived case artifacts of the development process.</td>
<td>Collecting all data from the evaluation. Converting proprietary file formats into universal formats. Digitize files if not already existing in a digital format. Importing and cataloging the case files in ATLAS.ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Initial Case Analysis</td>
<td>To understand the events and actors involved in shaping the evaluation and the developing program</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>A chronology that details events and the actors involved. Program Development Map</td>
<td>Documentation of Task Force meetings Documentation of other invited meetings Products of the developmental evaluation Evaluator log, field notes, and journal entries Process check interviews</td>
<td>Identifying key events that contributed to the development (“developmental episodes”) Thematic analysis of case data. Identifying and coding and developmental moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Post Evaluation Exit Interviews</td>
<td>To inquire into developers’ experiences in developing the DEI program and in working with a design-informed developmental evaluator</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Narrative interviews</td>
<td>Six program developers (members of the Task Force)</td>
<td>Writing analytic memoing Semi-structured interviews Questions informed by previous Phase 2 Analysis Interview was informed by narrative inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Full Case Analysis</td>
<td>To incorporate program developers’ perspectives into my case analysis to come to a fuller understanding of the developmental evaluation, and in the process, begin to answer the research questions</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Analysis of interviews Re-analysis of case in light of developers’ narratives</td>
<td>Exit interviews Case data</td>
<td>Analyzed the interview transcripts both structurally (for narrative properties) and thematically. Reviewing the full case for convergence and divergence. Borrowing from Narrative Inquiry, I used the structure of a narrative to understand and narrative techniques to represent the case, hence, the case narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Case Synthesis</td>
<td>To synthesis the many findings generated from previous phases</td>
<td>Data Synthesis</td>
<td>Narrative sketches Case Narrative, A summative argument to the role of design-informed developmental evaluation on the development of the DEI program.</td>
<td>All available data sources, including the evaluator’s own narrative</td>
<td>All available data sources, including the evaluator’s own narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Products of the developmental evaluation included:
  
  o E-mail correspondence (170+ pieces)
  
  o Documents, reports, and other graphical products (24 documents)

• Evaluator log, field notes, and journal entries

• Process check interviews conducted pre-program launch
  
  o Audio recording (6 participants; 198 minutes; averaging 30 minutes per interview)

This corpus of data evidenced the case in a comprehensive fashion. All collected data were generated over the course of the developmental evaluation (and not for research purposes). Collectively, they shed light on the unfolding histories and trajectories of the program development process. Table 3 discusses how each source of case data informed this research.

Table 4

Data analyzed from the developmental evaluation and what had been learned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>This data type provided evidence of...</th>
<th>What had been learned from analyzing this data source... (and what they added to the understanding of the case)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of Task Force meetings</td>
<td>Deliberation and decision-making surrounding the conceptualization, implementation and launch of the overall program</td>
<td>Reveal the substance of the deliberations that had taken place, as well as the nature of the deliberations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of other invited meetings</td>
<td>Deliberation and decision-making surrounding specific aspects of the program (e.g., online learning; course design)</td>
<td>Reveal the substance of the deliberations that had taken place, as well as the nature of the deliberations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products of the developmental evaluation</td>
<td>The activities that were taken in the developmental</td>
<td>A characterization of the kinds of issues encountered during the developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase II – Analyzing the case data: techniques for data analysis & interpretation. I employed a host of qualitative data analysis techniques and strategies to make meaning of the case data. The primary analytic technique I employed was qualitative thematic analysis (Bloor & Wood, 2006; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Patton, 2008; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). I analyzed the documents for substance (what the document was about) and function (what the document contributed to). I engaged in memo-writing to facilitate analysis and interpretation, and to record my impression and initial conjectures. For instance, in reviewing File ID 36, I interpreted it as an evaluation report. In my memo, I wrote about its substance and function:

This document presented my observation and analysis of a workshop where the Task Force’s vision of online learning was presented to course designers. I circulated this report via e-mail almost immediately after the first course designer session. I provided feedback about successes of the workshop and my feedback about what we ought to consider next. What did happen in these meetings was the surfacing of operational decisions and issues that wouldn’t otherwise have been considered.” (Analytical Memo, File 36).
In this way, I came to understand the breadth of the case data. To identify significant episodes of development, I analyzed the data for developmental episodes (discussed above). As a consequence, I was able to establish a chronology of the developmental evaluation (Yin, 1994). This chronology (Appendix G; see also Appendix H for a visualization of this chronology) is presented in the form of an event listing, a matrix “that organizes a series of concrete events by chronological time periods and sorts them into multiple categories” (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014, p. 194).

To gain depth into the case, I engaged in qualitative thematic analysis. I analyzed the case data for units for developmental moment (see above to review criteria). These units of developmental moments were then assigned a code, using one of in-vivo coding, descriptive coding, or initial coding techniques (Saldaña, 2012). Similar codes that converged into a meaningful pattern were assigned a label as categories. When such categories converged into a meaningful pattern, these patterns of categories yielded a theme. When a new code/category/theme was being considered, it was tested against previous ones using deductive logic, in a process known as “constant comparison” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998, pp. 80-81). Only when a unit of data was dissimilar to other already-established analytic-units would a new code/category be generated.

It was at this stage that I looked for design-informed interventions. This required a degree of interpretation. For this task I performed all the coding within ATLAS.ti. The software allowed me to manage files, coding, and memo-writing with ease. A challenge I encountered was in working with the many hours of recordings of task force meetings. The cost to transcribing these proved prohibitive (upwards of $2500). I chose to work
with the audio files directly, coding segments of audio (Figure 7) within ATLAS.ti. In the memo section of ATLAS.ti, I was able to record a transcript of the segment.

Figure 7. Using ATLAS.ti to code audio files directly. Audio waveforms can be directly manipulated, allowing segments to be coded as one would with textual data.

From the 261 documents, I generated 189 codes, which were ultimately collapsed down to four major themes:

- developmental evaluation: providing strategic feedback, fostering feedback, and brokeraging knowledge
- evaluation: uptake, evaluator role, evaluative thinking
- program development, as it relates to the process: the invisible influence of institutional norms and structures in attenuating innovation, interruption
- program design: design exercises, design thinking, defining the program’s unique value, engaging in evaluative thinking (valuing)
At times, it became difficult to keep the full breadth of the case in mind as I worked with individual documents. I found myself having to review the case at the global level by referring to the document memos, and the event-listing matrix. I discussed my analysis strategies with my committee members and consulted them whenever I had questions. Throughout coding, I engaged in memo-writing to track and facilitate my analyses. Code-memoing documented the specifics meaning and reasoning around code assignment. I also documented my thinking and reactions as a means to interrogating my thinking and reasoning as I proceeded through data analysis.

**Phase III – Post-evaluation exit interviews: Data source and data collection.**

A series of interviews were conducted post-evaluation. The goal of these interviews was to understand program developers’ experiences in participating in a design-informed developmental evaluation. These interviews took place five months following the close of the evaluation. This five-month-window reflected the time it took to assemble the case (Stage 1) and analyze the case data (Stage 2). This five-month-window allowed developers to revisit their experiences anew without having the immediacy of the evaluation influence their judgment. As well, enough time had passed for the evaluation to bear fruit, and so the developers could speak better to the value of their experiences.

All members of the Task Force (7) were invited to participate. In the end, six interviews were conducted with all remaining members of the Task Force; one developer had since left the University for other opportunities and so he was unavailable. This missing data did not significantly influence the outcome of the research given how comprehensive and rich others’ accounts had been.
To conduct these interviews, I prepared an interview guide (Appendix F). I framed my interview around the three narrative commonplaces—temporality, sociality, and place—as I invited developers to narrate their experiences. Specifically, I was interested in how program developers described their experiences; what, if any, episodes stood out to them; what meaning or significance they assigned to them; and from that inferred what value they held for design-informed developmental evaluation. I used findings from previous analysis (Stage 2) to inform my question construction broadly, and with specific questions/issues I wanted to explore with them. I conducted the interviews in a semi-structured fashion. This gave me flexibility to probe and explore ideas and significance as they came up.

It was important that I minimized verification bias in my interviewing given my involvement. The interviewing could be misconstrued by the participant as an attempt to validate my involvement or contribution. I tried minimizing verification bias by: (a) inviting candid and honest feedback; (b) by declaring my genuine intention to learn from the interviewee; and (c) admitting that my involvement could have shaped the evaluation positively and negatively in both intentional and unintentional ways. The narrative approach aided my efforts by empowering each person to tell his/her own individual story. Relationships between that of researcher and participants matter in narrative inquiry (Hogan, 1988). My experiences with faculty members on the task force as a graduate student had included forthright and intensive discussions around ideas I was exploring as an emerging scholar. They were aware that I valued honest and reasoned critique of my understandings as these were emerging. They were also familiar with my Master’s research and the rigor and diligence that had gone into creating a defensible
account of both the developmental evaluation story and my behaviours as the evaluator in this previous context. Together these conditions gave me confidence that I would have frank conversations around the questions that made up my interview protocol.

**Phase IV – Full case analysis: Techniques for data analysis and interpretation.** The goal in analyzing the interview data was to incorporate program developers’ perspectives and experiences into what I had been learning from my initial analysis in order to come to a fuller and richer understanding of the case. I began by cataloguing and transcribing the interviews.

The seven interviews produced 160 pages of text. I experimented with using software to assist with this analysis but after initial efforts, decided against it. In this instance, I found the process of using the software cumbersome because of the relational nature of the data. I discovered that I was coding manually as I was working my way through the data. This led to the decisions to code all seven interviews by hand.

I analyzed the text from developers’ responses both structurally and thematically over multiple readings. I found it helpful initially to attend to the narratives holistically and see the linkages that existed within each interview (plots and narratives threads). Attending to the data in this way allowed me to see how differently the evaluation was experienced as a function of role and responsibilities. Thematic analysis let me make sense of the narratives across individuals. I worked with the raw text, coding units of data, in turn aggregating them into larger units of meaning and then into themes. I also produced narrative sketches (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 11), brief digests of individual narratives, as an exercise of analysis and interpretation.
Phase V – Case synthesis: Techniques for synthesizing case study findings.

The final challenge was to integrate all that I had been able to learn and in doing so discover whether there was even more to be about this instance of design-informed developmental evaluation. Rather than telling the story in my own words, I decided to use elements of narrative inquiry to allow the data to reveal the story. This meant using narrative constructions—plot, characters, and conflicts—to frame the story.

To construct the plot of the story, I identified what I called critical developmental episodes. These were developmental episodes task force members had identified as significant turning points in the program’s development, episodes that I had identified as significant in shaping my role as the evaluator, and episodes particularly germane to the program’s development. This yielded 12 episodes, which formed the structural basis to my case narrative.

I experimented with telling the story from different perspectives. I could have told the story through one of the program developers’ perspective. Or, I could have told the story from multiple developers’ perspectives. In the end, I decided to tell the story from my own perspective—that of the evaluator. This was purposeful given that my intended audience for this work is primarily the subset of evaluators interested in what it might be like to orchestrate a design-informed developmental evaluation. By allowing these readers to encounter the events as they unfolded, they may vicariously confront the challenges I faced, consider the decisions I had to make and then assess for themselves the resources that they might bring to these situations along with the appropriateness of my decisions in this case. The narrative is thus an instrument for helping potential
developmental evaluators consider some of the strengths, pitfalls, and values inherent
design-informed developmental evaluation.

Next, I explored the multiple truths embedded in the case (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). This included identifying what developers had thought was the process as it was unfolding, what I had thought about my participation and that of task force members as program development was taking place, what developers thought about the developmental process now that it was over, and finally what I now understand to be meaningful for the evaluator in light of these truths.

It was through this act of re-storying—by writing and rewriting the case—that I was able to explore the meaning and significance of events to the case and beyond. This re-storying quality of narrative is what Connelly and Clandinin (1990) termed as broadening. In sum, the retelling of the case provided insights about design-informed developmental evaluation previously unavailable to me. As a case narrative, the story of design informed evaluation is presented through the lens of the evaluator but not simply with an evaluator’s lens.

**Provisions for Enhancing the Trustworthiness of the Study**

The cornerstones of high-quality, trustworthy qualitative inquiries are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Guba, 1981). In this study, I address concerns of conducting high-quality, trustworthy qualitative inquiry in two major ways. First, I attended to and addressed methodological warrants associated with the respective research methodologies, issues I have already discussed in this chapter. These included standard qualitative research practices: employing reflexive practice (memoing and journaling); member-checking of findings with program developers; looking for and
presentation of disconfirming evidence; triangulation of findings across data sources, time points, and perspectives. Second, I structured my research design purposefully to minimize threats and enhance trustworthiness, the details of which I detail below.

**Prolonged Engagement.** In this study, I enjoyed a protracted stay (18 months) in the study site. During this time, I gained a deep understanding of the case, including its context and culture. My prolonged engagement also meant that I had become exposed to a wide variety of issues in ways most external evaluator or researchers conducting research on evaluation would likely not develop. This exposure translated to the study in two ways: first, in generating a thick description of the case; second, in lending a deep understanding of the case and how contextual exigencies had shaped the study.

**Researcher as a co-inquirer.** My role in this study was significant. In collaborating in the role of a developmental evaluator, I assumed an active role in the study, co-inquiring and co-generating knowledge alongside the program developers. In doing so, I was afforded many opportunities both during and after the case to inquire into the case and test out assumptions related to the practice of developmental evaluation and design.

**Promoting authenticity.** Furthermore, by assuming the dual roles as both the evaluator and the researcher, I was able to bring a degree of authenticity in ways observational studies could not bring. The knowledge generated from this case advanced an account of an actual, real developmental evaluation that had transpired. The extent to which I had been able to operationalize principles of developmental evaluation and design reflected the extent to which the circumstances of the case allowed such practices
to realize. The program developers would not have allowed me to do anything they did not approve. This serves to guard against confirmation bias over the course of the developmental evaluation, a conceivable threat in this study.

**Temporal separation in a phase-wise design.** The temporal separation between each phase of the study afforded me an additional measure to guard against confirmation bias. The first way in which this happened was by separating the evaluation from the research-on-evaluation. I focused solely on my roles and responsibilities during each of the respective phase of the study. During the developmental evaluation, my role was that of a developmental evaluator. I was guided by the standards of practice related to program evaluation (see end of Chapter 1). I was, in fact, obligated to act in ways a competent, professional evaluator would be required to act because of my professional obligation to my professional order as a Credentialed Evaluator. This was especially important during times of discomfort in my role as the developmental evaluator. During the research phase, my role was that of a researcher. In that role, I was guided by texts on methodology and methods, and the relevant standards of practice (e.g., research ethics frameworks).

Temporal separation also occurred during each phase of the study as my research progressed study because of how much data I had to analyze at each phase of the study. I found myself revisiting the case out of necessity. This meant I was renewing my understanding of the case along the way, discovering shortcomings and issues that had gone unnoticed previously. I was developing and refining my understanding in an ongoing manner as a result.
Expert-Panel Oversight. Furthermore, this study was supervised and guided by two panels of experienced researcher: my supervisory committee and my examination committee. Their oversight of the work led to refinement in the development of the study, conceptualization of the problem, development of the methodology and methods of the study, analysis and reporting of the work.
Chapter 4: Case Narrative

I. Entry

“The first day back, and here we are,” remarked Donna, the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, and the leader of the Task Force responsible for stewarding the program development. “I really want to hit the ground running, because we have so much to do over the next month and a half.”

So, here we were, on the second floor of the Faculty building, in an oversized classroom that had been converted from an underused gymnasium. Large-screen TVs serving double-duty as digital monitors adorned the walls. Gentle rays of the September morning sun were shining through the windows (a rarity in this building), lending this room an iridescent quality. Off-centered in the room, we gathered around a makeshift conference table assembled from smaller modular tables.

“Everybody has got the agenda. The one thing I want to add is something Chi and I have talked about over this weekend. Chi is going to give us an update to what he is doing and the meetings Kenneth and I have had with Chi. Just to put you in the loop of what’s happening there… Chi, take it away.” With that invitation, the meeting was off to a start and the floor was yielded to me.

I scanned the room before starting. To my left sat Lisa, the program manager for the faculty’s existing graduate programs. To my right sat Patricia, the Faculty’s marketing and communication coordinator. Beside her sat Barbara, a professor of education in assessment and evaluation, whose long association with this very program would only become apparent to me some time later. Across from me sat Kenneth Reeve,
assistant professor in educational technology. All of them had been invited to steward the program from its nascent state through to its launch.

I felt strangely nervous. I had worked in different capacities and in different contexts with all members of this group before. To Donna, I was a former writing student, having studied about the craft of writing under her guidance. To Barbara, I was her doctoral supervisee, with whom I had spent 5 years in graduate school exploring the world of evaluation. To Lisa, I was a student in the graduate program that she managed. To Patricia, I was a colleague with whom she consulted because of our mutual interest in exploring the potential of social media within educational spaces. To Kenneth, I was a former advisee. I should be more comfortable than I was.

Then it struck me. I was nervous because of the stakes involved. It was important that they be able to see me in a different light: more as a partner, a collaborator, and a colleague; less as a student, a novice, or worse, a wall flower. I was afraid that my evaluation involvement would only be symbolic (Weiss, 1980; Shulha & Cousins, 1997). To gain any credibility with this group I knew I would have to make clear my involvement and the contributions I sought to make as a collaborator.
To introduce my involvement, I had prepared a few talking points—the product of some anxiety-induced pacing from the night before. While Donna and Barbara understood the nature of my involvement as a developmental evaluator, might others become suspicious of my involvement? Would they see me as an enabler, a helpful ally in their cause, or would I be redundant? Would they take me seriously? Would they care for what I had to offer? What do I have to offer? After all, my role, a design-informed developmental evaluator, is not mission-critical. The program will get developed whether I am present or not.

Referring to the handout I had prepared (Figure 8, left, File 32), I explained my role to the group in this way: “Think of me as a consultant who has been invited to collaborate on this project. I bring expertise in evaluating programs and in designing programs. Why am I here? Through my dissertation research, one of the questions I am trying to understand is: what would happen if we begin to think of a program as a designed object.

*Figure 8.* Slides taken from a handout I prepared for the Task Force. The content of which shows how I conceptualized my role at the time.
My work here is to help the team in designing this program in ways that would be meaningful for those who are going to be enrolled in this program” (File 5, Sept 03, 2013). As soon as these words exited my mouth, I realized I might have over-complicated my introduction explanation, something I had been cautioned about before.

I went on, wanting to do away with any suspicion or skepticism about my participation. “You may think, ‘he’s an evaluator and he is here to evaluate us.’ The truth is: not really. [That is] because when we are developing things, designing things, [we are] less concerned about making judgments about whether something worked or not. [We are] more interested in thinking about how we could be making things better than what we do now” (File 5, Sept 03, 2013). I went on to explain how I saw myself making a contribution to their efforts:

- The first thing is, that I will keep track of progress and decisions being made so I can keep all of you up to speed with development.
- I will also ask evaluative questions. I will ask questions about quality and around design. How do we think about creating a strong program?
- The third thing is to help us reality test. Going into this program, we have certain assumptions. Do they actually get carried out? In a year from now, what will the program look like and do those assumptions carry through. If not, how did we rejig things?
- The fourth thing is to broadly support the program developing using evaluative data. (File 5, Sept 03, 2013)
On that note, Donna, the Chair, invited the group to ask questions. None were posed. A part of me had wished to see some more signs of enthusiasm about my collaboration with them. I had wanted them to ask me how I could help with their work. But I didn’t make much of the situation then, mostly because I was relieved that they didn’t find my participation an intrusion and shortly after, she proceeded to thank me. The meeting then carried on as planned.

***

This episode is a place to begin the story of how the Diploma in Educational Inquiry program came to be developed and how, as a design-informed developmental evaluator, I tried to navigate and shape the developmental evaluation. This episode introduces the group of educators working together to develop the DEI program.

I understood that what this group would achieve together would be shaped directly by what each person sitting in that room would bring to the table. It would be through our collaboration—through the coming together and the interaction of our individual aspirations, values, and passion, but also our hesitations, anxieties, and worries—that we would leave our imprint upon this program. Each member of this Task Force came to the undertaking with different experiences, histories, and capacities. For instance, Lisa had a rich history of managing operations in the Graduate Studies office. She was integral to preparing the initial approval documents required by the university with Donna and Barbara. As for Barbara, her involvement in the initiative was not all surprising given her standing as a senior member of the Faculty. Having her steward a project as central as this one was to the growth of the Faculty made strategic sense. She also brought to the project curriculum and program expertise. Only later, however, would
I learn just how extensive her association had been with this project. Kenneth and Patricia’s involvement was not all that surprising either. Kenneth was a faculty member whose scholarly interests lay in the space of learning possibilities enabled by technologies. Patricia was the Faculty’s marketing and communications officer. She had experience in leading marketing efforts for all of the Faculty’s undergraduate and graduate program and would lead the marketing of this program. Tapping into her respective expertise made clear sense given the goal was to launch a new part time online graduate program that supported the efforts of working professionals with educational responsibilities.

What is important to foreground, in making sense of this design-informed developmental evaluation, is that the program to be developed would not be the output of a preset process, but the product of co-creation by this Task Force. While the university had approved the broad goals of the program, there were no clear directions in place for how we ought to shape it nor any clear path identified for how to achieve program success. As educators, we each had a fairly sophisticated sense of what successful learning might look like, but the means for orchestrating those learning outcomes were nevertheless vague in this online terrain we were about to explore. Approaching program development in this fashion can reflect inexperience or a lack of sophistication in developing programs—but in this case, it was an intentional choice that Donna had chosen to adopt. Unknowingly to her, this approach also typifies how social innovators prefer to approach the task of program development (Westley, Zimmerman, & Patton, 2006). They willingly embrace ambiguity and tolerate uncertainty. They trust the process.
Donna understood this implicitly. “When you put competent people together and let them do good work, quality products emerge.” (Donna, Exit Interview).

II. Exploring Teaching and Learning

Although the Task Force convened for the first time in September 2013, the work on the articulation of the program as a Queen’s offering had long begun. Donna, Kenneth, and I had been meeting since June to tackle some of the specific challenges of online learning. Spurring our work was Kenneth’s charge to come up with a way to facilitate the online development of DEI courses.

It was from these meetings with Donna and Kenneth that I learned about the history and context of the project. Donna, Lisa, and Barbara had previously secured program approval and authorization, a lengthy process that involved the School of Graduate Studies and Queen’s University Senate. Donna and Barbara had together articulated the case for a graduate diploma program in professional inquiry; Donna, with assistance from Lisa, then stewarded the submission through various approval processes. For the application, an outline of course offerings was proposed in partnership with in-house subject-matter experts; preliminary course outlines delineated the curriculum for each. All of this work had been warranted by a robust needs assessment that had established high interest from a wide audience in a Queen’s University, part-time, graduate-level professional education program in professional inquiry.

The Faculty of Education had historically offered a part-time Master’s degree option that drew in a respectable number of working professionals. But over the years, enrolment had declined. In contrast, the full-time Master’s program had evolved away from a primarily professional development orientation into an academic one, more suited
for those interested in advanced scholarship. During these same 25 years, the Faculty had established itself with a core group of international and American schools around the world as a top-tier educational institution in the preparation of teachers. These schools and their staffs were looking for an alternative graduate program that would stress high quality learning, that did not have the onerous requirement of on-campus residency, and that could be completed within the standard 2 to 3 year international school contract. As graduate business education had demonstrated, with online learning becoming both more viable and meaningful, full time residency in an educational landscape was becoming less and less attractive. Professionals no longer want to leave their employment for advanced learning. Hence, the DEI was seen by the Faculty as a way to recapture a market that it had all but lost, while continuing its mission to serve the evolving professional needs of the educational community.

When I asked Donna why she had brought me on to the team, she explained that as the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, she had learned that my PhD work was focused on developmental evaluation. She reported knowing a bit about developmental evaluation, and what it could supposedly do for organizations. She had learned, through Barbara, that with my growing experience in developmental evaluation processes I might be able to make a contribution to the project. She wasn’t sure, however, how this would happen, as she had not yet participated in a developmental evaluation herself.

Learning about this history puts the project in context. By the time I was involved, the program had been approved. From the program’s theme (i.e., professional inquiry) to its delivery mode (i.e., entirely online), and from the audience (working professionals with educational responsibilities) to the choice of learning management system (i.e.,
using the Faculty’s existing infrastructure), the program was already bounded in some important ways. Identifying the negotiable decisions in program development is an important responsibility for a design-informed developmental evaluator. In determining what is and what is not negotiable in a project, the design-informed developmental evaluator is better able to focus and influence the evaluation inquiry. Here’s an instance of when I learned about the boundaries of the project:

> Obviously we’re going to use D2L [Desire to Learn] as the framework. The Faculty isn’t going to run around getting up to speed on a new one. [So the question we have to answer for ourselves is what might that look like? How do we encourage others to take advantage of other [features]?] – Donna, Jun 26/13

Like tracing lines in animation, the constraint that each decision imposes may be transient; we could reconsider, revise, or even remove this constraint if needed. But, for now, this ‘given’ served as a heuristic, short-cutting the decision-making process, allowing us to use this information as we focused on the next task at hand. This phenomenon is called ‘path-dependency’ in the complex systems literature—the idea that the options available at a given time are dependent upon the decisions made previously. Put simply, the present is a product of our past.

***********

Our meetings were not unlike any small-team meetings you would expect to find in any large organization. If you were in the room with us, you would see us sitting around a table, unpacking challenges, questioning assumptions, clarifying one another’s ideas, and debating possibilities. What set these meetings apart was that they had an air of
inquisitiveness and a bias towards experimentation and action that in my experience was rather refreshing.

We would arrive at our eventual solutions organically through deliberation; there wasn’t an explicit decision making recipe that we followed. To the untrained eye, this process would have looked rather serendipitous. A closer look, however, revealed a process that involved skillful turn-taking in listening and building on each other’s ideas. This was especially evident in the interactions between Donna and Kenneth. Their efforts especially advanced our search for solutions.

To better understand how this process worked, it is helpful to examine some issues that were explored. One of the first points we deliberated was what to call the product that would act as the substantive guide that course authors would be required to use when planning the scope and sequence for the DEI courses. The obvious choice would have been to call it a ‘syllabus’ or a ‘course outline’.

I watched as Donna and Kenneth placed such great emphasis on figuring out the proper labeling. They first toyed with calling it “a template” which they rejected in little time. Sensing a lull in the discussion, I proposed calling it a ‘scaffold’, alluding to Vygostsky’s instructional technique. Debating this idea led Kenneth to suggest calling the product ‘protocols’, borrowing from the learning science literature. We further toyed with various propositions, before finally settling on the notion of “course designs” (June 26, 2013; file 2). The term was intended to signal to our course authors their role in going beyond content and designing purposeful learning experiences for potential students (June 26, 2013; file 2). In freely-associating ideas and in turn evaluating them, we came upon a viable solution to our problem.
We then decided that the “course design” should be buttressed by a set of considerations—respect for learner privacy, cross-platform accessibility, and durability in the web applications that would be promoted within the course. Kenneth reasoned:

“Considering the half-life of many web applications these days, we want to be careful to choose something that isn’t going to go away in a year or two” (June 26, 2013; file 2).

Notice that we did not turn to some manual, or consult the best-practice literature to arrive at this set of considerations. Instead, these considerations emerged out of continuing deliberations that involved weighing options and considering implications.

In retrospect, I can see that we enjoyed considerable latitude while brainstorming during these small-team meetings. Donna’s formal authority was not used as a way to either impose a preconceived vision of the program or to direct the process in any one way. This latitude allowed us to wrestle with and think through many ideas. It was typical for one idea to lead to the next, like dominos falling in turn and branching out. There was no prescribed order to what we would discuss. There was no pressure to be right in suggesting a direction or to generate an immediate answer to a dilemma as it emerged. All ideas were put forward in service of development. For instance, on the issue of ensuring durability in the selection of educational technologies, Kenneth showed insight in countering his own point: “What may be seen as durable in a year or two, students may see it as we're not keeping up to date.” This is but one of many examples where the implication for decisions were considered fully, often leading to a further fleshing out of ideas.

Beyond thinking about the scope and quality of the learning within courses, Donna clued us in to her aspiration to imbue the program with a sense of community, to
allow for a metaphorical student union of sorts where students would congregate and work with one another. Donna underlined the importance of promoting a community even though it was likely that students would only gather virtually with one another. This intentional focus on community, while not unique to online or distance education programs, was forward-thinking (Childress & Spurgin, 2009; Rovai, Wighting, & Liu, 2005).

Intentional community-building efforts are typically directed at the course/classroom-level, less so at the level of program or school (Stone, 2016). Together, the two-pronged issue we were wrestling with is seen in this question: How might we best use web-based technologies to foster a community of learners?

As we refined our ideas, possible paths for decision making became more apparent. We acknowledged that we should free ourselves from any preexisting notions of online learning. We would rethink how we would want to approach online learning. Recent advancements in technology had already broadened possibilities in regards to synchronous communication (e.g., Skype, Google Hangout), assessment (e.g., e-Portfolio), content sharing (e.g., blogging as reflection), and collaboration and creative representation of learning (e.g., wiki and GoogleDoc as platforms to enable collaborative writing; story-telling through comics strips and animation sequences).

We knew about reported ‘best practices’; Kenneth was in the best position to help bring that knowledge to our deliberation. But as many in education and business are aware, as the context for learning or operation varies, so does the power of an idea or practice to fulfill its mandate (Snow, 2015). This understanding removed any pressure for us to justify our decision making using the best practice literature.
Donna had initially presented us with the challenge of conceiving how technologies could play a meaningful role in this program. One of the issues that made this task so challenging is that the technologies chosen would have to be ones that course designers could easily understand and use. How Kenneth had reframed this task is worth pointing out. He connected the choice of technology directly to the nature of learning we were specifically striving to promote within this program. Reframing is an interpretive design strategy (Cross, 2011; Dorst, 2011; French, 1994; Selig, 2015).

As a consequence of his reframing, we freed ourselves from the constraint of existing program structures within the Faculty. We did this even though it meant subjecting ourselves to some risk (August 28, 2013). A purely rational approach could have compelled us to adapt existing program structures given their history within the Faculty and the familiarity that course authors would have with them. Instead, we agreed that these were limiting and perhaps inappropriate models given the teaching, learning and community goals we were trying to achieve with DEI. Kenneth’s reframing gave us an ‘out’—an invitation—to consider alternatives. We would let the form of learning we were striving to support drive our choices of technologies and not the other way around.

The first meeting was marked by a great deal of progress in our thinking. I summarized our decisions as a record of our deliberations (Figure 9). This record shows that we were not solution focused. Instead, we concentrated on understanding the task ahead of us. This focus on exploring the problem space is a designerly preference stemming from an understanding that better solutions arise from a deep study of the problem (Cross, 2011;
Dorst, 2011; French, 1994). This is in sharp contrast to the way program development is typically approached.

Here’s how we’ve been thinking about solving this problem:

- providing a menu of activities to help instructors match intended learning experiences to e-learning tools
- Not using the word “template” to refer to how we intend to facilitate course design
- We recognize that a tension exists between striving for consistency and choice.
- “Scaffold” --- to provide a structural framework to courses, and a way to think about how various pieces of technology might fit (think in terms of augmenting the core structure with various pieces)
- “Protocols” --- reusable instructional strategies
- If connecting is important, perhaps students can keep a commonplace book in the form of a blog

Outcome:

- Courses should be designed to provide sufficient guidance to allow adaptation (“flexible”), but provide enough of a safety net to allow instructors to just pick up and go.
- If we envision 12 classes to a course, what do we want to see in each?
- Does every course have a culminating activity?

*Figure 9. An excerpt taken from the Analytical Proceeding dated September 18, 2013 (File 34) produced of the discussion surrounding online learning. This excerpt text captured our evolving understanding to how Kenneth, Donna, and I had been thinking about the online learning problem.*

**III. On Collaboration and Designerly Developmental Evaluator Involvement**

Being present for program planning discussions is unusual for evaluators. There I was, in the thick of it all, in the moments of creation and decision-making. Typically, evaluators are brought in after program decisions are made. They are most often relegated to making observations of programs already in operation, and from these draw implications for future program decisions. But in this case, I was part of shaping program decisions as they were being made.
Even in these early days, I was spending considerable time on this project. I knew that developmental evaluators spent considerable time in the field with their clients collaborating on program development (Patton, 2011), but I didn’t know just how much time was reasonable. I reasoned that sustained interactivity (Huberman, 1989) would be most appropriate, given my interest in understanding developmental evaluation processes and the role of interactions in shaping these processes. By being embedded in the discussion, I could and did became sensitized to the aspirations and goals of the group (June 26, 2013; File2)—not just at the global level, but at the level of decisions. I also thought that my design background would be helpful (September 18, 2013; File 34). Furthermore, when the time came to evaluate the program prototype, my extensive background knowledge could help me to tailor the evaluation to meet the information and decision-making needs of the Task Force.

In these meetings, I found myself excited by my responsibilities and pleased with the way the process was unfolding. But should I have been? I remember questioning whether I was in a position to express a value judgment about how the process was unfolding, or to make judgments about whether a decidedly designerly orientation was being adopted? I reminded myself that my primary role was as the developmental evaluator, first and foremost. That was how I wanted to project and enact my primary identity. I had been invited to be a contributor, a companion in this journey—and not to lead. The responsibility to lead the process or to ensure that our best work was done lay with Donna and Kenneth. (Donna later confirmed this stance in her exit interview: “If I had wanted a consultant, I had lots of people to turn to.”)
So what were my responsibilities to the Task Force? Developmental evaluators are responsible for monitoring the ongoing decision-making process and the decisions that are being made (Patton, 2011). I was doing that (e.g., see File 216, 35, 37; Appendix J). But beyond that, the literature provides no further prescription (what I should do) or proscription (what I should not do).

From previous developmental evaluations (Lam & Shulha, 2014), I understood how ambiguous the boundary could be between helping and rescuing, and between informing (extending a line of inquiry and enriching the conversations) and shaping (forging new lines of inquiry). To be true to the role, I figured my entry points would need to be those evaluative moments in conversations when we would weigh different options or when we would consider the quality to an aspect of the program. This allowed me to introduce the notion of participants’ program experience as early as the second of these trio meetings. I had wanted us to think about “how students would come to see and experience the overall program—from start to finish” (Sept 18, 2013; file 34) with the same attention we were paying to the quality of learning within specific courses.

I struggle to resolve the appropriateness of my participation as much now as I did then. Perhaps there can be no inherent rule to govern practice, other than ascribing to a general guideline of practice: “support as the need becomes apparent.”

* * * * * * * *

In revisiting our work together, with the benefit of hindsight, I can appreciate how difficult intellectually it was to create the course design. We had rejected the simple adoption best practice and existing structural recipes to solving our problems. We spent much time reading unpacking and refining the program vision and articulating this vision
as it was emerging. I can now see, from Kenneth’s line of questioning that he was trying to understand how different aspects of the program, as they had been proposed, would connect to one another and be brought to life. For instance, on the issue of promoting a sense of community, he invited us to think with him what that notion meant in practice within courses. How might we actually promote a sense of community? What behaviours might we expect to see, if indeed, a community was developing? And, in turn, what available web technologies would enable such behaviour? These were the sorts of questions that needed to be raised and then unpacked. It turned out to be a laborious and taxing task.

It was obvious, even then, that no matter how well the task force articulated the case for the program and the course design on paper (and it was), operationalizing the implications would prove challenging. For every element of the proposed course design that was examined, questions of implementation would surface. This was followed by members offering a range of possible decision options with accompanying rationales for each of these alternatives. For instance, on the issue of educational technology, we found ourselves returning to the question of which learning management system and support programs to adopt (June 27, 2013; Aug 28, 2013). After re-considering the implications of this decision we were confronted with the choice of confirming our choice or making a new decision, but the complexity did not end there. Each decision we made as a task force raised the re-occurring question: how do we support the subject-matter experts involved in course design in understanding our deliberations and decisions. Their buy-in to these decisions would be essential if there was to be congruence in the use of technology across the program.
What may be surprising to those who have served on a number of planning committees is that this Task Force managed to create the course design over the course of four face-to-face meetings. The design took the form of a set of principles formally referred to as the “6 Cs” within the Task Force. These principles articulated the learning behaviours to be promoted within the courses and corresponding web technologies that could be used to support these behaviours. Designerly thinking and strategies—reframing problems, free association, creative brainstorming, and delaying judgment-making—all played a role in facilitating the deliberations and in reaching this outcome. As the developmental evaluator, I would have relished the opportunity to promote this kind of thinking, but in this case, Kenneth also held a design orientation. More often, it was he who promoted and led discussions that included principles of design. My role was to support and encourage where possible and as needed.

With these principles in place we had achieved a critical milestone in the development of the DEI program. The task force was ready to recruit course designers to bring these principles to life within the context of individual courses.

IV. A Program as More Than the Sum of its Parts

From the beginning of my involvement with the DEI Task Force, I struggled to articulate what design thinking could offer in service of program development. I understood the theory tacitly. I also understood what I needed to pay attention in a developmental evaluation. In revisiting my participation it appears that I lacked the language to communicate, in ways that could be easily understood, what it is that I wanted to do. Because of this dilemma, I was not able to assert myself into the process as strongly as I would have liked. (October 16, 2013)
A significant insight about my involvement in the project came about as I was sitting on the patio of a sushi restaurant in Washington, DC (October 16, 2013). I was there for the annual conference of the American Evaluation Association. It was an annual tradition for current students and graduates in evaluation from our university to gather on one night for dinner. It was a way to build and sustain our own internal community and catch up on each other’s work. Part way through the night, Elaine, an alumna of the program, turned to me and asked, “So, Chi, what are you working on now?”

I wanted to tell her about this project so I ran through several versions of it in my head. *I’m investigating the role of developmental evaluation in supporting program development.* But, no. I wasn’t sure if developmental evaluation would resonate with her, and I didn’t want to go down a rabbit hole into explaining the approach. Besides, such a characterization wouldn’t be entirely complete; my interest lay in how design could augment that process.

*Oh, I’m doing some work trying to understand evaluation theory through practice.* No, that was just too elusive an answer.

*I’m trying to bring evaluation to the support of program decision-making.* Not quite.

My eventual answer ended up being an amalgam of my thoughts. “I’m working with a group at the Faculty and they are working on developing this new, exciting online program for professionals in education.” Elaine nodded in acknowledgement, as if to encourage me to go on.

“So what I am doing is supporting that process using evaluation processes and thinking. And what I’m trying to do is see if we were to approach that program
development with a design mindset whether we would end up with a more robust program.” That sounded right. But, I could see her eyes start to glaze over.

“It struck me at some point . . . that we ought to think about a program as more than the sum of its courses. So that’s why I’ve turned to design, to give us that extra vantage point to look at the development.”

It was then that I realized what I was doing with the group! What I had been attending to when working with Donna and Kenneth, or in those Task Force meetings, was the through-line that connected the program experience. I cared about how various aspects of the program, from their experiences with program staff during initial registration, through to the quality of learning possible within courses would connect together to give a cohesive experience. I cared about how our Task Force might think and act creatively so as to realize the vision of the program we were constructing in our minds. In short, I cared that the entire program experience was meaningful.

Now that I better understood what I wanted to do, the challenge was how to express it in my work.

V. Introducing the Course Design to a Broader Audience

By November, the time had come to start designing the courses. We would unveil the program guiding principles to course designers and lay out a process to facilitate course design work. And because this model of learning would be new to the course designers, it was important that they understand the rationale and values behind this model. But as anyone who has worked with capable, independent, strong-willed academics know, it is no easy feat to coordinate such efforts.
The task force had recognized the stakes were high. It would be the first time that specifics about the program would be unveiled to an audience outside this group; including their notion of building a program around professional inquiry, their vision of what learning online could mean, and their orientation for how web technologies could support and possibly enhance student learning.

When I asked how I could be helpful, Donna articulated her evaluation needs in this way: “What I really want to learn about this is what the uptake is. We’ve been talking among ourselves now for a few months and [it’s easy to get attached to an idea]” (October 24, 2013; File 10).

* * * * * * *

On two different days, Kenneth organized and presented the program’s vision and how this might be translated into the course development process by the course authors. I sat in on these meetings listening carefully to the conversations. I noted all questions raised, and I later analyzed them to see if it was possible to determine what was motivating each question (Figure 10, below).
Discussions and Decision-Making

[Meeting started with acknowledgements of Orientation 1 discussions]

- The notion of putting on a play-date to learn about available technologies

  We're currently undergoing 'design' → iterative process design with end-users in mind.

  Students becoming good with technology is an important outcome of the program.

  Important for courses to have some familiar elements. Our module structure considers that. The rhythm to these courses would be important.

  The importance to create a community and not alienate these distance students. Maybe telespace will help

  Will there be any kind of induction to students? → : in yesterday's meeting, we discussed the possibility around pre-admission meetings and post-admission meetings.

  What about those w/o current employment? Do you need to stipulate a context? → ..... No, too late to do so. Perhaps not critical either. But it will be important for course designers to identify some of these contexts for students.

Figure 10. Excerpt from the Analytical Proceeding produced of the October 30, 2013 meeting. The Analytical Proceeding captured questions raised by course designers.

One challenge in this task was to interpret the meaning of a question. Was a question indicative of a perceived fault in the program logic? Was a question revealing of an issue that had yet to be considered? Or, could the motivation for a question be the consequence of poor framing or communication of an idea? Possibly the most serious,
option was that questions were indicative of a conflict in the values underpinning the program and the notions of quality we had identified as a design team.

I thought about the questions not only from an evaluation standpoint but also a design-informed one. I asked myself this question: What implication might the questions hold for future discussions? What issues ought we attend to next, and with what priority?

I assembled my observations, along with my reflection and analysis in a document, which I later circulated to both Kenneth and Donna (Oct 30, 2013; File 35).

I reflected on the significance of these two days and noted it in my report: “From a program design perspective, this was one of the first opportunities for us to reality-test the work that we've been doing. The strength of our design will be dependent on the fidelity of the message as it gets translated by course designers, course instructors, our marketing folks, and most importantly, our participants!” (October 29, 2013; File 216). Implicit in that message was an awareness that fidelity in the messaging will need to be reinforced and carefully monitored.

* * * * *

Writing these proceedings was not an easy task. I recall on some matters, I felt as though I had recommendations that ought to be considered by the group as well as ideas that had not yet been voiced. It was at this time that I most felt that my ability to inject myself into program planning was being hamstrung by my evaluator-first identity.

I knew as an evaluator I should not enter the fray of program decision (“this is what you should do”) for reasons of evaluator integrity. I could almost hear evaluation elder, Scriven (1991), protesting in my head: The job of the evaluator is to evaluate.
That’s all. Even with my experiences with developmental evaluation, I nevertheless struggle with negotiating my role in a program development context.

So, what of the design-informed developmental evaluator? Perhaps he might enjoy more latitude in putting forth ideas for consideration? Program developers could surely appreciate any attempts at supporting their cause? Or could such a move be viewed as overstepping one’s boundary? In resolving this dilemma, I made the decision—yet again—to view my role as primarily an evaluator, and not as a program designer, as I would have liked. Still, I wondered if and how early identification of program design issues could be helpful.

VI. A Crisis of Confidence

It is now November, and we were three months into the project. And a rhythm had developed for the project. The larger Task Force met once a month, and Kenneth, Donna, and I met on an as-needed basis to support course designers in authoring courses. At each meeting, I monitored the ongoing deliberations. I would document and analyze any decision made systematically for implications to the goals of the program, and in turn, feed this information back into the task force (see Appendices A, B, C).

I saw producing these Analytic Proceedings as one of my primary duties. Without them, I would “have been nothing more than a glorified note-taker” (November 1, 2013). Facilitating program development in this way—by systematically studying and interrogating the ongoing development process, in addition to the actual emerging program—is something I have previously termed as data-informed decision-making (Lam & Shulha, 2014).
Being design-minded meant that I was also attending to the interrelationship between different elements of the program, such as how courses would connect to lend a coherent experience for the learner, how recruitment efforts might align with the values of the program. And on a process level, I was paying attention to the overall structure of the program, watching when those elements and related decisions would eventually be made.

The sum of the contribution I saw myself making to this project was that I could offer an outlook and specific strategies to help the group build a more robust program, faster. This point would later be echoed by James when I asked him what he perceived to have been the contribution of a design-informed developmental evaluator:

The importance of the evaluator is that it allows us to have another person who has a sole responsibility for asking difficult questions but also providing valuable guidance. They have an external perspective because they are not focused on one aspect of it and it allows the leader to focus on the bigger picture stuff but allows the evaluator to see what they see just from that slightly outside perspective. They are not directly involved in the production of it. (interview, p. 14.)

I sensed that my participation was welcomed and that my contribution was generally well received. My analytic proceedings would get acknowledged in meetings, and Donna would thank my e-mails. But I wasn’t seeing much in terms of uptake or follow through with my ideas. I had identified issues and other points of consideration that I hoped the Task Force would discuss as a team.

I couldn’t help but feel that my work was becoming redundant and that my participation was becoming symbolic. I had wanted to contribute in similar ways as
Kenneth had, and that was, to engage the group in design thinking about the overall program. My role here was definitely constrained for reasons that I have now come to better understand. They include: (a) the time everyone had to devote to the project, and (b) my own social capital and standing in relation to others on the project—I did not find that I was in a position to do more.

Not only was I struggling in my role as a design-informed developmental evaluator, I also saw myself failing to support program development. In my journal, I noted the following:

I worry that we may be moving too quickly ahead and neglecting important design issues. From the literature that I am reading, there are particular issues that should be attended to, and particular strategies that I could do with the group to resolve them. Success of this endeavour goes beyond just the success of each individual course (which has been the focus of our work lately)... and that attention at the program-level would be important towards that end. I fear that we are paying attention to the trees and losing sight of the forest. (Nov 2, 2013; File 246)

Evaluators know about the danger of poorly constructed programs whose true effects are masked by flaws that could have been avoided (Funnell & Rogers, 2011; Wholey, 1987). I was determined not to let this happen to the DEI program.

I had a decision to make. I could stay the course and find new approaches to ‘work in’ my contributions. Alternatively, I could raise the issue and see how the Task Force and I could work more closely. A third but least desirable option was to withdraw my participation especially if it became more apparent that I wasn’t able to make the
kinds of contribution that would be expected of a competent evaluator (Canadian Evaluation Society, 2010). Given that we were still early in the project, I decided to stay the course, find new avenues to be heard, and continue to ‘work in’ my contributions for now.

**VII. On Collaborating Designerly**

Any attempt at retelling this evaluation would not be complete without further exploration of Kenneth’s design orientation. He was brought onto this project by Donna to identify web technologies for use in courses and to create the structures for course authors (Donna, interview). As important as the decisions were that Kenneth helped to facilitate was how he helped to facilitate them. Kenneth brought a degree of fluency in design to this work. When I asked him why he had done so, he explained that he framed his assignment more broadly than what was given to him. In his own words: “My goal was to promote expansive thinking about what [the courses] could be” (interview, p. 1).

So, how had his design-informed orientation shaped his approach? It began with a real appreciation for how technology could drive and support learning. For Kenneth, the technologies needed to align with intended learning to yield the particular qualities of learning being sought. For that reason, he worked to clarify what the program theme—professional inquiry—could mean and how it could be supported within the online learning environment. The discussions he had with Donna and me were instrumental to that end. Only after he understood the vision deeply did he seek to articulate a set of principles that would guide the selection of web technologies and course design. This set of principles, introduced above as the “6 Cs”, would come to be referred to as the “ethos” of the program by members of the Task Force over time.
What he avoided was the seduction of simplicity, i.e., to approach his assignments on face value. He did not introduce the Task Force to popular web technologies available at the time, and describe what could be accomplished with each. Such an approach would most likely see course designers making technology selections based on their interest—or more likely their comfort level based on previous experience. Instead, Kenneth problematized the selection of web technology in a productive manner to be closely connected to desired learning processes and outcomes, a designerly move (Cross, 2011; Dorst, 2011; French, 1994). More importantly, as he confirmed later in his interview, this was a purposeful decision (Kenneth, interview).

Kenneth approached the subsequent task of course design in a similar fashion. He considered what course developers would need to know and understand in order to write courses consistent with the program’s vision of learning. On that, he saw course authors’ task of writing courses as designing learning experiences. Hence, the label course designers. Working on this problem led Kenneth to consider both the sequence of activities that needed to be organized to help course designers author their courses and the form and quality of work course designers would eventually produce. Many of the considerations he was wrestling with may seem practical on surface but they were rather conceptual and abstract in nature:

- How many modules of learning would be featured in each course?
- How many hours of independent work should course designers expect from learners?
• By what mechanisms could learning intentions, as they were conceived by the original course designer, be communicated to contract instructors, if and when enrolment demanded that additional instructors be hired?

• Who would vet the content to ensure they were consistent in quality?

Meanwhile, other considerations were more operational and logistical in nature:

• In what form should course material be submitted?

• When should course material be submitted?

• Who would prepare the courses for online presentation?

Thinking through problems in this way, and working out their implications, helped unearth the need for decisions that would otherwise lay dormant had he not approached the process with such rigour. As I see it now, the result was a more sophisticated, considered solution to planning than would otherwise be achievable within the same timeframe. But, committing to this designerly approach to problem-solving took time and perseverance.

Fortunately, he was in good company, as such an approach was highly valued. In other contexts, I can see how program leaders, unaccustomed to this style of thinking, might say, “Can’t you just tell us what to do?” Infusing design into development requires patience and acceptance, it would seem.

************

Kenneth’s designerly orientation was not really surprising. It stemmed from his disciplinary background in the learning sciences. Since completing his doctorate, Kenneth talked about the reading he had done in design literature. We shared many lively conversations about design thinking and the work that has been going on at Stanford’s
School of Design. Working with someone like Kenneth in this project was fortuitous since he shared my designerly sensibilities. Because I was sensitive to his way of thinking, I was able to support his designerly moves and build evaluation processes and products that followed that logic; that is, validating design assumptions and elaborating on our understanding of users. In many ways, I saw him as an ally in moving design forward in this work.

However, my collaboration with Kenneth would not be without friction. As early as the second (August 28, 2013) of five trio meetings, Kenneth expressed concerns about the evaluation agenda. I had naively expected his support. We were working towards the same goals, I reasoned.

At the time, we were still early in exploring what learning would look like in this program. I had introduced a design concept, user experience, to help stoke our exploration. To make my point, I borrowed from evaluation the concepts of merit, worth, significance to bring attention to the multitude of ways by which a program could be evaluated by our learners. Much to my chagrin, Kenneth, rather politely, expressed his discomfort. He feared that evaluation would prematurely kill off ideas before they had had the chance to grow legs.

In the heat of the moment, however, I failed to recognize the constructive dimension to his feedback. “That isn’t what I am doing,” I became defensive, “at least, that’s not how I am approaching the evaluation in this project.” I thought he understood what I was trying to do here. Here, he was responding to summative/formative notions of evaluation. He was right in sensing a potential threat if that was indeed what I was doing
and why I was there. But I wasn’t; I was there as a developmental evaluator. I was there to support his and others’ effort at building the DEI program through evaluation inquiry.

What this incident reaffirms to me is that evaluation, of any kind, can be threatening. In Kenneth’s own words, there’s “big-E” evaluation (the formalized, summative/formative kind), and then there’s “small-e” evaluation associated with developmental evaluation, the kind which we employ as a way to establish a working relationship with clients for the purpose of program development and design and which is integral to program development and design.

As I reflect upon this now, his objection actually spoke to his wisdom as a design-thinker. Ideas take time to grow, as do effects to take hold. And this would be why evaluation—particularly, developmental evaluation—ought to be conducted and framed delicately to avoid conflating conceptions of evaluation. Accepting my explanation, Kenneth gave me the encouragement: “Stay off the details. But capture the spirit” (August 28, 2013).

VIII. Rebooting

It was January 2014, following a bitter cold winter break, and a major ice storm, when development picked up momentum again. In less than six months, the program would launch and welcome its first intake. Kenneth and a sessional instructor would take responsibility for instructing the students enrolled in the first two courses. At this point, however, major elements of the program were not yet developed. Courses had yet to be written and the student community space, a long desired feature of this program, had yet to be constructed. Course development was now behind target according to original
plans. And enrolment numbers were starting to be worrisome, with only a few students registered and enrolled.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

The feel of the first Task Force meeting of the year (Jan 14, 2014) was not unlike the others, except it was now led by a new Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. James, an active member of the Faculty, had taken on Donna’s portfolio, while Donna took on the position of Acting Dean. Whether this shuffle would complicate program development or its evaluation was unknowable at the time, but I thought I should be mindful to any changes in the dynamics. Certainly, I had known James to be supportive of developmental evaluation from my prior work with him.

The priority before the group centered on supporting course design, a task now in the hands of course designers. Questions about the qualities of learning and the use of technologies had largely been resolved. What Kenneth would have to work out were processes by which authored materials would come to be submitted and later transformed into their online version. This proved to be more challenging than devising the guiding principles because he was responsible for making decisions about form, content, and workload that had implications for his colleagues. And for a junior member of the Faculty to negotiate these dynamics would not be easy (Kenneth, interview).

Another emerging priority was to market the program. With the launch of the program quickly approaching, the team was eager to increase enrolment so this work would be worthwhile. For some, the fear that this program would have limited appeal began to weigh on our minds. At the very least, it was important that this first intake of
students bring in enough revenue to cover expenses. The consensus seemed to be that more and better marketing would increase enrolment.

Multiple marketing activities were already underway. The Faculty was advertising the program online and in print to reach international educators, the program’s initial target audience. Despite having invested some significant budget towards online advertising, interest had been lacklustre. Many of those showing initial interest did not register. In addition to advertising, the Task Force decided to staff an information booth at the upcoming Teachers’ Overseas Recruiting Fair. While these were tried-and-true tactics for advertising programs in the past, in this context, they were not appearing to be particularly effective.

In response, the Task Force expanded their marketing efforts. They began to organize a webinar series. They wanted to communicate the program and its features more publicly more broadly and more directly to interested audiences and in ways not possible with print/online advertising. The webinar format would satisfy their requirements, allowing potential students to interact with program developers directly, as well as creating an artifact that could serve as an information resource that could be accessed by interested persons at a time convenient to them. And, because this would be a first for the Faculty, there was much to learn about conducting webinars effectively.

I took initiative to support their exploration in a number of ways. First, I drew from the literature to identify criteria of success for webinars. I also attended a webinar organized by an American institution on their online doctoral degree program to gain a first-hand experience. I tried to answer the question for myself and the team, what might a successful webinar look like? It struck me then that one of the challenges associated
with program development was determining what ought to be appropriate and relevant criteria by which to judge our efforts.

Secondly, when the Task Force invited me to attend trial runs, I assumed the role of audience and made note of the event. In this way, I tried to provide the team with feedback on successes and hiccups as I had witnessed them. My experiences with webinars and general proficiencies with technology informed my observations. The Task Force welcomed my input, incorporating them with each iteration of the trial. In this instance, I had not drawn on design concepts to further the work. I had felt that developmental evaluation alone would sufficiently address the developers’ needs.

In time, three different webinars would come to be organized and delivered over the months of February, March, and April. In each, three to five persons would attend. I monitored the quality of these webinars as a participant observer, providing feedback and suggestions where appropriate. I also accepted the invitation to provide technical assistance should attendees run into technical difficulty (and they did). I was happy to help out, but I did find my involvement odd. But as I come to better understand the work that developmental evaluators do now, helping in ways outside the scope of evaluation expertise is not atypical. Program development is an activity that requires ‘all hands on deck’. The evaluator, being a member of the development team, is often expected to lend help in unexpected ways—something I had learned from one of my first developmental evaluation experiences (Lam, 2012).

IX. Helping Students to See Themselves in the Program

In retrospect, it was apparent that concerns about marketing had cropped up as early as July of 2013, just a month into development. Patricia met with the University’s
central marketing department to develop a marketing plan for the program, and even then, had struggled to define the program’s theme of professional inquiry. Barbara stepped in and worked with her and Lisa to flesh out the theme.

By September 2013, the Faculty had to advertise the program to the public. This marked the beginning of a series of marketing woes. As Patricia and others would later admit, marketing the program was challenging because the theme—professional inquiry—was foreign and abstract at first. They also found it challenging because they had never marketed any online program before. This was our first effort to create an online presence for Queen’s that wasn’t supported by the Ministry of Education and teacher’s associations.

The significance of this early episode escaped me in the moment. Like the rest of the team, I was focused on program-building and course-building, discounting the importance of marketing in the development of the program. It seems obvious now that Patricia’s ongoing struggle with marketing was symptomatic of an evolving conceptualization of the program. Despite Patricia’s needs for a concrete stable program description to use for marketing purposes, we were unable to attend to her very real needs in a timely fashion given her responsibilities—no doubt raising her stress level considerably.

I was initially hesitant to approach marketing issues. I saw it as peripheral to my expertise. My training was in educational research and program evaluation, not marketing. “Don’t people go to business school to learn about marketing?”, I thought to myself.
I now see my reluctance as misplaced. While it is true that marketing is itself a highly-developed field of study, the core questions of the field—to raise awareness and to communicate the values of a product, service, or in this case, an educational program—do cut across the private-public or profit-nonprofit divide. For one field to claim exclusive dominion over marketing activities, that is to say, only marketing folks should handle marketing, could jeopardize the contribution that other adjunct fields (like educational researchers and program evaluators) could bring to tackling marketing issues. Indeed, the labels, which we assign ourselves, may be less important than the utility of what we have to offer in a situation.

It was insightful that in re-reading the literature on theory-driven evaluation, I found parallels between marketing and evaluation. For instance, the issue of locating an audience—markets in marketing terms—is paralleled in Chen’s Action Model in terms of “Target Group” (see Figure 11, below).
Figure 11. Chen’s (2005) Conceptual Framework of Program Theory. The framework is comprised of two primary components: the change model and the action model. The action model specifies target group as a key component of the overall program theory. Raising awareness of the program across a target audience could be incorporated into the program’s evaluation as part of the program’s change theory. In other words, the distance between evaluation and marketing—especially in a context of programming—is not as wide as I once thought.
Because I hesitated to take an active role in issues of marketing, I found myself following Patricia’s lead and supporting her in whatever way I could. Her strategy was to try what had not yet been done. But I was beginning to hypothesize otherwise. We could devise better marketing if we were to understood the needs and motivations of our target audience better.

With our marketing, as with other aspects of the program development, we were information poor. But Barbara had conducted a needs assessment as part of the university proposal process. Kenneth reminded us of this data source when he remarked in a meeting that: “I came in after the needs analysis, and good design goes back to user needs…” (Kenneth, March 18, 2014; File 17). In reviewing the findings, the needs assessment wasn’t particularly informative for the purpose of guiding development. If it was, in fact, a well-executed needs assessment, then, why was it not helpful? Shouldn’t a sound needs assessment already answer questions about users needs, as its name would suggest? (It wouldn’t be until this research work concluded that I began to appreciate the nuance between the two purposes.)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

We needed to move forward in gathering information for use in marketing. I thought we should approach this question empirically, and not conjecturally. Following my hunch, I wanted to organize an inquiry to better investigate potential graduate students’ reception to the DEI program. Working with such a population would of course be difficult. How could I feasibly identify potential graduate students of this program over the web, and long before the program would launch?
We did have access to graduate students enrolled in our full time programs, many of whom had entered the program only recently and were close in terms of demographics. They could speak to their experiences in contemplating graduate education and help us understand, what might be attractive about the DEI program. With this information we might be able to develop our marketing plan.

I proposed the idea to the Task Force (Feb. 11, 2014; File 16). But the idea gained little traction with the group, and in particular, with James. Urgency, time, and feasibility likely factored into James’s decision. I could see us learning a lot from the focus group. But I was unable to argue this case successfully. Eventually I abandoned the idea. In retrospect, I wish that at the outset of the developmental evaluation I had negotiated a budget for evaluation activities. Having such a budget would have meant the freedom, resources, and at least preliminary permission to conduct this form of developmental evaluation inquiry.

So I now had to find another way to approach the gathering of information for the purpose of supporting the issue of marketing. I realized the answer might be to propose a comparable question; namely, among those who show interest in the program, what are drivers that promote or inhibit them from committing to the program? What I was seeking to inquire into was the onboarding phase to the program.

Onboarding is the label I used to refer to the process that begins when a student becomes curious about the possibility of pursuing graduate work, which leads to learning about Queen’s offering, and ultimately the decision to commit to and then register for admission. The onboarding experience seemed important for me to investigate for two reasons. My first hunch was that students would judge their readiness for the DEI
program on the availability and quality of information presented to them; my hypothesis was that the better we satisfied students’ information needs, the more likely marketing efforts could convert, to use a marketing term, interest into registration. My second hunch was that students’ final decision about registration would not likely be strictly a rational process, but one fraught with emotion and uncertainty. By inquiring into the onboarding experience more holistically, the Task Force stood to gain insights into ways they could “to help students see themselves in the program.” This was an aspiration that Patricia had advanced that I thought captured nicely the goal of her marketing strategy.

X. Markets and Marketing

“We have two students accepted into the program with a few more in the pipeline,” reported Lisa at the March Task Force meeting. I looked, somewhat nervously, around the room, trying to gauge others’ response. Surely I couldn’t be the only one who thought this number was worrisome. The Task Force had expected international educators would embrace the program immediately. All evidence was pointing to the contrary.

What followed was a discussion on how else the Task Force could market the program. There was talk about bringing flyers to conferences and meetings that professors would attend. The assumption seemed to be that we needed to bring the program before more eyeballs. I noticed Kenneth was quieter than usual.

In re-thinking whose needs we had targeted in our design process Kenneth reminded us they were “people who need credentials.” He invited the group to consider whose careers could be furthered with graduate education but whose credentialing needs weren’t currently being met: nursing educators; systems leaders (e.g., school district...
leaders, Ministry of Education leaders), or my example, student services professionals working in tertiary education.

His observation was insightful for he had pointed at the very ground on which we were standing. We shifted attention once again to refocus on “tailoring the program after a pattern of need” (Kenneth, March 18, 2014, Doc 17). This focus would be short-lived, however, as we were forced to hasten the pace of development.

* * * * * *

At the time, attending to issues of marketing felt like major set backs that robbed us of our spirit and momentum. Now the questions that beg to be asked are: Were these marketing issues inherent in the innovation process we undertook and therefore to be expected; and if so, could we have anticipated them sooner?

In looking for answers, I first considered the composition of the Task Force. In this project, each person was chosen to offer a particular expertise. The responsibility of marketing fell squarely upon Patricia and to a smaller extent, Lisa, to execute. This sort of configuration is known in organizational literature as cross-functional teams. Individuals are expected to bring their unique perspectives and knowledge to bear on the common problem; individuals are also asked to assume responsibility over execution in their respective area of responsibility.

This configuration is indeed appropriate for complex, ambiguous tasks, such as the case here, because both the resulting program and the process benefit from a diversity of perspectives (Daft, 2000). But what is also deemed necessary is cross-training among members into one another’s functional areas (Brown, 2009; Hansen & von Oetinger, 2001). In the organization and management literature cross training is a form of
knowledge management (Jones, Hersechel, & Moesel, 2003; Wiig, 1997). If we had applied this principle, our Task Force could have benefited, for example, from Barbara and Kenneth developing some understandings of the complexity of marketing, and Patricia and Lisa expanding their understanding of academic processes and decision making.

Without this form of cross-training there was an uneven investment of time and resources across the many issues that needed attention. Barbara admitted that during the design process she had zeroed in on the program’s academic integrity and had not considered marketing decisions as something she should weigh in on very heavily. She had trusted Patricia to manage marketing. And yet often discussions around marketing fell to the way side, leaving Patricia and at times Lisa working on their own and leaving this aspect of program underdeveloped compared to the academic element. When I explored this very issue with James, the acting leader of the group during this critical period, he agreed that there was real danger when we expect only one person to assume an area of responsibility, when a cross-functional approach was called for.

Admittedly, it may be a tall order to expect program developers working on a cross-functional team to cross-train into one another’s functional areas. But such may be just what it takes to be effective at developing programs. In lieu of cross-functional awareness, a design-informed developmental evaluation may help bridge by facilitating knowledge sharing and perspective sharing.

XI. Back Filling Evaluation and Doing Design

By May, the ground was beginning to thaw, and the thought of the impending program launch loomed large upon us all. Enrolment remained in the single digits.
Beyond remaining focused and optimistic, there was little we could do but stay the course.

Since February, the team had focused on refining and ramping up marketing efforts to increase enrolment. The Task Force had spent much time refining the Facebook ads to reach different audiences and explore means of alerting teachers in local school boards to the program. What was becoming apparent to me was that what we thought of as marketing, in the way it had unfolded so far, was more advertising. But marketing means more than just advertising. For one, careful attention to marketing should direct one to consider the issues of where potential markets could be. Kenneth had voiced this orientation in the March meeting.

In addition, for any form of marketing to be successful, the program being marketed must have value. To flesh out what value was emerging in our program, I turned to Scriven’s (1991) framework that looked at value in terms of merit, worth, and significance. Merit refers to the intrinsic quality of the program as it relates to the quality of teaching, learning, and program administration. Worth would refer to the comparative value of the program in comparison to some costs (e.g., a student might ask: Is this program worth my time given what I might learn from it, or what I trade for time or money? Might some other program offer more given my needs?). Significance would refer to the unique differentiation this program would be able to make from others (i.e., its focus on professional inquiry, as opposed to more generic focus in leadership or educational technology). So, I played this logic out.

- On merit. We would find important hallmarks of functioning programs still absent: a coherent sequence of activities in which a participant progresses through
program outcomes begins to emerge (a theory of action); or a set of articulated expectations or assumptions as to why the identified sequence of activities is expected to lead to expected outcomes. But these were under development, and frankly, it was not a process I felt comfortable in which to intervene.

- On worth and significance… It was then that I stumbled upon an idea. The program’s worth and significance may have been apparent to us—that is, from a developer’s perspective—the program’s worth and significance were less apparent to the user.

I was afraid the virtues of the program as we saw them were actually hidden to potential students. If this was so, our advertising was easily interpretable as a mere sales pitch. Had we been so immersed in developing the program in ways that allowed us to have a unified vision of the program, that we had forgotten to look at our work from the perspective of our potential students’? Was enrollment low because applicants could not identify with the vision of the “professional learner” we were trying to operationalize; or possibly because, learning experiences we saw as essential in the program were not important for them? If any of these conditions existed, what I had defined along with Task Force members as “a marketing challenge” was really a gap in the program’s design. Reframing is a central design practice.

So what were we to do? I realized we could create and build into the program the very values by which our program could be judged by our students. I was thinking about values and attributes like:

- having a practical focus on professional issues;

- providing students with expert guidance in accessing literature;
• facilitating interactions between peers and scholars on problems encountered in practice; or,
• devising a program structure that would be sensitive to professionals’ lifestyles and schedules.

These were only a few of the values and attributes that came my mind. To help us identify and hone those most pertinent, I would need the help of others.

I was sufficiently convinced of this assessment but I knew better to hold my hypothesis lightly for I had little evidence to show for this claim; at this point, an emerging judgment began to form which could account for what we had experienced as a task force to date. I felt the need to validate my assessment. I felt I needed to build a case for it. But I would do this more strategically, unlike last time. But there was little time left. Thankfully, it was fortuitous that the summer evaluation design would have to be drafted, in time for program launch so we could learn from the inaugural cohort. Evaluation would be my way in to drawing attention to these issues.

* * * * * * * * *

I booked one hour with each member of the Task Force so I could interview him/her about their needs of the evaluation. Specifically, I focused my interviewing to identify program development priorities. Here, you can see the questions I raised in my interview guide (Figure 12).

**DEI Conversation Guide**

Come this summer, the DEI program will launch. At that time, we’ll have the opportunity to engage our program participants in conversations about their experience with the DEI program.

My role will be to:
• help us think about ways we can learn from our participants
• ask questions that can be valuable to us and to them.

My hope is that from this inquiry process we can begin to
• learn more about our DEI program from the learner’s perspectives… and
• begin to fold these insights back into our how we make decisions about the program.

There are many facets of what we do that we can talk to our participants about. So I need your help to focus our questioning on what really matters to you and the team.

So, one way I can be helpful to you and to the team is to learn as much as I can about what you see as critical to learn from the participants. I’ll ask other task force members the same questions. I’ll summarize what we as a group want to find out and report back.

1. How would you describe your role within the task force? What do you see as your role/responsibilities/contributions?

So this summer, we’ll have our first intake of students. They will be enrolling in two of our courses.

2. Are there aspects of the program that you think we should monitor as students take part in these courses?

Following the conclusion of these two courses…

3. Are there aspects of the program that you think could be (or should be) approached differently?

4. From your perspective, what, if any, decisions would you feel more comfortable making had you have more information on hand?

5. Are there issues or questions that you think the Task Force should discuss, either now or later?

6. Any other ways I can be helpful?

Figure 12. Interview Guide used to guide the pre-launch interview between members of the Task Force and I. The questions were designed to solicit their information needs related to the development (May 12, 2014; File 262).

I approached this round of evaluation-planning systematically, conducting and analyzing the interviews with the same rigour I would bring to any research or evaluation
endeavours. Independent evaluators might not consider doing this because of how costly it is in time and resources. I was committed to the task, however, because I wanted to advance a defensible interpretation of our development situation and suggest a carefully reasoned agenda for going forward.

The findings of my interviews confirmed my assessment. Task force members were committed to thinking through the implications of their decisions, but their attempts were hampered by a lack of resource or sustainable attention. It was difficult getting everyone together to work the project. I concluded that this represented a healthy tolerance to the ambiguity and urgency associated with the project, which I termed the “start-up situation”. Where that metaphor fell apart, for me, was that unlike most start-ups, we no longer seemed to have the agility to change course and attack any emerging problems differently. Not unsurprising, the issue of marketing was at the top of everyone’s mind.

Summarizing what I had learned from my interviews, I advanced the following proposal for the evaluation, as show in Figure 13 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My plan is to focus our evaluation to shed light on:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The demands of the program on participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expression of program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Usage/analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of communications (re: Program-to-Student: registration, learning expectations; program-instructor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13. Excerpt from the report made of interviews conducted with members of the Task Force on their emerging priorities. This list of program development priorities formed the basis of the first-intake evaluation.

* * * * *

The concerns of the Task Force members confirmed for me that, in addition to building the evaluation agenda, a design lens was an appropriate perspective for supporting decisions around marketing. The findings also gave me confidence to look more closely at program as a journey from the students’ perspective, and to attend to their experiences as they engaged the program.

The design exercise, *journey mapping*, would achieve these aims. A journey map (Stickdorn & Schneider, 2011), in short, invites developers to notice and articulate the expected path through which a program user would experience a program. This journey, once mapped, can be used to engage developers in discussion about the quality of interactions they wish to structure along the journey.

I was cautious not to approach the exercise head-on as designers would often do. I didn’t want to risk overwhelming Task Force members with yet another activity. The risk was negating the value of the exercise. Instead, I prompted them through the exercise with questions. I began by asking us to focus on the ‘adjacent problem’ of how a student might experience the program. In doing so, I hoped to bring to attention any incongruities in the experiences that might need further refinement.

* * * * *

On user experience
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“I would like you to recall an exemplary dining experience,” I posed the question to the Task Force, and paused.

“What about the experience did you find exemplary?” I asked.

“The food. The quality of the food,” explained Patricia.

“The service,” explained Lisa.

“For me, it wasn’t so much the food or service that was stellar, but the significance of the occasion and the company,” explained James. These explanation fit nicely into the merit/worth/significance framework.

“Surely you had a series of decisions to make before you enjoyed that meal. You might have called ahead, spoken to the host, and managed to reserve a table. Before that, you might have gone onto the web and studied the menu. You might have looked up the restaurant’s reviews online or asked a friend.” I said. I watched as the group nodded in agreement to each of my point.

“So evidently, the lead-up to you arriving at the restaurant can be as important to your assessment of the dining experience as the meal itself. If you were a restaurant owner, you would want to influence those decisions.” The group nodded, this time more slowly, and I could see the dots connecting for some.

“We may want to think about DEI program in a similar fashion, that is, as a journey comprised of multiple phases,” I suggested.

What I did then was somewhat unorthodox for a design activity. Instead of inviting the Task Force to construct the journey map, I presented them with one that I had prepared ahead of time (Figure 14). I had it printed on poster paper. I unrolled it flat on the table and taped down its corners. I had done so not only to optimize the use of
members’ time, but also to give it significance. I had thought that they would react differently to a physical artifact than to an on-screen digital document.

I then pulled out from my bag, pads of sticky notes. I watched as they reacted to this poster before them.

Figure 14. Journey Map (ver. 1) of the DEI program as of May 22, 2014. This graphic visualizes the expected path a typical user is expected to take in their participation of the program.
I then invited them to study the graphic and react to it. “Whenever the graphic doesn’t quite capture what Task Force had envisioned, let us revise it”. Appendix M shows the prompts I used to structure this exercise.

* * * * *

Emerging from this exercise was a new level of clarity about our program. In debating where critical ‘touchpoints’ go, the Task Force was able to make explicit what had previously been tacit knowledge of the program theory. I used this new information to inform my evaluation planning. I found this level of focused attention on the program refreshing. I was encouraged that the graphic had triggered Patricia to debate the sequence by which a potential student might learn about and “shop for” online programs, which held immediate implication for what information we were to present on the web site.

More importantly, the exercise led to meaningful discussion about what, if anything, might be changed or improved about the program. The answer, incidentally, was “not much,” because, as we discovered, we were constrained by other larger institutional policies and processes. For example, we had agreed in that room that the entire onboarding phase should embody those values we were working so hard to imbue within the courses so as to make the entire program experience a consistent one. But, as the Journey Map made apparent, when students register in the program, they would be redirected to an external registration system administered through the School of Graduate Studies, which on technical and visual fronts, can give off what was felt to be an outdated and impersonal impression. In other words, it wasn’t a program step that the Task Force felt good about maintaining, but it was an institutional requirement and we would have to
make do. I saw value in knowing this, even if the problem observed wasn’t something we could change. This was because in knowing something, we stood to be in a position to mitigate it. We had a stronger sense of our students’ first experience with the program. We could choose to compensate for this and if the opportunity arose in the future, we could be ready to seize it.

I had hoped that the exercise would point Task Force members to areas of the program that were still under-developed. I was concerned that the program had no concluding closure activity when students finished coursework and that there hadn’t been any talk about how the program would transition between the diploma to the Professional Masters program. My hope was this exercise would make these gaps explicit. I had also hoped that such an exercise would invite close examination of the onboarding process. I hoped that the Journey Mapping exercise would demonstrate that this process was both circuitous and confusing. Being able to make such observations about a program shows the potential power in a design exercise like this. It could help program developers see their program in new light, and in ways perhaps they hadn’t before. Regrettably, I wasn’t seeing any evidence of that. My sense was that they were already operating at capacity, so much so that program decisions beyond the immediate future would have to be deferred.

Nevertheless, I was pleased that the exercise yielded a more comprehensive picture of the program. It fostered a common understanding of the program, beyond the piecemeal sections for which each person was responsible. I may not have been able to promote cross training among members of the Task Force, but at least, this had helped in promoting a common perspective. As for myself, the conversation around the Journey
Map made apparent that the next focus for evaluation was to unpack and understand how students would experience these initial phases of the program. And, in just a few days, I would synthesize Task Force input and advance an evaluation plan.

XII. Exit

On November 10, 2014, I attended what would be my last Task Force meeting before delivering my exit presentation on the findings of this design-informed developmental evaluation. For the past eight weeks, I had been immersed in data analysis, with an eye to drawing my involvement to a close in the most responsible and productive way possible. As usual, we went around the table and voiced our respective agenda items. When it was my turn, I asked that we discuss how I could give them some ways to continue to think about the program. I had conducted and analyzed 6 hour-long interviews with all but two of the program’s initial participants as a way to help the Task Force gain an in depth understanding of students’ experiences with the program. I had also collected data from the two instructors who had instructed the inaugural session. Moreover, I had poured through the abundance of data I had collected during our development process.

I located respondents’ experiences along the lines of the developers’ orientation (values, aspirations, intentions). My analytic goal was to identify program successes, weaknesses, and their implications to inform program development moving forward in order to draw lessons for the future. I wanted to leave my tenure having strengthened the task force’s capacity in developing programs. While the analysis process was demanding, the idea that I could play a role in informing their thinking and decision-making energized me.
“I’m curious how you would like for me to report on what I have learned?” I posed the question before the group to seek their input. I was prepared to write a report on what I had learned. I was open to the idea of preparing a “slide-dument,” a standalone document that presents written words in the form of slides. I was also prepared to conduct an oral presentation on my findings. I was even open to the idea of organizing a workshop or two so we could see that findings got used.

“An oral presentation would be great,” Donna suggested.

“It strikes me as important to help our MDEP instructors to hear what you have to say. How close are you to finishing your analysis?” Barbara followed up.

“I’m close to being done.” I replied.

“I’m meeting with the MDEP instructors in two days. Could you have it ready then?” said Barbara.

“That would be too soon,” the words almost escaped my mouth. But before me was a genuine opportunity to share the evaluation findings with folks who could really act on the findings and shape future courses. If I reduce the scope of my presentation I could feasibly present a portion of the findings, I thought.

“I won’t be able to present on the full evaluation, but I could speak to what I had learned from my evaluation. What do you think about that? Would that be helpful?” I said.

“That would be fantastic, Chi. It would give our course designers a sense of who our students are.” Barbara said.

* * * *
A few days later I presented the initial findings of the evaluation with course designers. I managed to cobble together a 15-minute talk on what I had learned from the evaluation about our users. I framed it around questions that could be immediately actionable.

- Who are our program users?
- How did they first come to learn about the program?
- What are students looking for?
- What features of the program have they found helpful?
- What makes a difference in their program experience?

I wanted the presentation to be as much about reporting as it was about capacity building. I wanted to leave them in a position to be able to make sense of the findings and act on them.

Soon after the preliminary presentation to instructors, I found myself, once again, in the conference room where most of the Task Force meetings were held. Only this time I was at the head of the table, about to deliver my presentation on the findings to the entire developmental evaluation.

“So, Chi, I think we’ll get started.” Donna said.

I led with what I had learned from interviewing our participants. I really wanted my collaborators to see the program through the eyes of our users. I followed up by exploring with Task Force members the meaning of the findings. I recommended practical, hands-on exercises that would allow the group to continue asking important questions and conduct follow up deliberations on their own. It was important that the presentation be not only educative but also actionable. As a final contribution, I wanted
my exit from the Task Force to be seen as a benchmark rather than an endpoint in the use of design-informed developmental evaluation activities. And so my work with the Task Force drew to a close.

* * * end of the case narrative * * *
Interlude

In the preceding chapter, I told the story of how I had supported the efforts of a team of program developers to plan and launch an educational program through developmental evaluation informed by design thinking. A year has past since my exit from the collaboration. From this distance, I am able to see the evaluation with new clarity. In revisiting the case in its entirety, and retracing how the evaluation unfolded, I have seen patterns emerge. The stories told by the developers of their experiences of the evaluation helped to round out my understanding. As a consequence, I have developed a richer, fuller picture of what we experienced and a more holistic understanding of the design-informed evaluation process. I have a newfound appreciation for the complexity of developing programs, how developmental evaluators might act in service of program development, and above all, a perspective on how design might inform developmental evaluation.

While I felt welcomed and valued, I struggled to see my work take hold in decision-making. I had my expectations challenged. I anticipated that developers would embrace my enthusiasm and my expertise without qualification. I did not appreciate at least initially, the complications embedded in identifying myself as a design-informed developmental evaluator while being identified by others as a graduate student in evaluation. The fact that my ideas were associated with my graduate student and evaluator identities undoubtedly made it more difficult for my collaborators to think and act in the design-informed developmental ways that felt so natural to me. In short, I struggled to find a place of my own. That’s not to say the efforts were futile. In the end, a respectable program did come to be developed. And I did manage to generate credible
information in support of program development and about the first-cycle of implementation.
Chapter 5: Answering the Research Questions

In this chapter, I take a focused look at the entire design-informed developmental evaluation to answer the research questions.

RQ#1: To what extent is there evidence from the case to qualify this particular evaluation as a developmental evaluation?

Emerging from this validation exercise was a characterization of the DEI developmental evaluation concerning the extent to which it qualified as a developmental evaluation. Because the guiding principles refer only to those generic, essential qualities of developmental evaluation, this exercise was sensitive only to those core characteristics of the DEI developmental evaluation, and not on the design-informed aspects of the evaluation. Table 5 presents an overview to the results of this validation exercise.

Table 5

A display of confirming and disconfirming evidence showing how the guiding principles of developmental evaluation had been operationalized within the DEI Developmental Evaluation.

|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Developmental purpose  | ● Rationale for initiating the developmental evaluation was to support the development of a yet-to-exist program, DEI. [interview]  
● Evidence of actual development: e.g., course guiding principles (the 6’Cs), course design, marketing, assessment. [documentation] | ● Development was at times uneven and not always sustained.  
● Insights emerging from the developmental evaluation were dropped and not further developed or explored. |

Note: This particular application of developmental evaluation to facilitate DEI program development is classified as one of five developmental evaluation uses called preformative development.
of a potentially scalable innovation.

2. Evaluation rigour
   - Basing feedback on observation and reasoning from data. [self]
   - Making observations of the program development process in a rigorous fashion, in what is called “data-informed decision-making”[self]
   - Engaging in systematic situational analysis, principal-based evaluative thinking, and appropriate methodological decision-making with primary intended users. [documentation]

3. Utilization focus
   - Strategies implemented to enhance evaluation utilization:
     - Identifying stakeholders
     - Stakeholder analysis, incl. information needs
     - Provision of feedback via analytic proceeding
     - Seeking to understand Task Force’s preference for learning and decision-making [documentation]

   Note. Utilization is enhanced when Principle 1 and 2 is attended to.

4. Innovation niche
   - Innovation was intended to:
     - to attract a since-lost audience group
     - to recapture a revenue stream
     - to leverage faculty expertise in new ways [documentation]

   The resulting DEI program was less innovative than was expected [interview]

5. Complexity perspective
   - Employing complexity principles to interpret ongoing program development [documentation]

   Lack of iteration opportunities minimized the contribution of complexity concepts in interpreting program implementation [documentation]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Systems thinking</td>
<td>Systems thinking used to analyze stakeholder participation, perspectives, and boundaries. [documentation]</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looking for systems lever to maximize potential program impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Co-creation</td>
<td>Evaluation became embedded into the DEI program</td>
<td>Unclear whether the evaluation component would remain in place following the end of developmental evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental evaluation feedback became a feature of the development through the provision of analytic proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Timely feedback</td>
<td>Provision of feedback, consisting of observations and analysis of situation, following each session [documentation]</td>
<td>The exit presentation took time to prepare, making rapid feedback difficult. [documentation]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principle 1: Developmental purpose.** The first guiding principle of developmental evaluation concerns the purpose for which the evaluation had been conducted. Patton (2011, 2016a) stipulates that a developmental evaluation ought to support the development of an innovation (a program, in this case). The developmental evaluator: “illuminate[s], inform[s], and support[s] what is being developed, by identifying the nature and patterns of development (innovation, adaptation, systems change), and the implications and consequences of those patterns” (Patton, 2016a, p. 291). Development is not happenstance but the consequence of an effortful, intentional attempt to create change. To satisfy this developmental purpose criterion would require demonstration of both intention and action to support change in the program. To see evidence of this principle, I looked to why the DEI evaluation was initiated, and how development was promoted through evaluation activities.
In interviewing Donna, the Task Force leader, I learned about why she sought my collaboration. She thought the evaluation could help support the development of the DEI program. The Task Force was composed of those individuals who could “oversee what is happening and make decisions and enact the kinds of things that need to be enacted to get this program online and going. And what I did was I identified the people who I felt would have a role in that” (Donna, p. 5). Specifically, on inviting an evaluator on board, Donna thought my involvement would be “a good thing in terms of seeing what happened and evaluating what the process was like. What we might do different next time and what we could learn?” (p. 5). My dual status as an evaluator and graduate student did prove beneficial in one sense for it brought to the evaluation a student’s unique perspective to understanding the program ideas as they were being proposed. Donna’s familiarity and comfort with the evaluation process proved beneficial for she, in a leadership capacity, supported and welcomed my participation and collaboration. Together, these findings suggest that the evaluation had been initiated for the explicit purpose of supporting the creation of the DEI program. In fact, such application of developmental evaluation to program development is classified as one of five recognized “uses” of developmental evaluation, the preformative development of a potentially scalable innovation; Patton (2011) explains this application of developmental evaluation in this way: “Changing and dynamic situations require innovative solutions to worsening conditions. Model needs to be developed/does not exist” (p. 311).

Did the evaluation make a meaningful contribution to program development? An example of this linkage was apparent in the refinement and subsequent adoption of the new program’s guiding principles, the “6 Cs” principles. These principles played a
central role in informing the design of courses. They also framed how recruitment and marketing strategies were devised (Section 10 of the case narrative). Commenting on their significance to the development, Donna said: “[The 6 Cs was a really important conceptualization of what is underpinning [the DEI program] and how are we thinking about [it]” (p. 5). How developmental evaluation supported the refinement and subsequent adoption was by monitoring the success with which course authors understood these principles, by raising questions about how the task force might embody them into our marketing and recruitment strategies, and also during the first summer intake evaluation, about how, if at all, the principles had been experienced by candidates.

Another example of how this evaluation facilitated program development came from the way designers finally decided on how growth and achievement would be assessed. A debate emerged among course designers who held different views on how students ought to be assessed within the program (January 24, 2014; File 39). Some believed that students would be best served by a growth model in which learning and achievement was understood to reflect the coming together of ideas, knowledge, experiences in a non-additive fashion, while others argued for defaulting to a more conventional model that sees achievement as the linear addition of discrete assessment tasks. The evaluation activities supported the development of the final decisions by tracking the perspectives of individuals expressed and by documenting the various preferences advanced. A growth and achievement rubric was developed in time for the program launch not without controversy. For that reason, I reminded the task force that this matter was an issue worth revisiting. In this way, the developmental evaluation
supported program development by tracking the status and continuity of development priorities.

Across the many developmental episodes, I identified some of the strategies I used to support and further program development through evaluation. They included,

- Points raised within group conversation
- Prepared remarks (e.g., see Figure 4.1)
- Written analysis, i.e., “Analytic Proceedings” (see Appendices K, L)
- Structured exercises (e.g., see Figure 4.5 on Interviewing; Appendix M on journey mapping)
- Formal evaluation reporting

These behaviours are in keeping with what is expected of developmental evaluators.

While program decisions proceeded over time, development was at times uneven. For instance, issues of assessment were examined only initially and not again during the course of the evaluation. In the case of marketing, attention was irregular. Attention was given to this issue only when the matter became urgent, such as when the need arose to make information available on the website or when the team became concerned about the enrolment. This is not to suggest that program staff had not placed great importance on these issues, or that they did not work hard on them, but in this case, rather than developing in an ongoing, focused way as Patton (2011) describes. Different aspects of the developing program took on varying importance at different times.

In sum, the unfolding history of program development—from an explicit intention to develop a program, to systematically learning about the implications of decisions that
needed to be made—exhibited hallmarks consistent with the developmental purpose of developmental evaluation.

**Principle 2: Evaluation rigour.** The second guiding principle of developmental evaluation requires that a developmental evaluation be conducted with rigour. With this principle, Patton (2016a) underscores the importance of data and evidence in a developmental evaluation: “Data are gathered and interpreted to understand the implications of what is being developed” (p. 296). He then goes on to emphasize the role of empiricism in developmental evaluation, and indeed across all evaluation. “Any high-quality evaluation is data-based, but this principle is included here because in some cases, organizational or community development processes, evaluator-facilitated program staff discussion and development-oriented expert consulting are being labeled as developmental evaluation without any data collection.” He therefore excludes interventions that are based purely on tacit knowledge (here’s what I think you should do), or those derived purely on experiential knowledge (here’s what I have seen work, and therefore you should do this). In other words, developmental evaluators must pursue empirical investigations and draw on data and evidence to support program development. Evaluation rigour, to him, “resides in diligent, systematic situation analysis, principles-based evaluative thinking, and appropriate methodological decision-making with primary intended users” (Patton, 2016, pp. 296). The ways in which I satisfied these warrants included:

- Frequent reporting on my analysis of the development needs and directions (see Appendix J)
• Engaging in reflective practice on my own influence and contribution (see Appendix P)

• Engaging primary users in discussion about issues of methodology, data collection methods, and reporting (e.g., Appendix I for Evaluation Design)

Evidence of this principle in action came from the sources of knowledge and the standards of practice used to shape developmental evaluation contributions.

My general strategy for enhancing rigor was to ground my involvement in data. I took care to draw my arguments and conclusions from premises that were based in empirical observation. For instance, in Section 11 of the case narrative, I showed how I based the decision on whether to involve developers in design exercises on a study of developers’ needs. I would often make preliminary judgments about how best to help the task force move forward but I was determined to validate these empirically. By turning my hunches into questions, I could make explicit the need for data and evidence to inform decision-making.

In this way I intentionally framed the process of supporting program development as an inquiry. I collected and analyzed decisions, ideas, and perspectives systematically. In this way, data-informed decision-making became a routine for my clients as they worked to develop the program. Specific examples of this work include the prepared reports I crafted on both course development and marketing.

**Principle 3: Promoting evaluation utilization.** The third guiding principle concerns the promotion of evaluation utilization. The intentions of this principle are congruent with those articulated by the Utility standards of *The Program Evaluation Standards 3rd Edition* (Yarbrough et al., 2011). Patton (2011, 2016) asks developmental evaluators to help clients to make use of information generated from the evaluation and to act on evaluation findings. Attending to evaluation utilization is neither a passive process nor a one-time obligation. Instead, promoting evaluation utilization requires ongoing, intentional efforts directed at stakeholders who have a vested interest in the evaluation and the program (Patton, 2008). This notion is best captured by Patton’s mantra on the subject: enhance evaluation utilization by attending to the “*intended use by intended users*” (2008, 2012). Intended use in a developmental evaluation refers to facilitating program development. Intended users in a developmental evaluation refer to those personnel responsible for using and acting on the information and findings generated from the evaluation, in this case, the Task Force. For Patton, developmental evaluators need to: “know, understand, be able to work with, and adapt to the particular styles, approaches, and commitments of diverse social innovators, whatever they may call themselves.” To see evidence of this principle in action, I looked for strategies that were used to ensure utility and facilitate actual use. I implemented a repertoire of strategies to promote utilization.

- Identifying stakeholders and analyzing for their information needs
- Soliciting, identifying, and acting on client’s information needs, such as when the 6 Cs were introduced to course designers
• Making regular and ongoing observation and analysis of development by preparing analytic proceedings.

• Noticing the Task Force’s decision-making style and processes, so to align my own developmental evaluation practices.

• Inquiring into Task Force’s preference to learning about the evaluation’s findings (November, 2014, File 25).

Patton noted that evaluation utilization is reinforced when a developmental evaluation is focused on its developmental purpose (i.e., intended use) through engaging in rigorous evaluation (principle 2) with key stakeholders (Patton, 2016). The strong evidence supporting attention to principles 1 and 2 adds weight to the claim that that principle 3 was satisfied.

**Principle 4: Innovation.** The fourth guiding principle of developmental evaluation addresses the application of developmental evaluation to innovation. Patton argues that developmental evaluation is most appropriate to those program situations that call for a change to the status quo. Change may stem from a need to “create a fresh response to an emergent or intensifying crisis, an intractable challenge, or a wicked problem” (Patton, 2016a, p. 300). Both change process and outcome to change may be referred to as the innovation. The role of the evaluator is to support the innovation process by “elucidating how the change process and results being evaluated involve innovation and adaptation” (Patton, 2016a, p. 301). To see evidence of this principle in action, I reviewed the issues that the DEI program sought to address and the changes the program sought to create.
The DEI program sought change on multiple fronts. First, targeting the program at professionals who could not leave employment for full time graduate work was a strategic choice. It was an effort to recapture the presence of a once substantial group of part-time graduate students at the Faculty. The disappearance of this group was attributed to an evolution of the existing program. Previously, there was only an on-site program with a residency requirement. The demands associated with writing a culminating project or thesis, and completing course offerings, focused more on the exploration and application of theory than on the improvement of practice (Barbara, Interview; Donna, Interview). Focusing DEI on the inquiry and decision making needs of professional audiences was intended to expand the reach of graduate work at the Faculty beyond the traditional K-12 classroom teacher, and not inconsequentially, improve the revenue stream into the Faculty. A needs assessment had identified this as a viable program niche but determining how the program would address these needs and thus take on value for participants was a substantial part of this innovative process. The innovation challenge then, was first to develop the program in such a way that it would serve the real needs of professionals with educative responsibilities, and second, to reflect these needs in articulating the potential value of the program to potential users. The developmental evaluation response was to question and document program assumptions and decisions throughout the initial development phase—keeping at the forefront the implications for the way participants would experience these decisions—and to inquire about program users and their needs formally through the first-intake evaluation.

For members of the task force DEI was a way for the Faculty to leverage its expertise and enhance the capacity of professional educators in Ontario and beyond. It
was also an opportunity to advance their ability to facilitate teaching and learning. In doing so, two innovation challenges emerged. First, we had to learn about what professional educators, working in diverse contexts, would value in a graduate program education, and in turn, articulate the value of the developing DEI program to them.

The second innovative challenge was to act on the educational and thus social-betterment intention. This, however, imposed additional demands on the Faculty’s operation and management structure, straining under already-limited resources. I heard this undertone throughout the evaluation as program staff stretched their capacities and capabilities to develop and ready the program for launch. The innovation challenge, therefore, was marshaling resources and creating the conditions to enable creative, forward thinking development.

My contribution to this last condition for promoting innovation was limited. Patton (2016a) argued that developmental evaluators need to be as assertive as possible in helping developers query assumptions and engage in discussions about the appropriate acquisition and distribution of organizational resources to the innovation. In my dual role as a graduate student, however, I felt I had little legitimate authority to request that task force members reveal the complexity of Faculty resource management to me. For this reason, decisions around the distribution of resources fell outside of the scope of this developmental evaluation. It is difficult to estimate what influence, if any, this may have had on the innovative process, but the high commitment to the new program from task force members, which included a Faculty administrator, suggests that whenever possible, creative ways were being used to marshal resources in support of the innovation.
**Principle 5. Complexity perspective.** The fifth guiding principle of developmental evaluation concerns the epistemological orientation taken in a developmental evaluation. Specifically, Patton (2016a) encourages evaluators to adopt a complexity perspective to conducting developmental evaluation:

Understand and interpret development through the lens of complexity, and conduct the evaluation accordingly. This means using complexity premises and dynamics to make sense of the problems being addressed; to guide innovation adaptation and systems change strategies; to interpret what is developed; to adapt the evaluation design as needed; and to analyze emergent findings. (p. 304)

Those complexity concepts Patton (2011) refers to include: emergence, nonlinearity, adaptation, uncertainty, dynamical, and coevolution. Applying a complexity perspective to developmental evaluation provides a framework for noticing and observing change in the otherwise unpredictable, emergent environment that is program development (Patton, 2016). To see evidence of this principle in action, I looked to strategies I had employed to be mindful of complexity dynamics during the evaluation.

- **Emergence:** Engaging in continuous, fast-cycle inquiry. I kept watching for unexpected events. Inquiry wasn’t constrained to defined periods (as would be the case for midterm formative evaluation and end-of-project summative evaluation).
- **Nonlinearity:** Watching for disproportionate results when engaging in inquiry during program development and when interpreting results from the summer evaluation.
• Uncertainty: Accepting that decisions cannot be made with certainty in its outcome; embracing and becoming comfortable with having reduced certainty when decisions are made.

• Dynamical: Being mind of relationships that may be “volatile, up-and-down, unpredictable, turbulent, nonlinear, and complex” (Patton, 2011, p. 140), in my interpretation of findings.

• Coevolution: Recognizing the dependencies at play on certain decisions, such as when we were deciding what a renewed vision online learning ought to be, the decision depended on the technical constraints of learning management systems and the web applications; or that the program depended not only on academic but also on the marketing considerations. I accepted that decisions were not always discrete but could be interrelated. Decisions on one matter could bear implications on another.

Identification and attention to the complexity of our task could have played a larger role in this evaluation had there been opportunities for quick iterations of data collection and analysis. In a previous developmental evaluation (Lam & Shulha, 2014), the program was revised week-over-week during implementation. Developmental evaluation helped render feedback, which the program developers incorporated into their decision-making, evolving the program as a result. Complexity perspective offered a means to conceptualize and observe change as it was unfolding before me. In this case, however, the opportunity for quick iteration was not there, minimizing the role of complexity may play in facilitating interpretations into changing conditions.
**Principle 6: Systems thinking.** The sixth essential element of developmental evaluation is the employment of systems thinking into situational analysis. Patton (2016a) emphasized the importance of attending to the “interrelationships, perspectives, and boundaries” of systems that “undergird and inform both the innovation process and evaluation” in a developmental evaluation. Employing systems thinking “helps social innovators and evaluators, thinking together, to deepen their understanding of whether, how, how much, and in what ways, systems changes are occurring” (p. 306). In doing so, Patton encourages developmental evaluators to adopt a structural perspective to understand the context in which change was to happen. To see evidence of this principle in action, we may look to how systems principles—attention to interrelationships, perspectives, and boundaries—were incorporated into the evaluation.

In the DEI developmental evaluation, I employed systems thinking in several ways. The first was through framing evaluation stakeholders in terms of social systems. I did this through noticing the nature of relationships between the stakeholders and their evolving nature over time. This alerted me to the emergence of new organization as the nature of work prompted new organization and their later disassembly.

This relational understanding subsequently allowed me to frame differing perspectives held by different stakeholders. I could see how priorities and values could differ between members of the Task Force as a function of their social location. For instance, on whether we might be under-resourcing marketing activities, I could appreciate and reconcile the conflicting positions arising from James’ values and priorities as an administrator compared to Patricia’s values and priorities as a marketing coordinator working at the front-line. There also emerged a division in values and
priorities between those Task Force members who were academicians versus those who were staff members. This is not to suggest the division impeded program development only that these competing values were central to shaping the interrelationships among staff members and the perspectives that contributed to the development process.

Employing systems thinking also made me conscious of the system’s boundaries. In practical terms this meant looking at the Task Force as a system embedded within the larger Faculty system, which itself was embedded in the policies and norms of the broader University. Understanding the connections that existed across these systems helped to contextualize and clarify decision-making processes at the program development level. As an example, the nested nature of university operation meant that a graduate program is subject to academic regulations and operational policies that are imposed by the School of Graduate Studies, which is in turn, regulated by the University Senate (and so on). In realizing how these systems linkages were in play, I could better see that our DEI was restricted from offering a tailored registration experience. Investing time and energy into lobbying for a new registration experience was ill-advised because these resources were better targeted at other higher-yield issues. Employing systems thinking in this practical way was an application of the systems concept, *systems levers*, i.e., to look for linkages in the system(s) that, when manipulated, may yield disproportionate results.

Making explicit these systems linkages was intended to serve two strategic functions: first, to clarify for the developers the range of options available to them, and help in evaluating which of the many program development priorities we ought to choose; and second, to allow the team to question what ought to be changed about the
current situation. This application of systems thinking was especially valuable as we attempted to bring fresh thinking to the task and innovate.

**Principle 7: On Co-creation.** The seventh guiding principle of a developmental evaluation calls for developmental evaluators to enable co-creation of the program and the evaluation. “The innovation and the evaluation develop together—interwoven, interdependent, iterative, and co-created—so that developmental evaluation becomes part of the change process” (p. 306). This co-creation, he asserts, comes about from integrating data collection and evaluation activities into program development to enable feedback, such that the program that gets implemented reflects a melding of both program activities and evaluation activities.

I saw evidence of co-creation in the DEI developmental evaluation. Evaluation—the systematic, intentional collection and use of stakeholder information—became an integral feature of the program development and implementation process. The value of collecting implementation data was reinforced by the first program participants who felt these efforts showed attentiveness to their interests and needs. Had there been the opportunity for iterations of this during implementation, the contribution of developmental evaluation and the outcomes of co-creation would have been more evident.

Co-creation was also evident, albeit attenuated, in the development of the program. Evaluation processes—close collaboration between evaluator and program developers, tracking of decisions, and rendering of evaluative evidence that informs development, to name a few—became an feature of the DEI development process.
Another encouraging example of co-creation came from the emergence of a Marketing and Communication Plan that appeared to have been modeled after the Evaluation Design I had previously circulated. While I hesitate to attribute fully both turns of event to the evaluation, it would be hard to completely rule out influence from the evaluation.

In these ways, there was strong evidence in support of the co-creation principle in this developmental evaluation. Co-creation can also be described as a form of evaluation use. If there was a significant fusing of evaluation into the program development processes, then the evaluation processes should remain evident as the program continues to be defined. In the DEI, it is unclear whether this will be the case. This doubt arises, at least in part, because of the subsequent dismantling of the original Task Force and consequently the loss of expertise in developmental evaluation practices.

**Principle 8: On timely feedback.** Finally, the eighth guiding principle of a developmental evaluation concerns the provision of feedback in a timely fashion. Specifically, Patton (2016a) encourages developmental evaluators to “time feedback to inform ongoing adaptation as needs, findings, and insights emerge, rather than only at predetermined times, e.g., quarterly, or at midterm and at end of project” (p. 308).

In the case of the DEI-DE, I produced evaluative feedback following each engagement I attend. Feedback rendered in this developmental evaluation (see Table 6) ranged in form, from brief observations to formal reports.
Table 6

Different forms of feedback circulated with the program developers within the DEI developmental evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of Feedback</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Proceeding (e.g., Appendices J, K)</td>
<td>A report (2-3 pages) prepared following meetings capturing decisions made and their rationale. I also analyzed for implications arising from decisions made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email communication</td>
<td>Brief communication between the Task Force and I, typically on an idea that I wish to invite a response (e.g., how business schools are conceptualizing online graduate education), or to respond to an inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphical output to structured exercises (e.g., Appendices, H, M, N, O)</td>
<td>A visual summary of inquiry, typically undertaken to invite attention on an aspect of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Evaluation (e.g., Appendix I)</td>
<td>A document outlining proposed evaluation activity and its supporting rationale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluation report</td>
<td>A comprehensive analysis and evaluation of (1) developers’ evaluation needs; and (2) of students’ experiences of learning in DEI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the feedback prepared was short and concise, so to keep it manageable and actionable for the client. On each instance, feedback was prepared and circulated within a day following a meeting.

There was one instance within the evaluation where I ran into difficulty in keeping with this principle. The episode concerns the exit presentation on the full developmental evaluation. I had wanted to analyze the interviews I had conducted with the summer-intake students, and review the program development to extract lessons-learned. This goal turned out to be too large in scope given the time lines for reporting. Thankfully, the pace of the development had slowed, and so the longer-than-expected
time it took to produce feedback became less problematic. Had the team continued their pace of development, I could have missed a critical opportunity to contribute to the development. In my final report I was able to introduce the Task Force to information and potential activities intended to support decisions around next steps. This task of preparing materials intended to encourage continuing data-informed innovation and a smooth exit for me from the evaluation context was, however, a daunting one. In the future I will assess the scope of this task by mapping the priorities of the program developers with the time and resources available to attend to these needs to assure a feasible fit.

**Summary.** This validation exercise examined the degree to which the DEI developmental evaluation had been conducted mindful of developmental evaluation principles (Patton, 2016a). By bringing evidence to bear on each principle, the validation exercise showed the close alignment between developmental evaluation in theory and the DEI developmental evaluation in practice.

This validation exercise also suggests an important point about the relationship between design and developmental evaluation, and that is, in informing a developmental evaluation with design, the introduction of design does not alter its core properties. Design did not complicate the doing of developmental evaluation. This is an important finding for it sheds light on the relationship between design and developmental evaluation at a fundamental level; this validation exercise suggests that they are, at least, compatible frameworks. A fuller nature of this relationship will be developed as I deepen my analysis of the case below.
RQ#2: How does a developmental evaluator navigate and shape a design-informed developmental evaluation?

What made this developmental evaluation design-informed was the introduction and support for ideas about how to proceed with innovation.

I was able to navigate and shape this developmental evaluation in design-informed ways with the help of a narrative inquiry process. This way of observing and analyzing our program development work provided me with the methodology to examine my own practice in ways that brought my thinking, my practice, and the context for this developmental evaluation together. The use of narrative inquiry encouraged me to examine my decision-making and then to extract the meaning of the efforts I had made to insert design thinking into the developmental evaluation.

Having revisited and studied the developmental evaluation, a generalized pattern to how I had informed the evaluation with design emerged; decisions about when and how to integrate a design-informed process typically followed the following protocol.

**Remain sensitive to ideas expressed in the design literature and how these might be applied.** Prior to this design-informed developmental evaluation, I read the design literature extensively. As I read I made a conscious effort to consider how particular design ideas, concepts, methods, mindsets might support the work of developmental evaluation. This theorizing led to the building a network of ideas and propositions, or what Patton would call a sensitizing framework, with which to guide my decision-making in the design-informed developmental evaluation.

Assess at any given time whether design thinking might make a contribution to the innovative process and the developmental evaluation. As I participated in
conversations about program development, I would assess whether design thinking might augment, enhance, or otherwise inform the developmental evaluation inquiry being organized around the developers’ needs. Consider those developmental episodes around marketing from the case—from driving enrolment numbers up, and better defining the target audience, to devising different means of reaching out to them. Drawing on my understanding of design, I saw the relevance of design concepts, such as adopting a user-centered perspective, and design processes could make to the process. I suspected that such design concepts and processes could open up a space within the developmental evaluation to think about the task at hand differently and focus the evaluation around different questions. Thinking in this way prompted me to organize various activities intended to shape the direction of the design-informed developmental evaluation.

It was not always the case that design could inform the evaluation. In my decision-making I questioned whether other bodies of knowledge might better inform the task at hand. Take for instance those developmental episodes around developing assessment policies. It was clear to me that there were significant domain expertise and know-how with which to tackle the issue.

**Determine the best way to introduce these ideas into practice.** Having formed these design-informed propositions, I then decided how best to introduce these ideas into practice. On some issues, it was evident that it was already being championed. Take for instance, course design, which was closely championed by one of the Task Force members. In that case, I decided to parlay my ideas and suggestions through the champion. On other issues, responsibility was distributed and diffused. In that case, I decided to approach the issue more directly and sought to foster collaboration around the
issue. Such was the case with marketing. I determined that I could make the biggest contribution by first working with the staff individually as opposed to involving the entire Task Force. Factoring into my decision-making was who could best act on the issue.

Following that, I decided on how best I would introduce the idea. Returning to the example of marketing, I chose to introduce the idea slowly and ease the select program stakeholders into concepts like user experience. Facilitating design exercises, like journey mapping, was one of the ways I decided to bring about a user-centered perspective and attention into yet-to-be-developed aspects of the program into sharper focus.

**Test out assumptions about the value of design thinking through the reactions to my actions.** In carrying out my plan, I monitored and inquired into the extent to which members would respond in ways I had anticipated. In particular, I paid attention to what sense they made of the ideas put forward, what they were able to achieve in working with those ideas, and finally, what I might do consequently to further stimulate their work. The inquiry framework of developmental evaluation offered the natural complementing toward inquiring into the value of design thinking.

In the marketing example, I noticed that members of the Task Force warmed up to the idea of journey mapping as they saw the relevance of the activity to their work. This took repeated engagement with the staff and facilitation at each session. I would ask evaluative questions about different aspects of the user journey—as one would in facilitating a logic modeling session—to gain clarity into the program experience. In doing so, incongruous ideas or incomplete understandings would come to the surface and be made explicit. In facilitating the process, I could help reframe the conversation around
what they could be doing differently and how we might organize developmental evaluation around these program decisions moving forward.

Use the observations, comments, and behaviours of Task Force members as evidence from which to extract meaning about the contribution of design thinking.

On the basis of what I was observing and learning from Task Force members as they engaged in design-informed activities, I began to extract meaning about the contribution of design thinking. Primarily, I was attending to the extent to which an activity was being carried out in ways we had expected it. Secondarily, I was interested in identifying those factors that had contributed to success. Narrative inquiry played a major contribution in placing my experiences, along with that of the developers, in context. These meaning I was generating informed my ongoing collaboration with the group up to, and including, my exit.

Finally, I related these meanings back to all of the propositions that had informed my initial actions. This objective was achieved through this study. This was important to do because, in studying my experience systematically, I came to appreciate the holistic contribution that design brought to developmental evaluation. I now come away with a more nuanced sense into how design could inform developmental evaluation in terms of its utility, feasibility, and consequences. By engaging in this final step, the meaning-making was anchored by both principles of developmental evaluation and design thinking.

By working through these processes I was able to bring a small sample of the ideas and practices in the field of design together in the act of doing a developmental evaluation making the two fields mutually informing.
Designerly Practices, Revisited

Earlier in my research I identified seven design principles that may serve to anchor a design-informed developmental evaluation. Table 7 below revisits these seven principles and displays both confirming and disconfirming evidence from this case. The concepts that had most influence in this particular developmental evaluation were:

- The adoption of having an end-user in mind, a dominant approach known as user-centered design.
- Designers generally reject a problem as presented, instead preferring to problematize it
- The use of design exercises to promote close attention to user experience

Table 7

A profile of the designerly practices constructed of the case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Confirming Evidence</th>
<th>Disconfirming Evidence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Design is an iterative, non-linear process by which initial concepts</td>
<td>• evident at the local level with respect to developing the ‘course design’</td>
<td>• absent at the program-level; there was no time or opportunity to iterate within the engagement</td>
<td>designing in this iterative, non-linear fashion was enabled by a supportive environment (the trio working group) and with individuals familiar with the creative process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and ideas become increasingly concrete and refined for production</td>
<td>• evident, somewhat, in the evaluator-led efforts at understanding the student experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the heart of the iterative design process is</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>• prototyping was attempted by</td>
<td>by Kenneth’s admission,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Confirming Evidence</td>
<td>Disconfirming Evidence</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prototyping</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth, the Task Force lead, but somewhat thwarted by the complexity of the project.</td>
<td>opportunities to prototype was constrained by time and resource, and as a consequence settled too early on a version when he could have pushed for further work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Designers generally reject a problem as presented, instead preferring to problematize it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evident in the way I had approached the issue of marketing, through reframing it in terms of helping potential students to learn about the value of our program (my developmental evaluation response was to better understand the onboarding phase of the student experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evident in the way in which Kenneth and I had approached the task of course design. From how we do teach using technologies, we moved to asking “how might we construct meaningful learning experiences that engage our learners in knowledge construction?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Design involves both analysis and synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evident, strongly, in the way in which evaluation processes and products (e.g., through analytical proceedings) supported Kenneth’s design efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evident, also, in how the summer evaluation inquiry examined and analyzed the students’ experiences, and tailored the reporting to enable action next-steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Confirming Evidence</td>
<td>Disconfirming Evidence</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In proposing possible solutions, designers engage in both divergent thinking and convergent thinking</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The effects of divergent/convergent thinking are mostly suppressed, as the opportunity to engage in iterative design was absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To help keep the design task manageable, and to ensure the solution is most appropriate to the problem, designers impose constraints upon their reasoning</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Not observed in this DiDE as the opportunity to engage in iterative design was absent.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Design decisions are made with end-users in mind, a dominant approach known as user-centered design.</td>
<td>• evident in the emphasis the developers came to place on users, attributed to the questioning voice I brought to the evaluation and through Kenneth’s involvement</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experience of this case suggests that, on balance, designerly practices are most meaningful when they are embodied through the developmental evaluation processes, and when there are opportunities for sustained focus on iterating the program. Furthermore, this design-informed developmental evaluation finds support for approaching program development in a collaborative fashion. It was in bringing the multiple sources of knowledge and perspectives that the developmental evaluation was made meaningful in service of developing a strong, robust program.
Summary. This case saw the purposeful introduction of design principles into a developmental evaluation. In doing so, the system of ideas and practices as expressed in the design literature came to be tested and their value better understood. This case offers promising support for informing developmental evaluation through design, particularly when done in collaboration with and in support of program developer. Moreover, the way in which one might engage in a design-informed developmental evaluation is becoming better known as a result of studying this case systematically.
Chapter 6: Contributions to Evaluation Theory and Practice

This research married my study in the theory and practice of developmental evaluation with my interests in the role of design thinking in innovation. From the 18 months in which I have been immersed in conducting, analyzing, and reporting on this research I identified four themes that warrant further discussion:

1. Situating Oneself as a Developmental Evaluator
2. Valuing-in-Action
3. Design thinking in service of program development
4. Narrative as a Method for Advancing Professional Learning about Developmental Evaluation

Theme I – Situating Oneself as a Developmental Evaluator

My objective in conducting this research was to make a contribution to scholarship in developmental evaluation. In conducting the developmental evaluation, my goals were to 1) make a contribution to the efforts of the Task Force responsible for developing an innovative response to the need for a part-time professional graduate program in education, and as a consequence, 2) learn from the experience about the nuances of conducting developmental evaluation and the contributions design had played in informing the developmental evaluation. A significant dilemma I experienced throughout the evaluation was how best to implement design-informed developmental evaluation. At times, I wasn’t sure if I was doing enough. I wanted to do more, offer more, and collaborate more in decision-making. But despite my efforts, my ideas and suggestions often did not get the response or uptake that I hoped for. It wasn’t because I was unfamiliar with the dynamics or the specific challenges associated developmental
evaluation; this was my third developmental evaluation project. My lack of influence was likely, in some parts, idiosyncratic. In constructing the narrative (Chapter 4) and answering my own research questions (Chapter 5), I now have a deepened understanding related to multiple roles that I brought to the table when joining the Task Force.

I perceived myself in this new context primarily as a developmental evaluator with both ideas and experiences in hand to serve the deliberations and decision-making processes of the Task Force. In addition, I was anticipating opportunities to test out the influence of developmental evaluation when it was informed by design concepts and principles. Task Force members knew me best as a graduate student. Graduate students are typically asked to serve on university committees and to contribute perspective rather than to inject expertise that faculty members and staff may not have. While I could see ways in which I might make a strong contribution to the program developers’ thinking about their work, I often felt unable to situate myself as an informed contributor. Thus, in addition to attending to the evaluation needs of the Task Force, I found myself focusing on how to create the space where I could do influential developmental evaluation work.

The issue of multiple and often overlapping roles may not be one experienced by developmental evaluators who are recruited to contribute their expertise to the program development collaboration. The very fact that program developers may identify these evaluators as external consultants may automatically add weight to their voice. I was not seen as a consultant. Being internal to the organization, and at the outset having introduced my research interest as well as my practical interest in the project, it was likely that for many, if not all Task Force members, my primary identity continued to be
one of graduate student. While I was welcomed in joining the work of the Task Force, my role could easily be interpreted as additive but not essential to the process.

The idea that evaluators hold multiple and often overlapping roles is not new (see Ryan & Schwandt, 2002; Skolits, Morrow, & Burr, 2009). However, the discourse has typically connected evaluator role to evaluation methods, models or stakeholder orientation (e.g., the neutral social scientist, the advocate, the knowledge broker), or to functional demands created in response to performing an evaluation, as Skolits, Morrow, & Burr (2009) have argued. My experience suggests an alternative to conceptualizing the complexity of the evaluator role, and that is, by attending to the multiple identities with which an evaluator shares with program developers, the organization, and to stakeholders: I was at once an evaluator and a researcher; a graduate student and a specialist; an ally and an instigator; and, a collaborator and an observer. This multiple-identity perspective to conceptualizing evaluator role suggests a relational understanding is constructed and contextually (and probably, temporally) defined. Such a perspective could account for how evaluator identities could intersect with context, people, and demands of the evaluation in shaping an evaluation.

My experience also brings to mind the literature on internal evaluation (e.g., Love, 1993), where staff members internal to an organization perform evaluations of direct relevance to one’s organization. As in internal evaluation, my familiarity with the context and my existing relationships with stakeholders complicated the evaluation in ways unlikely to be encountered by those external to the evaluation.

To date, the link between internal evaluation and developmental evaluation has yet to be made in the literature. Making the connection explicit between the two bodies of
literature may in future yield a richer understanding to the potential challenges associated with the varied contexts in which developmental evaluation may take place.

Still, in contexts where the role of the developmental evaluator may not be highly valued, at least initially, the evaluator should be equipped to respond. In this case, I tried to redress the status differential that I felt by practicing professional humility. When it became clear to me that I would not be viewed as an expert, I did not abandon the opportunity. Equipped with the principles for developmental evaluation, I assumed my more familiar role as learner. I adopted an inquiry stance for both for myself “How can I adapt my initial notion of how to conduct developmental evaluation?” and in the service of the Task Force by focusing on and attending to their explicit information needs. In these ways I tried to present myself as an ally willing to work towards a shared goal. I recognized my collaborators as experts in program development, implementation, and execution. As I learned how interested Kenneth was in using his design background to shape his contribution to the new program, I worked to parlay the influence I had hoped to have with my design thinking through his work. My experience suggests that the design-informed developmental evaluator does not always need to lead the charge in integrating design into the developmental evaluation. Considering who in the program development team might best be in a position to bring design influences into the developmental evaluation might be an important decision and task for the design-informed developmental evaluator.

My practice of professional humility within this developmental evaluation was not a difficult adaptation. In prior work I had investigated the practice of servant leadership—a values-based approach to leadership that emphasizes leading without
power—in developmental evaluation (Lam, 2015). Humility was one of six leadership ‘devices’ with which an evaluator might employ to approach a developmental evaluation. This study adds support for its practice and deepens the field’s understanding as it offers illustrations to how it was applied to drive toward a strategic end.

Writing about the influence of the evaluator here has reminded me of one the first lessons I learned about the practice of evaluation: evaluation is inherently political (Weiss, 1998). Jennifer Greene (1990) argued that “evaluators should recognize that tension and conflict in evaluation practice are virtually inevitable, that the demands imposed by most if not all definitions of responsiveness and technical quality (not to mention feasibility and propriety) will characteristically reflect the competing politics and values of the setting” (p.273). She saw it as the responsibility of the evaluator to explicate the politics and values that underpin an evaluation.

This case brings to light how politics shape not only the technical dimensions of evaluation, as has been the focus in the literature, but also the evolving processes and the changing relationships the evaluator have with clients as a developmental evaluation unfold. How individuals are expected to participate and take leadership in program development and who has the authority to make decisions and act on ideas were two insights.

I am reminded by this case that evaluation is not a necessary element of to program development. Put another way, program development does not require evaluators’ input or expertise. This observation is no surprise to anyone who has been involved in organizing, managing or leading social or educational change. This turn of events in this developmental evaluation underscores the onus upon the developmental
evaluator—echoing what Greene (1990) charged the evaluator to do—to show the value that developmental evaluation may make to their efforts. Clients may not know what contributions a developmental evaluation can make to their specific program or how they may involve a developmental evaluator until the evaluator shows them. This value-added frame for thinking about developmental evaluation becomes even more challenging when the evaluator has only informal authority for influencing the process. Currently, there is little guidance in the literature on how developmental evaluators who find themselves in contexts similar to mine might do so.

My resolve was to demonstrate to Task Force members the behaviours that could add value to their efforts and ultimately the emerging program. More specifically I chose to create analytical proceedings of meetings. In doing so, I hoped to demonstrate the thinking processes I was using and thus stimulate further thinking about our efforts. I also introduced and continued to follow up on the notion of focusing on the desired experience of program users as a way to shape program development decisions and to judge the quality of our decision making. While I was not explicit about it, I also drew on the structure of the logic model (e.g., Knowlton & Phillips, 2013) and the thinking behind program theory (Chen, 1990; Donaldson, 2007) as ways to shape my thinking, conversations, and questions about the emerging program.

When I was unable to stimulate interest within Task Force members to be involved in evaluation activities, specifically in data gathering and analysis to inform their decision making, I chose to assume those responsibilities myself. I believed this to be the most concrete way to demonstrate my concern for and commitment to the evolving quality of the emerging program. This decision required that I design and implement an
information gathering strategy for the first summer intake, interviewing the developers and the program participants to learn about their needs, and creating an exit developmental evaluation report. Role boundaries, while operational, may become more invisible as evaluator and the program development team collaborate and trust evolve over time.

In general, this case showed how fundamental issues about evaluation practice—evaluator role, politics, and collaboration—may look different in the context of developmental evaluation. The experience of this case suggests a need to better understand, conceptualize, and develop strategies for how developmental evaluators are to negotiate evaluation contexts. Attending to evaluator roles, in particular the multiple identities, which get constructed in context, and to the political dimension of evaluation, are important. Greater understanding in these areas can help developmental evaluators remain adaptable and to shape reasonable expectations for their work.

**Theme II – Valuing-in-Action**

One aspect of my work as a developmental evaluator was quite predictable; namely, learning about the first iteration of the program’s implementation, both to see what was working and what was not. In this way, evaluation could serve to inform decision making on how to keep program development moving forward. The process of attending to the overall quality of the emerging program became complicated and challenging when, as a Task Force, we would try to be innovative in our decision making without reference points or yardsticks to help us judge whether that approach had value. I found this to be a place where having the perspective and role of a developmental evaluator allowed me to make a contribution. For instance, as we worked our way
through the issue of what it meant to reach our potential participant group and thus market the program, we landed on the idea of mounting webinars. The Task Force spent time deliberating what the content and the technology for conducting these webinars should be. These decisions were made without the benefit of a shared understanding of what a successful webinar series might look like for the program. Only the most general criterion for success (i.e., immediate expressions of interest in our program by potential students) was identified. As a consequence, neither our success nor lack of success could inform us about the relationship that might exist between the program as an innovation and our target participants and thus how to improve this alignment. Hence, conducting developmental evaluation in this case was, in part, about evaluating decisions that were meant to support the emerging program.

It became apparent to me that establishing criteria to assess progress and success in program development is a form of valuing. Valuing, as an aspect of inquiry refers to “the methods by which we assist our natural abilities to judge the value of alternatives” (Julnes, 2012, p. 4). Collectively, the task force and I needed to engage in valuing not of the program as it was to be implemented, but of our decisions and actions as these contributed to the program’s development. Hence, this notion of valuing-in-action emerged out of this case study. A revisiting of the decisions around the use of webinars revealed several identifiable phases where valuing-in-action either could have or did make a contribution to our larger challenge of program development.
1. An Emerging Decision
   The Task Force became inspired to organize a webinar series as a form of marketing (goal).
   What was driving this decision was the intention to explore webinar technology as an avenue for marketing (intention).
   Specifically, the Task Force thought webinar technology could offer potential students a means to learn more about the specifics of the program in ways not possible with other marketing means. It would also offer students the means to interact with the program staff, which would lead them to sign up with the program (assumptions and theory-of-change).

2. Valuing-in-Action
   Upon learning about their intention, I began to conceptualize what might constitute success for this particular task. I decided to look at it in two different ways: technical merit (did it work well for the audience?) and functional worth (did it do what we had expected it to?).
   Because we had no prior experiences with organizing webinars, we had to identify relevant, meaningful criteria with which to judge our success.
   On technical merit, I consulted industry resources from the webinar providers to see what they suggest as important criteria:
      Quality of audio feed (e.g., static-free transmission)
      Quality of video feed (e.g., stutter-free transmission)
      Ease of registration
      Ease of navigation
   On functional worth, I sought to make explicit their intention and rationale for organizing webinar, and from that, infer what they had hoped to achieve (outcomes) and any values that they wish to communicate.
   I then created a crude evaluation instrument. I could have created a rubric. I could have presented it in the form of a rubric, but I decided against it. I thought a checklist would be more accessible (and that performance of criteria could easily be expressed in binary terms)
   Having created this instrument, I invited feedback from members of the Task Force. By designing and using this instrument I tried to demonstrate to the Task Force how collecting, and recording data about innovative efforts could become a regular activity in the innovative process of program development.

Figure 15. An example of valuing-in-action from the case.

In this example, valuing-in-action was about identifying relevant criteria in advance of an action to in order to assess the contribution of these efforts to the proposed
innovation. Identifying the criteria for valuing the webinars was established formally as an explicit part of the developmental evaluation. Valuing-in-action can occur as part of collaborative deliberations around the innovation as well.

In one instance, a decision had to be made concerning how courses ought to be scheduled within a term. Members of the Task Force weighed the benefits and cons to various models, and the discussion came to a stall as no option seemed ideal. At one point, Barbara made the following suggestion: “I think if the issue is ‘intensity’ [emphasis mine], spreading the course out makes sense! James’s proposal looks like a reasonable one to me while aligning it to the term structure!” (Barbara, File 108). In this case, the notion of intensity—the amount of time and energy that may be required of the learner—was advanced as an evaluative criterion with which to facilitate decision-making. The Task Force agreed with the logic put forward and the decision was made.

In the 3rd edition of The Program Evaluation Standards (Yarbrough et al., 2010) standard A4 (Explicit Program and Context Descriptions) and E1 (Evaluation Documentation) specify the importance of constructing a description of both the program being evaluated and the efforts used to fulfill the purpose for the evaluation. In developmental evaluation a record of valuing-in-action would serve, at least in part, the intention of E1. Satisfying the intention of A4 is not as simple in developmental evaluation given the program does not yet exist. The content of the valuing-in-action record could, however, provide a detailed description of the values underpinning the decisions that allowed program development to progress.

understanding why people are vulnerable to making systematic errors in the way they reason. *Fast thinking* refers to knowledge that is grounded in experience, association and practice. Each Task Force member was selected to participate in the development of DEI because of his or her background. Individual expertise was considered important for the task. Deferring or at least weighing the experiences and ideas of others in the group during decision making would be a form of fast thinking. In this context fast thinking could be viewed as a natural strategy for helping the Task Force make continuous progress in program development given this task represented only a small portion of everyone’s workload. Fast thinking can thus be interpreted as trusting in the value of the ideas, intuitions and experiences of both individuals and the collective for decision-making. In contrast, *slow thinking* “focuses attention on problems that demand concentration” (p. 104). Fast thinking operates automatically whereas slow thinking is mobilized when the expected consequences from our decisions do not play out as expected. In these moments of “disturbance” (p. 105), while slow thinking, “directs attention and searches memory for an explanatory story”. Valuing-in-action allows for the creation of a record of expected consequences. In the face of a disappointment or unexpected consequence in program implementation or outcomes, this record might also yield data about the usefulness of assumptions, judgments and experiences that were embedded in the context of program design.

**Theme III – Designer Thinking in Service of Program Development.**

The primary contribution to being design-informed in this developmental evaluation had been to foster perspective-taking during program development. Attention to how end-users might come to experience the program came to be fostered through
collaboration. Barbara’s reflection on the process illustrates this idea: “Helen and I planned our [DEI course] from a content orientation. We were making decisions about what [we think] they need, instead of thinking about the kinds of experiences that they would need to develop” (June 4, 2014, File 52). In design thinking, this change in perspective, from that of the provider’s to that of the user’s, is subtle but instrumental toward developing a program which will ultimately be experienced by its user. The design orientation, with its natural emphasis on end-users, invited the Task Force to come to understand the program in a different light.

In promoting a user’s perspective, discussion and decision-making re-centered from what was the de facto perspective—the provider’s—to that of the user’s. By attending to both perspectives, examination and evaluation into emerging program decisions became more robust. Insights came to the surface and flaws were revealed. The end result of which was enabling a more informed, user-aware approach to making decisions about the emerging program.

Critical to that end were discussions around user experiences as facilitated by design exercises like Journey Mapping and User Persona. Similar in function to modeling the program logic in an evaluation, these exercises offered program developers tangible ways to inquire into their evolving program. In the process, they were able to draw upon and integrate their tacit understanding and emerging findings and insights from the evaluation to better think about and make decisions regarding the program. Framed differently, design exercises offer to evaluators a means with which to engage in evaluative thinking and promote evaluation utilization.
This design-informed developmental evaluation provided me with opportunities, albeit limited, to test out design exercises in a developmental evaluation context. I learned that design exercises require careful introduction for them to be useful and meaningful. Design exercises should be matched to the warranted need of the program developers, as determined through deliberate study of the ongoing development process. Designer exercises should be integrated into the design-informed evaluation processes, as a form of inquiry, and not as standalone, drop-in exercises. My experiences contrast how the design literature positions the use of design exercises in social innovation initiatives (IDEO, 2011; Brown, 2009; Stickdorn & Schneider, 2011), which tends suggest context-free applications.

In sum, being design-informed brings to developmental evaluation a different orientation with which to frame the evaluative inquiry. What appears to support their complementarity is the contribution that each plays in service of program development. If developmental evaluation may be conceptualized in terms of providing the means with which to engage in inquiry about a developing program to generate insights and lesson-learned from action, then being design-informed offers to the developmental evaluation a means with which to act upon insight learned. This reciprocal relationship to design and developmental evaluation is illustrated in Figure 15. In this fashion, the fuller potential of design-informed developmental evaluation can be better understood.
Figure 16. The reciprocal relationship to design and developmental evaluation as situated within a context of program development.

Theme IV – Narrative as a Method for Advancing Professional Learning about Developmental Evaluation

As the field of evaluation continues to diversify, the charge to evaluators is to become more self-aware of their contributions to the evaluation processes and outcomes they are supporting (CES, 2010; Stevahn, King, Ghere, & Minnema, 2005; Patton, 2008; Yarbrough, Shulha, Hopson, & Caruthers, 2011). Given the recent introduction and adoption of the developmental approach to evaluation, there is a need not only for examples of practice but insights into the complexity of practice from those attempting to develop expertise (e.g., Christie, 2012). The call to improve professional practice has often been articulated in terms of becoming a reflective practitioner. Stevahn, King, Ghere and Minnema (2005) described what that might look like for evaluators: “Similar to engaging in metacognition, evaluators benefit from the following: being acutely aware
of personal evaluation preferences, strengths, and limitations; self-monitoring the results of actions intended to facilitate effective evaluation studies; and planning how to enhance future endeavors” (p 46). Narrative inquiry provides a method to develop reflective evaluators.

The Canadian Evaluation Society’s *Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practices* (2010) makes explicit the call for *reflective practice*. The competent evaluator is to focus “on the fundamental norms and values underlying evaluation practice and awareness of one’s evaluation expertise and needs for growth” (Canadian Evaluation Society, p. 3) Similar charges are set out in the 3rd edition of *The Program Evaluation Standards* (Yarbrough et al., 2010) in which evaluators are reminded that reflection is a central activity for building accountability into their practice “At its core, attention to evaluation accountability encourages reflection and a metaevaluative perspective in evaluators and evaluation users” (p 227).

Narrative inquiry—as a distinct practice from reflective inquiry—enables reflective inquiry. Charles Downey and Jean Clandinin (2010) noted four important distinctions between reflective inquiry and narrative inquiry: situation, method, the place of unexpectedness, and perspective. Table 8, below, offers a digest of the differences.
### Table 8

**A overview to the nuanced distinctions between reflective inquiry and narrative inquiry**

draw from Downey & Clandinin (2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Reflective Inquiry</th>
<th>Narrative Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focuses on the “problem of a problematic situation” (Schön, 1995), i.e., the inquiry “focuses on a particular situation set within a particular context” (, p. 388)</td>
<td>Takes one’s story as the situation; attention is paid to the many places and times visited in the unfolding story. Emphasis is placed on exploring the layered complexity of a situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method:</td>
<td>Inquiry starts “in a puzzling around concrete situations with an intention that this will lead to change in the understanding of a situation” (p. 389)</td>
<td>The starting point “is an attempt to understand an unfolding life in all of its temporal social, cultural, and contextual complexity as a means to better understand concrete situation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus, or what Downey and Clandinin termed as the “place of unexpectedness”:</td>
<td>Reflective inquiry focuses in on a particularly problematic situation, aiming to better frame, understand, and to some degree solve a particular problem, while simultaneously honing our more generic ability to solve problems. The translation of what is learned from solving any particular problem into a more generic “this is how to solve problems” form is crucial here. (p. 390)</td>
<td>Because a situation is understood to be situated in other situations, in layered and interlinked ways, “narrative inquiry focuses out from any one situation to see peripherally the many situations that compose a life (Bateson 1994). The process of looking across the many stories that compose a life fosters its own form of unexpectedness, one brought on by seeing not only how we have gone about composing a life, but also how we might now go about composing it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Downey and Clandinin (2010) pointed out, the distinctions are nuanced but meaningful in a context of trying to understand professional action. Professional reflection, at its best, invokes a rigorous way of thinking and experimenting around the naming of a problem or question in order to interpret experience, make meaning of behaviours and improve practice (Rogers, 2002). Rogers is also clear that “in community with others, the learner will broaden his or her understanding of an experience beyond where it might go in isolation (p. 863). The community Rogers is referring to, however, is one made up of peers or colleagues who may offer professional insight. Except for the rare occasions where developers can afford a team of developmental evaluators (see, for
example, Lam, et al., 2015) the closest community for developmental evaluators is likely to be the team of program developers.

This study shows how narrative inquiry can offer a method to engage in and cultivate reflective practice. The construction of the narrative required many data collection and analysis strategies, observation, documentation, interviewing, and reflection. Inquiring narratively provided a more rounded pool of data from which to draw insights. In this case the community that had the most influence in shaping the emergent meanings about developmental evaluation was the Task Force itself. While there have been significant efforts to understand the meaning of a collaborative approach to evaluation from an evaluator perspective (Shulha, et al., 2016), a narrative approach to professional learning around developmental evaluation integrates the experiences and perspectives of evaluation users, in this case program developers, in shaping professional learning.

Adopting a narrative stance to inquiry allowed me to remain sensitive to the changing demands of my role as a developmental evaluator and to attend to the interplay between program developments and the context for these developments. It also required that I take note of my own knowledge, skills, competencies, and reactions as these became situated within the history and a trajectory of this evaluation. The insights from this continually emerging and interwoven narrative informed my evaluation decision-making and the account of the design-informed developmental evaluation provided in Chapter 4.

In conducting this narrative inquiry, I remained attentive to how theory and practice might be mutually informing. The values and principles guiding my practice
(Patton, 2016a) were used as an important resource when weighing decisions about my next steps. In doing so, I was able to develop a deeper understanding of both the nuances inherent in the principles, the possibilities and the constraints in enacting them. While I was not always able to conduct the evaluation in the way I had anticipated, my behaviours remained purposeful and defensible. I found that in inquiring narratively, the perspectives and experiences of both the evaluator and evaluation participants (evaluation clients, stakeholders, users) can be interrogated, made explicit, and synthesized into a deeper, holistic understanding of the evaluation. In doing so, I was cultivating attentiveness to both theory and practice. Being able to work at the interface of evaluation theory and practice in this intimate, reciprocal manner may have important applications in future professional learning about developmental evaluation.

The act of retelling the evaluation provided the entry points I needed to better understand the evaluation holistically beyond my own experience and perspective. I had to integrate my experience as the evaluator with the experiences of Task Force members and understand our behaviours as a function of the context in which we found ourselves working together. In making connections among the events that had taken place, I had to assess how well the evidence supported the structure and substance of the story. The narrative itself served as a source of data for answering my two research questions in that it exposed the extent to which my work qualified as developmental evaluation and the ways in which designerly thinking came to be interrogated and clarified as I navigated and shaped a design-informed evaluation.

The act of writing revealed new understandings around my entry into this project as a developmental evaluator and showed how my status influenced my role and my
efforts to lead developmental evaluation activities. I also learned from the writing about
the complexity and importance of valuing-in-action and how documenting the valuing
process has to potential to help program developers be both explicit about what it is they
value as they progress with their work and to revisit the assumptions, judgments or
experiences that lead to unanticipated and unwanted consequences in the program’s
development or enactment.

Summary

This study into design-informed developmental evaluation produced a narrative of
how I initially conceptualized the task and how this conceptualization changed and was
implemented over time. This dissertation documents a method for both conducting a
developmental evaluation that draws on design thinking, I provided specific detail on
how to manage the diverse data that is generated and how this data can be analyzed to
unearth the critical developmental episodes that benchmark the path to innovative
program development. From these efforts I have learned how important it is to match my
efforts at conducting evaluation rigorously with close attention to both the knowledge
bases informing my practices and the responses of those with whom I am working. Doing
so enabled me to understand my own behaviours, my influence, or lack thereof, and most
importantly, my reactions, when working with program developers. From this
experience, and through this growing self-awareness, I feel better able to be agile,
pivoting and adaptive in the service of innovative program development. I invite others
interested in developmental evaluation to draw from this research any insights that can
continue to move the theory and practice of developmental evaluation forward.
Boundaries of Study

While this study has yielded insights into developmental evaluation, there are some inherent constraints to this study. The first constraint relates to the position I occupy within the study. This study has been approached from the perspective of the developmental evaluator as I attempted to understand and unpack the potential contribution of design in developmental evaluation. And because I assumed the dual role of also the researcher, I was able to readily incorporate the evaluator’s perspective into the research. The downside was that I may not be privy to some aspects and considerations of program development, such as budgeting or staffing considerations and other strategic considerations within the program because of my role as the developmental evaluator.

Another constraint related to the multiple identities that shaped my participation as the evaluator of this case. Not only was I the developmental evaluator, I was also a doctoral student, a supervisee, a graduate of the program, and a researcher. I was also a young, male, non-teacher educator. These were identities, among others, that shaped how I construed my self-identify and my interactions with the world. They, in turn, shaped how others interact with me.

A third constraint is an epistemological one. It is recognized that there are limits to knowledge about complex systems (Maguire, McKelvey, Mirabeau, & Öztas, 2006). All attempts at working with complex systems require a degree of reduction. This takes the form, for example, in establishing system boundary (what gets included and excluded), decisions about what is to be analyzed within the system, and the inherent
challenges around the use of language to represent the manifold interaction within systems and dynamics over time.

A related constraint of this study is the complexity associated with the nested nature of the study; the evaluation was nested within the research. Given that I was at once the researcher and the evaluator in this study, the conceptual and behaviour boundaries became murky at times. I found myself struggling with “changing hats”, that is, defining clearly at which level—research or evaluation—I was operating. While my efforts as an evaluator was guided by professional principles and standards, it is conceivable that my reflection and interpretation on my own work did include some “blindspots”. This was likely despite having had some practice conducting studies of such kind (e.g., Lam & Shulha, 2015). During the evaluation, I found it helpful in resolving this ambiguity by referring to those frameworks intended to guide evaluation practice (e.g, AEA, 2004; CES, 2010; Yarbrough, Shulha, Hopson, & Caruthers, 2011). During the research, I found it helpful to have approached the research in the way I did and adopting those provisions intended to enhance the trustworthiness of the study. These strategies helped with providing some distance between the research and the evaluation during the respective phases of the study.

Recently, I was made aware of a further methodological option for mitigating the aforementioned constraint, and that is by employing a third-party facilitator to assume the research functions while the evaluation was ongoing. In this study, a colleague trained in the qualitative methods could have conducted the mid-evaluation and post-evaluation evaluation with both the program developers and me. Introducing such a facilitator into the study could have facilitated my observation and reflection (while in the role of the
evaluator) of the process and outcomes of the evaluation as it unfolded. This data could be compared to reflections I made about my own assumptions, motivations, and behaviours, as well as, those of the program developers. Moreover, this facilitator could offer his/her own independent observation of the evaluation, enriching the study as a result. This method for increasing trustworthiness of the narrative and additional findings, however, highlights a fourth constraint.

Conducting research on developmental evaluation when you are both the evaluator and the researcher compounds the amount of time, energy, and data management required. Rather than having a singular focus of attention, i.e., the development of a program, the evaluator-researcher must make a systematic effort to collect and analyze data, from multiple sources, about the processes and products of the evaluation as these emerge in the practice. The strength of this research on evaluation approach is that it is more than a retrospective self-report of the evaluator and his experiences in conducting a developmental evaluation. The integration of multiple perspectives into a synthesis of the case adds to the veracity of the findings and knowledge generated.

It is important that the field continue to expand on empirical approaches to researching evaluation in ways that can yield insights into the understandings and experiences of the clients of evaluation. This study showcases just one possibility. As an alternative, evaluation researchers may wish to consider paring with an interested developmental evaluator to pursue an inquiry jointly. This would require that the individual taking on the role of developmental evaluator be confident enough to have their efforts observed and their decision making documented (and questioned), and that
the setting where the evaluator/researcher team is operating value the generation and publication of knowledge about evaluation.

**Significance of Study**

This study adds to a growing body of empirical literature on developmental evaluation. In marshaling evidence and studying the experiences of an evaluation systematically, rigourously, and in depth, the theories and practice of developmental evaluation came to be interrogated and substantiated in the process. This study makes public the processes and outcomes of a developmental evaluation. The work serves scholarly and public interests by both informing and inspiring confidence among program funders, sponsors, staff, and the public the usefulness and veracity of adopting a developmental approach to evaluating programs as they develop. They are free to draw implications from this study to their situation.

In conducting the study, methodologies for conducting *research on evaluation* came to be refined. In tying narrative inquiry to case study, I showed one way with which the unfolding development of the evaluation may be married with multiple perspectives of stakeholders (including that of the evaluator’s) to produce a holistic account and understanding of an evaluation. This study also adds to a growing body of case-based study, a popular methodology to understanding developmental evaluations (e.g., Patton, McKegg, & Weihipeihana, 2016).

Beyond methodological advancement, this study adds to the field’s understanding of developmental evaluation. It illustrates the complexity of enacting the guiding principles of developmental evaluation. The themes that had emerged out of this work—authority, positionality, multiple-identities, intersectionality, professional humility,
theory-and-practice as mutually reinforcing, reflective professional practice—shed light on what may be critical practice anchors as evaluators assume developmental evaluation, not as an end in itself, but in service of program development. At the same time, it raises implications to how the field might construe quality conduct and practices specifically in the areas of developmental evaluation, client-evaluator collaboration, and standards-setting in evaluation generally.

Informing developmental evaluation through design opens up a range of possibilities with which to focus and guide evaluation and collaboration. Investigating this topic is timely. Over the past few years, design has become an emerging focus within the North American community of evaluators, first with the founding of the Program Design Topic Interest Group in 2013 and most recently with the announcement of the theme to the upcoming 2016 American Evaluation Association annual conference, “Evaluation + Design”. The theme centers on three ways in which design intersects with evaluation: evaluation design, program design, and information design. As the field begins to grapple with design and evaluation, this study stands to inform the conversation in two of the three areas: evaluation design and program design.

Finally, it is hoped that this study has made a genuine contribution to the work of those developers with whom I collaborated and who participated in this study so willingly.

**Future Directions**

Future research should focus on bringing greater clarity and understanding into the nuances of conducting developmental evaluation in diverse contexts. Specifically, the interplay between evaluator identities and context, the ways in which client expectations
and organization culture shape evaluation processes and outcomes are both important issues to investigate further. A study of this kind also has the potential to lead to expansion of the guiding principles of developmental evaluation. How principles of developmental evaluation articulate with principles to collaborative approaches to evaluation may also be an important extension of this line of research. Doing so should yield a richer, most robust theory of practice. Building on the themes and findings of this research should provide a meaningful starting point.

Future research should also further study how design might inform developmental evaluation. The experience of this case suggests that design requires careful, and intentional integration into existing processes and in agenda that is not necessarily within the evaluator’s control. A better understanding into those factors that might enable or facilitate design integration into developmental evaluation is needed. Beyond that, there exists a general need to better understand the utility, feasibility, and consequences of design exercises beyond the few examined in this study.
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Appendix A: Ethics Considerations

All data informing this study were collected under the purview of research protocol (GEDUC-692-13; ROMEO # 6010661). The protocol was reviewed and approved by the General Ethics Review Board at Queen’s University (Appendix D). Participants were invited to participate in this research study on a voluntary basis (see Appendix B for the Letter of Information). A Letter of Information detailed the purpose of the research, participants’ obligations, as well as, other considerations related to research ethics. The provisioning and their signing of a consent form (Appendix C) evidenced informed consent.
Appendix B: Letter of Information

Towards a Theory of Design-Informed Program Evaluation
Phase One Study: Design and Early Implementation

Letter of Information

This research is being conducted by Chi Yan Lam under the supervision of Dr. Lyn Shulha in the Faculty of Education, at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines and Queen’s policies.

What is this study about? The purpose of this study is to investigate the potential contributions design theory and design methods could make to inform program evaluation practices. Specifically, I am interested in understanding the utility, feasibility, and consequences of applying design to developmental evaluation to facilitate innovative program development.

What role do I play? Over the course of developing the Master’s Degree in Education for Professionals program, I will be serving in the capacity of an evaluator. For purposes of evaluation and program development, I will be documenting deliberations about program development, as well as, the actual process of developing the program. I would be tracking decisions made of the program using a variety of documentary techniques, such as note-taking (meeting records), audio (recordings of meetings), and visual techniques (e.g. photographs of group processes). During the evaluation, I will also invite you to participate in periodic follow-up interviews. On all occasions where photographs are taken, the purpose(s) will be made clear to you. Purposes could include, but are not constrained to (a) the desire for a visual record of program development activities, (b) for program marketing, or (c) for research on the contributions of design-informed developmental evaluation. At no time will data be collected about your personal characteristics or background. At a later point, the development of the program will be revisited for purposes of research. You are invited to consent to the use of data that will be generated over the course of your participation in the development project for purposes of research. Participation in this study will require no additional time on your part, other than the time you’ve already committed towards the development of the Master’s Degree in Education for Professionals program. The periodic follow-up interviews are estimated to require approximately 15 minutes of your time, for approximately 3 times over the course of this project. There are no known physical, psychological, economic, or social risks associated with this study. This will be the only time that you will be asked to participate in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary. You should not feel obliged to answer any question you find objectionable or that makes you feel uncomfortable. You are free to withdraw from the study with no adverse effects on any contractual or other relationships with the investigator, or any future involvement with the institution. All documentation and artifacts collected during Development Task Force meetings and sponsored activities are intended to support the research. They can be edited or withdrawn by participants, without pressure, in order to protect their rights and integrity. Over the course of the development, you may “flag” any pieces of information to be excluded from the research. You will have the opportunity to review any data for exclusion associated with your involvement prior to the start of data analysis. You can withdraw by contacting the researcher at the earliest opportunity and respective data will be removed, if possible.

What will happen to my responses? We will keep your responses confidential to the extent possible. All data will be digitized, catalogued, coded, and de-identified. Again, you will have the opportunity to review any data for exclusion associated with your involvement prior to the start of data analysis. Further, only members of the research team will have access to the data, although these data may also be made available for subsequent secondary analyses. Any publication or presentation of the findings will not identify the names of participants or the university. Short quotes may be used, but will be carefully selected so as not to breach individual confidentiality.
What’s in it for me? Should you choose to participate in this study, you will be helping to refine the processes around the continual development of the Master’s Degree in Education for Professionals program. You will also be contributing to a growing area of research and theoretical development around developmental evaluation, as it relates to facilitating innovative program development. Should you be interested, a copy of the findings will be sent to you when the study is completed. In accordance with Queen’s policy, data will be retained for a minimum of five years and may be retained indefinitely for the purposes of secondary analysis.

What if I have concerns? Any questions about study participation may be directed to Chi Yan Lam (chi.lam@queensu.ca), or my supervisor, Dr. Lyn Shulha (613-533-6000 X 75016; lyn.shulha@queensu.ca). Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at 613-533-6081 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.

Thank you.
Appendix C: Consent Form

Towards a Theory of Design-Informed Program Evaluation:
Phase One Study: Design and Early Implementation

Letter of Consent

Name (please print clearly): ________________________________________

1. I have read the Letter of Information and have had any questions answered to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that I will be participating in the study called “Towards a Theory of Design-Informed Program Evaluation”. The purpose of this study is to investigate the potential contributions design theory and design methods could make to inform program evaluation practices. Over the course of developing the Master’s Degree in Education for Professionals program, the researcher will be serving in the capacity of an evaluator. For purposes of evaluation and program development, researcher will be documenting deliberations about program development, as well as, the actual process of developing the program. The researcher would be tracking decisions made of the program using a variety of documentary techniques, such as note-taking (meeting records), audio (recordings of meetings), and visual techniques (e.g. photographs of group processes). During the evaluation, the researcher will also invite you to participate in periodic follow-interviews. On occasions where photographs are taken, the purpose(s) will be made clear to you. Purposes could include, but are not constrained to (a) the desire for a visual record of program development activities, (b) for program marketing, or (c) for research on the contributions of design-informed developmental evaluation. At no time will data be collected about your personal characteristics or background. At a later point, the development of the program will be revisited for purposes of research. I am consenting to the use of data that will be generated over the course of my participation in the development project for purposes of research.

3. I understand that every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of the data now and in the future to the extent possible.

4. I understand that I will have the opportunity to exclude from this study any particular pieces of information that I do not wish to be included in accordance to the provisions listed under the Letter of Information.

5. I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time without any adverse personal effect. If I withdraw, I understand that I can request removal of all or part of my data; if I so request, all such data will be destroyed. I am free to withdraw from the study with no adverse effects on any contractual or other relationships with the investigator, or my future involvement with the institution. Only members of the research team will have access to the data. The results will be published in professional journals, presented at scientific conferences, or disseminated through other academic means (e.g. research findings web site), but any such presentations will be of general findings, which in some instances will be illustrated by short quotes that will be carefully selected so as not to breach individual confidentiality. I understand my confidentiality will be protected to the extent possible. I understand that I will be sent a copy of the results if I wish.

6. Any questions about study participation may be directed to Chi Yan Lam (Primary Investigator, chi.lam@queensu.ca) or my supervisor, Dr. Lyn Shulha (613-533-6000 X 75016; lyn.shulha@queensu.ca). Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at 613-533-6081 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.
7. Please sign one copy of this Consent Form and return to the researcher. Retain the second copy for your records.

I have read the above statements and freely consent to participate in this research.

___ I agree to being photographed
___ I wish our Faculty of Education to be identified in the publication of this research

Signature: ___________________________ Date: _______________________

If you would like to receive a copy of the study’s results, please provide your e-mail address here:

_________________________________________
Appendix D: Ethics Clearance

August 19, 2013

Mr. Chu Yan Lam
Ph.D. Candidate
Faculty of Education
Duncan McArthur Hall
Queen’s University
511 Union Street
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6

GREB Ref #: GEDUC-692-13; Romeo # 6010661
Title: ‘GEDUC-692-13 Towards a Theory of Design-Informed Program Evaluation: Phase One Study: Design and Early Implementation’

Dear Mr. Lam,

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled "GEDUC-692-13 Towards a Theory of Design-Informed Program Evaluation; Phase One Study: Design and Early Implementation" for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCPS) and Queen’s ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (article B.1.6) and Senate Terms of Reference (article G), your project has been cleared for one year. At the end of each year, the GREB will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB, with a copy to your unit REB, of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period. (access this form at https://serves.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Adverse Event Report). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example, you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To make an amendment, access the application at https://serves.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Amendment to Approved Study Form. These changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Gill Irving, at the Office of Research Services or irvingg@queensu.ca for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair, General Research Ethics Board

c: Dr. Lysa Shulha, Faculty Supervisor
Dr. Don King, Chair, Unit REB
Erin Wicklum, o/o Graduate Studies and Bureau of Research
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Lam, Chi Yan

has completed the Queen's University online Course in Human Research Participant Protection (CHRPP).
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Appendix F: List of Files Reviewed for Analysis

1 20130624_0026_DEI.mp3
2 20130626_0029_TRIO_Kenneth chi Donna.mp3
3 20130718_DEI_chi_Barbara.m4a
4 20130828_0031.mp3
5 20130903_0033.mp3
6 20130916_0036.mp3
7 20130918_0037.mp3
8 20131010_0038.mp3
9 20131017_DEI Mtg over skype.m4a .m4a
10 20131024_0039.mp3
13 20131128_0040_DEI_TF.mp3
14 20131203_DEI meeting with instructor.m4a
15 20140114_0042_DEI_TF.mp3
16 20140211_0043.mp3
17 20140318_TF Meeting_iphone copy.m4a
18 20140409__TF MEETING FILLER ___ absent.m4a
20 20140529_0052_DEI_TF.mp3
21 20140624_0057.mp3
22 20140617_0056_DEI_TF.mp3
23 20140725_0058.mp3
24 20140915_0064_TFMtg.mp3
25 20141110_0071.mp3
26 20141204_0072.mp3
27 20131031_meeting with Barbara to talk dissertation.m4a
28 20140602_chi_Helen.m4a
29 20140603_0053_DEI-Barbara chi Kenneth.mp3
30 20140603_0054_DEI_S.mp3
31 20130624_reflection.docx
32 20130903_chiRole.pdf
34 **20130918_Synthesis of Design Discussions.docx
35 20131030_course designer work sesh.docx
36 **20131029_course designer work sesh .docx
37 20131127_nov27TacticalObservation.docx
38 20140114_notes.docx
39 20140121_DEI __ assessment thinking.docx
40 20140306_MDEP MandE Plan.docx
41 20140414_Thinking about DEI Variation on a Theme .pdf
42 20140522_journeymap.pdf
43 20140524_Reflections on parsing these notes.docx
44 **20140524_DEI Update May 2014 chi.lam@queensu.ca.pdf
46 20140602_chi_M.docx
47 20140603_0055_chi Kenneth Barbara M.mp3
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84 20140908_scheduleLisaPatricia.pdf
85 20140821_Agenda_august_2014_fromRR.docx
86 20140818_emergentquestionsfrominstructors.pdf
87 20140813_KENNETH_prep for 21_9.pdf
88 20140813_KENNETH_prep for 21_8.pdf
89 20140813_KENNETH_prep for 21_7.pdf
90 20140813_KENNETH_prep for 21_6.pdf
91 20140813_KENNETH_prep for 21_5.pdf
## Appendix G: Timeline of Key Developmental Episodes

Note: Episodes are organized in reverse chronological order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Episode</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Task Force Meetings</th>
<th>Webinar</th>
<th>DEI/MD EP course designers mtg</th>
<th>Evaluation -Focused meetings</th>
<th>Notes on summary of Situation (Context, Issues and Topics of discussion; resolution &amp; decisions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 4, 2014</td>
<td>20141204_0072.mp3 DEI DEI debrief_expert_slidesonly.pdf</td>
<td>Task force meeting (debrief of developmental eval)</td>
<td>Task force meeting (debrief of developmental eval)</td>
<td>- Debriefed developmental evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 12, 2014</td>
<td>20141112_DEIsummer.pdf</td>
<td>Summer Eval Presentation on data to MDEP inst. H L Donna Barbara</td>
<td>PRESENTATION with DEI instructors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 2014</td>
<td>20140702_design DEI eval.docx</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td>FIRST TF after the summer. (1) summer student experiences (2) program model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 22, 2014</td>
<td>20141022_DEI Evaluation Update and DEI Eval.pdf</td>
<td>emailed TF to learn about how they would preferred to be debriefed; focus was on ensuring evaluation use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 18, 2014</td>
<td>20140918_courseproposal2.pdf</td>
<td>Mtg with Lisa and Patricia to work on journey map</td>
<td>Cautioned about the existence of DEI approval documents online.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 18, 2014</td>
<td>20140918_0069_LISA_PATRICIA.mp3</td>
<td>Mtg with Lisa and Patricia to work on journey map</td>
<td>Met with PATRICIA and LISA to work on a journey map — my intention was to capture the program as implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 15, 2014</td>
<td>20140915_Chi’s Update to DEI Task Force.docx</td>
<td>I noted in my briefing an update of the evaluation, and a summary of the what has been learned from the Summer Instructor Debrief.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 15, 2014</td>
<td>20140915_0064_TFMtg.mp3</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td>We’re beginning to learn about deficiencies in the current program design. (1) Assessment policy (2) CYL reported on evaluation progress and emergent findings! Talk about rapid feedback. Despite these ‘revelations’, we are nevertheless experiencing much inertia (due to resource constraints, etc). I included a cautionary note.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 8, 2014</td>
<td>20140908_scheduleLisaPATRICIA.pdf</td>
<td>Booking time with LISA and PATRICIA to finish journey map.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>File Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 21, 2014</td>
<td>20140821_e-mail to inst letter.docx</td>
<td>CYL provided a summary and analysis of situation of the debrief meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 19, 2014</td>
<td>20140821_A genda august 2014_fromR R.docx</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR DEBRIEF MEETING. (1) Our Community (2) Feedback from LISA and KENNETH. (3) Q&amp;A Chi (4) what next. video intro.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 18, 2014</td>
<td>20140818_e mergentques tionsfrominst rutors.pdf</td>
<td>CYL reported on what I had learned from talking with people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 13, 2014</td>
<td>20140813_K ENNETH_pr ep for 21_1.pdf</td>
<td>Co-constructing agenda for the instructor debrief session. The audience would be incoming instructors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 11, 2014</td>
<td>20140811_ MDEP approval.pdf</td>
<td>MDEP approved!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 5, 2014</td>
<td>20140805_D ElEval Intro letter.docx</td>
<td>I finally have evaluation plan designed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 5, 2014</td>
<td>20140805_C an we begin to develop a survey which we can use to track over time.docx</td>
<td>Interviewed DEI students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 5, 2014</td>
<td>20140805_C an we begin to develop a survey which we can use to track over time.docx</td>
<td>Interviewed DEI students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 29, 2014</td>
<td>20140729_D ElSurvey.docx</td>
<td>Created survey items to be used in evaluation. Got turned down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 25, 2014</td>
<td>20140725_0 058.mp3</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 18, 2014</td>
<td>20140728_L ISA course report_00.pdf</td>
<td>(1) admission number briefing (2) program structure; (3)Program tracks and specializations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 18, 2014</td>
<td>see also: 20140718_o nline program marketing plan_chi.doc x</td>
<td>I also took a peek at the two online courses. Have been staying out of them mostly. Invited the instructors to provide preliminary responses on early successes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 10, 2014</td>
<td>20140710__ 4URGENT FallWinter Program Structure and Review Draft Marketing and Communicat ions Plan for Online Programs.pdf</td>
<td>LISA asked TF to think about program structure. PATRICIA circulated marketing and comm plan!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>File Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 8, 2014</td>
<td>20140708_course_access.png</td>
<td>I also had to ask to be added to the courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2, 2014</td>
<td>20140702_leadership3.pdf</td>
<td>CYL learned that everyone was on leave. Unsure who is leading. Needed authorization to launch eval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2, 2014</td>
<td>20140702_design_DEI_eval.docx</td>
<td>CYL added to the secret sauce conversation, by proposing an articulation of the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2, 2014</td>
<td>20140702_design_DEI_eval.docx</td>
<td>I published the evaluation design for the summer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 24, 2014</td>
<td>20140624_057.mp3</td>
<td>PATRICIA proposed marketing plan. “secret sauce”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 24, 2014</td>
<td>20140624_Plan_for_June_24.docx</td>
<td>I noted a few things I wanted to do with my air time. To really get TF to consider what they would really want to learn about, now that I have collected and reflected ideas back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 23, 2014</td>
<td>20140623_DIEL_research_1.pdf</td>
<td>KENNETH asks TF to update their profile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 19, 2014</td>
<td>20140619_Updation_your_D2L_Profile_Actio_n_Required.pdf</td>
<td>In this meeting we were debating the logistics of the my-community space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 17, 2014</td>
<td>20140617_056_DEI_TF.mp3</td>
<td>ethics amendment had gone in to widen the scope of inquiry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 13, 2014</td>
<td>20140613_ethicsamendment2.png</td>
<td>Barbara talked about what she has learned from working on this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 3, 2014</td>
<td>20140604_chat_with_Barbara.docx</td>
<td>pre-launch meeting w/ LISA KENNETH LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1, 2014</td>
<td>20140601_Business_School_Disrupted_NYTimescom.pdf</td>
<td>Chi circulated an article from HBR on how b-schools are leveraging online learning to rethink their model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29, 2014</td>
<td>20140529_052_DEI_TF.mp3</td>
<td>(1) Community Space (1.5) Academic Integrity (2) CYL reporting on what had been learned from summer evaluation planning (3) Introduced the journey Mapping exercise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 2014</td>
<td>20140524_R</td>
<td>Notes on TF’s ideas about program development and perceive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid May, 2014</td>
<td>reflections on parsing these notes.docx needs to learn about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2014</td>
<td>20140503_OISE is phasing out bachelor of education degree The Globe and Mail_1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2014</td>
<td>20140501_KENNETH collaboration_1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 30, 2014</td>
<td>20140430_customer inquiry.png</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 29, 2014</td>
<td>Webinar with Barbara and Kenneth. Planning on 29.delivery on 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 14, 2014</td>
<td>20140414_THinking about DEI Variation on a Theme_.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 13, 2014</td>
<td>20140413_Tomorrow's Professor eNewsletter 1322 Concerns and Opportunities for Online Student Retention_1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 9, 2014</td>
<td>20140409_DEI Task Force meeting.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 18, 2014</td>
<td>20140318_TF Meeting_iphone copy.m4a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 6, 2014</td>
<td>20140306_MDEP MandE Plan.docx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eval planning with individual members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi forwarded out an article re: FacultyA program model. Invited group to consider what implication these market shift might hold for us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi reached out to explore potential collaboration opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi responding to inquiry from clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning for webinar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I initiated a thread to push the group to think more about how DEI is being conceptualized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donna forwarded article from Tomorrow’s Professor on online learning student retention. Triggered discussions on what we ought to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>….. absent. no records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talked a lot about marketing. Noted that we should tailor our program after a pattern of need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed a M&amp;E plan, at the request of LS to supplement the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 6, 2014</td>
<td>———</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDEP External Reviewers visited our faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 21, 2014</td>
<td>20140221_DL_EI video.png</td>
<td></td>
<td>PATRICIA telling us DEI webinar video is now up; feedback incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20, 2014</td>
<td>20140220_video of Feb 15 webinar_1.png</td>
<td></td>
<td>PATRICIA and team discussing what we should and shouldn’t do with our webinars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 15, 2014</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>WEBINAR</td>
<td>KENNETH &amp; Barbara did a webinar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 14, 2014</td>
<td>20140214_an interesting look at MOOCs.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td>DONNA circulated a TED talk on MOOCs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 11, 2014</td>
<td>20140211_043.mp3</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td>This meeting really revolved around two issues. The first is marketing and finding markets for our services. Assessment came up too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 6, 2014</td>
<td>20140206_webinarprep_1.png</td>
<td>webinar prep</td>
<td>DEI Webinar Dry Run.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 30, 2014</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>webinar prep</td>
<td>DEI Webinar Dry Run. We met outside in the hallway and we tested the platforms and decided on how to approach the task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 25, 2014</td>
<td>20140125_DL_Outline_1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td>CD circulates his draft of a course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 24, 2014</td>
<td>20140124_Assessment Feedback and grading overview D EI DRAFT_1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td>KENNETH has now crafted a policy statement on the topic of assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 23, 2014</td>
<td>20140123_Advertising DEI and MDEP pending at conference_1.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td>conference appearance planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 21</td>
<td>20140121_DL_Assessment thinking.docx</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi provided a summary of conversations on the topic of assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 17, 2014</td>
<td>20140121_Assessment notes DEIp df</td>
<td>Show and tell</td>
<td>KENNETH brought the course designers together. Assessment is a big issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 14, 2014</td>
<td>20140114_webinar_2.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara comments on webinar; comes up with independent criteria about what makes webinar good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>File Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 14, 2014</td>
<td>20140114_webinar.pdf</td>
<td>Following up on my observation attempt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 14, 2014</td>
<td>20140114_0042_DEI_TF.mp3</td>
<td>This is the first meeting where we see the introduction of James. We're still struggling a bit about this notion of a grand course, about the content, the degree of specification (what IDesign is to specify, vs what instructors), how to enable cross-talk between designers and instructors. We are picking up different threads from when we trialed ideas with course designers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 9, 2014</td>
<td>20140109_MDEP Dry run Jan 9_2.pdf</td>
<td>E-mail correspondence about planning for webinar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 3, 2013</td>
<td>201311203_DEI meeting with instructor.m 4a</td>
<td>The session was focused on helping course designers see the technology and their potential applications in learning context. Instead, KENNETH had hoped for a more high-level exploration of how technology pairs with intended learning. Also, coming out of those conversations were ideas about program components.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 28, 2013</td>
<td>20131128_0040_DEI_TF.mp3</td>
<td>1) Update about the administrative processes with getting MDEP approved. 2) Community space: we started talking Qwak, then about providing diff. avenues for participation 3) Chi reported on his observations. About the program being more than the sum of courses. I was a mole at one of the info sessions…. 4) Donna goes over the animation clip ideas. 5) Debated about the timing of courses. the number of weeks during summer vs winter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 27, 2013</td>
<td>20131127_nov27Tactical Observation.docx</td>
<td>I prepared briefing notes that outline thoughts concerning the design of the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 25, 2013</td>
<td>20131125_re commend journal.png</td>
<td>Barbara recommended a journal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, 2013</td>
<td>20131118_mole in webinar.png</td>
<td>I participated in another program’s recruitment webinar. I made notes. It informed my evaluative criterionology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 13, 2013</td>
<td>20131113_diff notions of need.pdf</td>
<td>My own notes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 8, 2013</td>
<td>20131108_DEI Course sketches and December workdesign bees_1.pdf</td>
<td>Here we see the beginning of discussions around how Dec 3 and 5th sessions could look like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 30, 2013</td>
<td>20131030_After you left_1.pdf</td>
<td>Course Designer Work Sesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 29, 2013</td>
<td>20131029_observations and Discussions from Today_1.pdf</td>
<td>Course Designer Work Session: Course Designers heard for the first time the vision of the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 24, 2013</td>
<td>20131024_0039.mp3</td>
<td>Chi/Kenneth/Donna Module structure and how tech pairs with each module. The notion of using contracts as an instrument to regulate designer behaviour came up, as a means to ensure our intentions gets translated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>File Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 22, 2013</td>
<td>20131023_QWAQ_3.pdf</td>
<td>Learning about QWAQ</td>
<td>QWAQ being advanced as a possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 17, 2013</td>
<td>20131017_DI_EI_Mtg_over_skype.m4a</td>
<td>Task force meeting</td>
<td>1) course designer roles all filled. 2) LISA update about timeline. 3) KENNETH debuted the 6C’s to the Task Force. 4) In reaction to KENNETH’s presentation, LS remarks that we are selling something more than content. 5) PATRICIA continues to explore ways to market the program. We contended with ideas about creating clips to introduce people to program; which i suggested could be a great marketing thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 10, 2013</td>
<td>20131010_0038.mp3</td>
<td>Chi/Kenneth/Donna #4</td>
<td>D2L vs Moodle; confirming the C’s. KENNETH trying to gain clarity into his task, to create the environments to enable others to design courses. Carving out the role distinction. (course designer/space designer/prime not prime). D2L vs moodle debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 24, 2013</td>
<td>20130924_Course_designers.pdf</td>
<td>Notice to hire for course designer has gone out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 18, 2013</td>
<td>20130918_0037.mp3</td>
<td>Chi/Kenneth/Donna #3</td>
<td>Discussed tech and learning pairing. Chi introduced M/S/W. KENNETH cautions about evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 18, 2013</td>
<td>20130918_Synthesis_of_Design_Discussions.docx</td>
<td>I prepared a synthesis of the “design discussions” to date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 17, 2013</td>
<td>20130917_2pager_1.pdf</td>
<td>PATRICIA; produced a one-pager of the program for promotional purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 16, 2013</td>
<td>20130916_0036.mp3</td>
<td>Task Force DEI Meeting #2</td>
<td>Barbara and PATRICIA both raised issues about Program identity. Barbara: is this one program or two. PATRICIA: “Why take this, and not business”. 2) Talking about Time-to-launch; staffing. 3) From a program design perspective, discussing the sequencing of experiences. 4) advertising concerns about setting Facebook ads filters (who) surfaced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 3, 2013</td>
<td>20130903_0033.mp3</td>
<td>Task Force DEI Meeting #1</td>
<td>TF met for the first time to look at the work being done and decide how to move forward. Met in the Mezzanine classroom. 1) Chi introduced DE role and responsibilities to the group. 2) KENNETH briefed the group on the C’s. 3) Initial articulation of program values, i.e., things that we care about. 4) marketing concern (prompted by advertising) PATRICIA trying to grapple with how to promote the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 3, 2013</td>
<td>20130903_c_hirole.pdf</td>
<td>Prepared a handout to introduce self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 28, 2013</td>
<td>20130828_0031.mp3</td>
<td>Chi/Kenneth/Donna #2</td>
<td>Topic of conversation continues to resolve around clarifying and elucidating what DONNA had in mind for the program. This interplay between vision&lt;---&gt;???. Conversation starting to coalesce. Chi introduced the experience analogy. 8’Cs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1, 2013</td>
<td>20130801_template.pdf</td>
<td>Wanda (CTE) giving us a few things to read about online learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 17, 2013</td>
<td>20130717_MDEP_Course_Outlines.pdf</td>
<td>(not significant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 7, 2013</td>
<td>20130707_What_is_Professional_Inquiry_and_the_DEI.docx</td>
<td>LS shared notes on what professional inquiry is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>File Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 7, 2013</td>
<td>20130707_Diploma in Educational Inquiry Marketing Notes.docx</td>
<td>Queen’s Marketing and Comm was initially going to help us, but they pulled out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 7, 2013</td>
<td>20130707_DIEL Marketing_.pdf</td>
<td>Barbara LISA PATRICIA met to discuss marketing. Wrestling with the question: what is professional inquiry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 5, 2013</td>
<td>20130705_Advise DEI Statement of Interest.pdf</td>
<td>LISA: requested advice on crafting the statement of interest portion of the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2, 2013</td>
<td>20130702_D2L The 6 Cs_03.pdf</td>
<td>First articulation of 6’Cs by KENNETH. Impress upon the importance of prototyping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 26, 2013</td>
<td>20130626_your slides.pdf</td>
<td>DONNA forwarded article to KENNETH on effective online learning practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 26, 2013</td>
<td>20130626_template.png</td>
<td>S (CTE) provided us with CTE template.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 26, 2013</td>
<td>20130626_029_TRIO_Kenneth chi Donna.mp3</td>
<td>Meeting between DONNA, KENNETH, CYL. KENNETH hired to work on conceptualizing the online learning possible within courses. We learned more about DONNA’s vision of online learning and of the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 24, 2013</td>
<td>20130624_026_DEIL.mp3</td>
<td>Description: Overall Orientation; with MDEP instructors. My first exposure to the program. Purpose: To solicit course outline proposals from potential MDEP course instructors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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July 02, 2014

DEI – Summer 2014 (Semester 1) – Evaluation Design

Program Priorities as identified for this round of evaluation
- Ensure course learning is educationally sound
- Determine congruence in expectations between program and user
- Better understand our students: motivation, needs, decision-making

Evaluation Purpose:
- Gain actionable insights to further program development in a responsive manner
- Harvest lessons-learned to inform our strategies

Evaluation Approach:
- Developmental evaluation: engaging in program evaluation to inform program development and enhance organizational capacity

Logic of Evaluation the following chart relates evaluation inquiry (if column) to its use (then column) so that data is being used strategically to inform program development (so that column).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If… (eval inquiry)</th>
<th>so that… (program concern)</th>
<th>then…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If we… understand the decision-making processes associated with committing to our</td>
<td>so that… we can enhance follow-through and better support candidates’ decision making</td>
<td>then… we can refine our marketing strategy to increase marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program and where continuity/breakage** lies in the onboarding phase of the program</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>efforts in “proven” markets and explore untapped markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Dewey’s notion of experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding Evaluation Question: What are current students and potential students’ information needs in committing to DEI?

| If we… understand our students motivation for further education, the perceived | so that… tailor our program to existing professional needs and gain a better understanding around market opportunities and | then… we can better tailor our program so that it responds to authentic professional needs |
| professional needs they have,                                                  |                                                        |                                                                     |
and what particular features of our program attracts them (worth)

Guiding Evaluation Question: To what extent is the program as it is currently being organized/designed meeting the professional aspirations of the participants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If we…</th>
<th>so that…</th>
<th>then…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>if we understand how students experience the courses and the program (merit / significance of the program)</td>
<td>We can learn about the extent to which program intentions (vision, community, 6C’s course design principles) are being enacted</td>
<td>We can tune existing program activities or develop new activities (or choose to emphasize the principles of 6C’s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding Evaluation Question: In what ways do participants experience learning within courses and the program?

---

**Evaluation Logistics**

**Scope:** Summer 2014 semester.

**Framing:** To make the evaluation a meaningful and useful exercise for our team, and especially for our students, it would be prudent to frame the inquiry properly. For that reason, the evaluation is being structured as an *educative* opportunity. It makes explicit the inquiry stance inherent in evaluation. Evaluation, conducted in this way, mirrors and models inquiry for the students.

**Basis for Design:**

This evaluation design is grounded in the pragmatics of program development. To identify relevant foci of inquiry, I drew from the following sources of information:

- program documents (program proposal, needs assessment)
- program design considerations, as tracked throughout task force meetings
- interviews with TF members to flesh out evaluation focus/design
- various evaluation design tools (Journey Mapping, Program Logic Model, stakeholder mapping)
- with reference to established theories of evaluation and design: developmental evaluation, theory-driven evaluation, program theory, utilization-focused evaluation, Program Evaluation Standards, and principles of human-centered design

**Actors and their role:**

- Task Force – to inform evaluation strategy and to act on its findings
- Assoc Dean GS&R – to provide decision-making on evaluation activities
- GS&R office and Marketing and Comm – participants in evaluation
- Chi – to facilitate the evaluation
- Students – to provide input
- Kenneth, Helen, Barbara – Instructors of courses offered this summer; to provide feedback
- ??, ?? – embedded participant observers (“plants”) to provide user-perspectives on course experience
Implementation Timeline

- Solicit input and finalize plan
- Send initial letter of invitation to students to inform program inquiry exercise
- Put a call out to course instructors to identify course-level eval needs, if any
- Send follow up letter (“disclosure”)
- Circulate pre-interview questionnaire
- organize interview
- debrief w/ course instructors
- debrief with TF
Guiding Evaluation Question: What are current students and potential students’ information needs in committing to DEI?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Program Issue</th>
<th>Data Source (who, when, where)</th>
<th>Method (instrument, timing, analysis, claim)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent do our marketing and communication activities support potential students’ decision-making?</strong> What are processes and products in place to attract, inform, and promote registration?</td>
<td>marketing/communication/program inquiry activities</td>
<td>Lisa + A Patricia</td>
<td>Working meeting with Lisa+A &amp; Patricia to identify processes; then follow up with an updated journey map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What meanings do admitted students make of their recruitment experience?</strong> How did our students come to learn about the program? What were some of their considerations in evaluating and committing to the program? What particular interactions (either from the program, products or processes, or external to the program) helped in committing students to the program?</td>
<td>Program touch points (early phase)</td>
<td>Current students</td>
<td>Pre-interview survey + interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What meaning/information do our program staff make of the processes and products?</strong> How do we go about tracking the successes and failure around recruitment? What meaning do we draw from each case? How is this data being fed back into program design?</td>
<td>Insight harvest around recruitment successes/failure</td>
<td>Lisa + A Patricia Chi</td>
<td>Working meeting with Lisa+A &amp; Patricia to identify processes; then follow up with an updated journey map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Evaluation Question: To what extent is the program as it is currently being implemented and conceptualized meeting the professional aspirations of the participants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Program Issue</th>
<th>Data Source (who, when, where)</th>
<th>Method (instrument, timing, analysis, claim)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What motivates students to seek out a program like DEI?</strong> What do students hope to get out of DEI (i.e. outcomes)? What opportunities might this open up for them? What values do students identify in a program like the DEI?</td>
<td>Anchoring program design in genuine needs</td>
<td>Enrolled students</td>
<td>Questionnaire –demographics “Semester debrief” (aka interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are students’ expectations of themselves from enrolling in this program?</strong> What are students’ expectations of the program, its staff, and its instructors? To what extent are they being met?</td>
<td>Congruence between program expectations and students’ expectations;</td>
<td>Enrolled students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do enrolled students see their early coursework and program experience as relevant (or informing) to their professional practice? What aspects of the program/courses are enabling that?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is the program currently being implemented?</strong> What are some assumptions underpinning it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding Evaluation Question: In what ways do participants experience learning within courses and the program as intended?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do program and course intentions become expressed?</td>
<td>6C’s community connection</td>
<td>Course designer-instructor</td>
<td>Identifying instances of expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do program and course intentions become enacted and experienced? How do students experience learning within courses and the program? (To what extent do they feel supported in pursuing course work? To what extent do you feel supported in the program? In what way are students being challenged constructively?)</td>
<td>6C’s community connection</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are enablers and barriers to learning and participation?</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Journaling + rapid feedback + debrief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preinterview questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix J: An example of an Analytical Proceeding (File 37)

**Analytical Proceeding**

November 27, 2013

As I sit in on conversations around the development, I pay close attention to the substance and nature of discussions, specifically for how people talk about matters of **quality** to our DEI/MDEP program. Below you will find my tactical observations to our work since my last update.

The two course designer orientation served two important purposes: 1) familiarize our course designers with their tasks and obligations (not very exciting for our purposes!), 2) allow us to prototype and reality-test whether our ‘boardroom’ decisions and intentions held any meaning among our course designers. Prior to the two meetings, Donna and Kenneth wanted to know from these meetings:

- the kinds of questions they ask of Kenneth/Donna
- the degree to which the communication was successful (Do they get it? Do they buy it? Is there something wrong with the delivery?)

My sense is that the course designers see the merit of the 6C’s and they feel prepared to tackle the task, but still want some guidance in putting the course together, esp. around the integration of ed tech and other structural issues (i.e. how modules are set to be set up… to what extent do these courses mimic our offline counterparts?)

Now, to pick up on a few ideas arising from these interactions:

- how might the 6C’s be experienced from the perspectives of our users?
- How might we bring continuity across the courses (so to create a coherent learning experience?)
- If, in fact, our program is attracting those with a high self-perceived level of technological efficacy, are we losing out on a critical market?
- **How might we imbue our DEI/MDEP program with a sense of community amongst the learners and instructors?**
  - How might we help our students (and yet-to-be students) get a feel of the strengths and uniqueness of our program? Why might we want to do this? What strategic purposes might this serve?
  - To what extent does our marketing material make explicit that the courses will help and support the learner to ‘cross professional inquiry boundaries’ and to help the learner connect to professional communities?
  - How are we involving instructors in our marketing and communication efforts? (We have talked at various points about making videos)
  - **How might we build in a “familiar rhythm” among our courses?**
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• If ‘production value’ is something that we care about, how might we build in quality media contents?

Supporting our Course Designers

• How might we support our course designers to learn about the potentials, possibilities, and applications associated with today’s technologies?

**Merit/Worth/Significance**

At present, we are operating with limited knowledge around what’s *actually* meaningful or effective about a program that has yet been implemented. Hence, the more clarity we can bring to our situation, the stronger our attempt will be at mounting a program of value to our learners (and the more likely such value will convert into $\)$. At the very least, such clarity will allow us to learn about our problem in more intelligent, focused ways. I must acknowledge the immense talent and strengths within the faculty. My job is to help us build on these assets and orient our efforts in the direction of program success.

It’s important to acknowledge that the only kind of judgments our patrons will make are of the summative kinds.
- about the learning (choice of exercise, choice of assessment;
- about the content (relevance to their learning/professional needs)
- about the technology (ease of use, intuitiveness, )
- about the time and financial resources invested
- about the ‘production value’ (so that the learning appears polished, refined, and well thought out)

Furthermore, there are other less obvious but equally important judgments:
- the degree of support in learning (e.g. navigating ed tech; instructor-led ‘disambiguation’; peer learning session)
- the extent to which they feel connected to the community (i.e. not isolated)
- the inherent frustration associated with rich, powerful, deep learning

We must also acknowledge that these summative judgments will be made throughout their enrolment in their program.

In other words, there will be high points and low points within their program participation that come to define their assessment of the quality of the program. From that insight, we might say that the strength of a program is only as the weak points.

So… how might we gain a better understanding about the high-points and low-points of the program?
Appendix K: Summary of Key Learning from the Summer First-Cycle Implementation, as Reported by Instructors

Key Learning

Overall
The meeting was productive and yielded rich information. It offered a glimpse into instructors’ needs as they ready for instruction. The meeting facilitated knowledge transfer between present and future instructors, familiarizing instructors with the program’s ethos.

Emerging issues that may warrant closer attention

Much of our discussion centered on issues related to learning expectations and the assessment of learning. Kenneth and Helen did a great job addressing the pragmatics/logistics of running and assessing a course like this. A need remains concerning clarifying—for both our instructors and students—the role of assessment in a professional-learning oriented program. Providing a illustration or exercise that walk our instructors through the assessment practices might clarify the assessment principles we operate under. There also appears to be a need to clarify grading practices.

Our instructors identified problems with the Community Space in its current state.
Some clarifying questions: What role does the Community Space serve in our program and to our participants? Is it important that the community be actively managed, with curated and original resources and content? Can it serve an educative purpose (e.g., providing tips and resources on thriving as a graduate students? Managing the stressors of online learning? Easing beginning professionals into professional learning contexts?)

How do we envision the Community working? Is it something that we want to actively sustain? Or are we okay with it taking on more of a passive mode in providing a mechanism to facilitate communication among students? Whose responsibility is it to monitor it?

Constraints of various sorts may be preventing us from acting immediate on these issues. But we may still want to look into these issues sooner rather than later because the quality of online engagement may be an important lever in our students’ determination of program quality (and ultimately, program reputation).

Emerging from the meeting are other practical learning, e.g. around structuring the mid-course consultations, the importance of consistency in course material presentation.
Many are suggestions that will need to be acted on.

**Issues to watch for**

Instructors: As the program scales and involves more instructors, who may or may not be familiar with how we operate, how do we induct them into our community?

Students: As the program scales and enrolls more students, how might we set them up for success to engage in graduate-level professional learning?

This attached document provides a running recording of the meeting. Speakers are identified by their initials.

Issues, action items, and key learning are delimited using the arrow-head bullet.
Appendix L: My Prompts for structuring the Journey Mapping exercise

Exercise: Journey Mapping a Fantastic Dining Experience

Recall the last time you had a memorable and fantastic dining experience.

In groups of two, **explore** what about that experience made it so fantastic.

*Task Force members to share their experience with the group.*

Now, think of your experience as a journey. What I mean by that is for you to think of your dining experience as having a beginning and an end.

Using the post-its, I want you to jot down the defining moments of that dining journey. What were you doing? And how did you feel at that moment?

+ Your overall judgment is defined by the sum of these interactions
+ We may call each of these interactions a touchpoint between the service provider and the client.
+ Each touchpoint presents an opportunity for the service provider to influence the customer experience.

______________

Let’s take it to our own context.

Each touchpoint of the program provides us with the opportunity to:
+ reinforce values of our program
+ think about different ways of meeting their needs

Now, let’s look at the journey map I’ve prepared.
Appendix M: Journey Map Ver. 1 (May 22, 2014)
Appendix O: Journey Map Ver. 3 (November 29, 2014)
Appendix P: Sample Reflection Entry from my Evaluator Log (File 31)

July 24/2014

I am nervous to being invited to join the Task Force. I had known peripherally that Barbara (my supervisor) has been involved with the DEI/MDEP project. But the idea of working alongside them has yet to cross my mind.

I think the reason to why I am being invited is due to my experience. Donna probably knows of my developmental evaluation work in supporting Barbara and James to rethink assessment education at the preservice level. I appreciate the gravity of the situation to make a genuine contribution.

Looking ahead, I can see some challenges. Surely, my status as a graduate student could pose challenges as I work with faculty members and staff. If I am to be successful, I would need to establish myself as an evaluator. I think I want to approach the evaluation as I would a consultant on any project. This might mean keeping a certain distance as prescribed by the standards of the field (and not get too excited with the idea of designing the program) and behaving in ways as an internal evaluator might. This stance may compel me to redefine my relationships with each of the members. I may have to push boundaries and question issues that I may not be privy to. How comfortable am I with it? I think if I were to approach the evaluation with good faith and explain my rationale, I should do okay.

Recognizing that developmental evaluation is fairly new, I suspect my evaluation clients may find it difficult to relate, at least initially, to how I am about to work with them. And so, I think the best way forward is to explain to them what I am there to do for/with them, and how it can be useful.

And so, prior to the meeting, I had prepared a few points to illustrate my role. To do this I introduced several analogies to illustrate my roles.

I think my input today was limited and that’s okay. I had wanted to introduce my role and I think I was able to get that through. I wasn’t particular enthused with how the introduction had gone. I don’t think I connected with the group well.

* * *

March 28/2015

This episode is interesting. I wonder how they envisioned my involvement. To what extent did they expect my participation and input? Does their understanding and conception of working with a developmental evaluator jive with my conception. Just how do they see my role? To what extent did interpersonal characteristics (and my identities) factor into the success of the projects?
Appendix Q: Exit Interview Guide

Interview Protocol

Thank you for meeting with me today. One of the things the research community do not yet have a good handle on is how programs, like the DEI/MDEP, come to be developed—the sort of considerations and decision-making that program staff, like yourself, have to make, and the processes that have to be put in place to enable decision-making. What I hope to be able to do with this research is to describe that process and share it with others.

The other bit that makes this research interesting is my involvement in the Task Force as an evaluator. Evaluators are often brought in once a program has been up and-running. But that wasn’t the case here; I was involved in the program from its conception. And I tried to work with you and others in a particular way. So I would be interested in getting you to talk about what you thought of that experience.

As you can see, the focus of the study is on understanding the complexity of readying a program for launch. This study is not interested in making judgments about people or their performances. I’m very conscious of the fact that we had to make decisions under a particular set of conditions. Such is the nature of work, am I right? Under different circumstances, I’m sure you and others might have approached the task differently or made different decisions. So feel free to name some of these constraints, as you see them, in our conversations today.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Let’s get started. _____(name)_____, could we first spend some time talking about what it was like for you and others to ready a program for launch. I brought with me today a timeline of our Task Force meetings. You’ll see in the second column a digest of those topics we had discussed at each meeting.

1. How would you describe to others what we had to do to get the DEI/MDEP program up and running?

Pay attention to:
- The meaning and significance attributed to particular events,
- The sequence of events presented
- Pay close attention any tension, complication, difficulties, challenges elicited
- Situation: What was your understanding of the challenges or issues the Task Force were facing?
- **Time:** At what point in the development of the program did we experience this?
- **People:** Who is being referred to in this instance? What was their particular involvement?

Let us now focus in on particular moments over the past few months.

2. **Were there times when you felt you or others were making significant progress?** If so, can you tell me about those times? (Why?)

3. **What was challenging about the situations you found yourself in?** (What were some of the challenges you or the group had experienced in readying the DEI/MDEP program for launch?)

* * * * * * * * * *

Your input has been very informative/candid so far. Thank you for that.

Now, I want to switch the focus a little and talk about what it was like to work with an evaluator. It’s important for you to know that evaluators are only learning how to best support program staff in the way I had worked with you. And so, there are likely aspects to my involvement that you found helpful, and others less so. So, both the good and the bad are equally important for me and others to learn about. I would invite you to be as candid as you feel comfortable.

4. **How would you describe to someone outside our group what it was like to work with someone who brought an evaluation perspective?**

*Some focusing questions, if needed:*
- What was the evaluator doing?
- What was helpful about it?
- What complications did it bring along?
- Did you find any merits or benefits to that?

5. **Were there specific aspects to my involvement that you found useful?**
6. **Were there specific aspects to my involvement that you found less useful?**
7. **So what does it mean for evaluators to be useful to those who are working on developing programs?**
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I have here with me a few of the tools that were introduced to the task force.

8. Do you recall when each of these tools was introduced? What were your reactions to them? Were these tools helpful in any way? Since they were introduced, have you able to revisit them?

9. Before we wrap up, is there anything else you would like to share in order to help me understand more deeply about what it means to, develop a program or what it means to work with an evaluator?