

**PADM 719  
Analysis and Evaluation I**

Lead Instructor: Professor Maureen Berner  
E-mail: [mberner@sog.unc.edu](mailto:mberner@sog.unc.edu)  
Office Hours: By appointment in office or via Zoom  
Updated: March 2020

**CONTACTING PROFESSOR BERNER**

All questions and issues should first be addressed with your individual course instructor, although you should feel free to contact me regarding sensitive issues. Communication is best via e-mail.

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course is the first in a two-course sequence, the goal of which is to give you the skills to be an educated user of information in your role as a leader in the public administration field. These courses rely on readings (traditional textbook, academic articles, blogs, and newspaper articles), videos, assignments, and small class sizes with weekly meetings. The courses are built around the continual preparation of a significant research paper, summarized in five pages and professionally presented. While statistics are part of the courses, they cover the research process overall and do not represent full statistics courses.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

The objectives for the courses are in line with the competencies the UNC MPA program is committed to providing its students. These courses focus on analyzing information for decision-making, specifically:

- Identifying, analyzing, and evaluating public problems, issues, and choices
- Selecting, applying, critiquing, and interpreting analysis for informing decisions
- Identifying, collecting, managing, and interpreting relevant qualitative and quantitative data
- Design and conduct appropriate research to address public problems, as demonstrated through writing an original research paper in a concise, practitioner-focused manner

My expectation for these classes is that (1) *we can engage you* with what is being discussed through the readings, class discussion, exercises, and assignments, and (2) *you engage yourself, others, and us* by asking substantive, thought-provoking questions, challenging positions, questioning interests, and pushing yourself, me, and your colleagues further. If there is any confusion about expectations, please speak to me or your individual section course instructor as early as possible. We constantly search for better ways to present the material, and I would sincerely enjoy talking about innovative ways to ensure you have mastered the competencies required for a UNC MPA.

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS

### Readings

We expect students to read material in advance of each class session, identify its main points, and be able to apply it when called upon in class. There are two main required textbooks for the courses:

- *Research Methods for Public Administration*, 6th edition, by Elizabethann O’Sullivan, Gary Rassel, Maureen Berner, and Jocelyn DeVance Taliaferro (Readings in course are listed for the 6th edition; using other editions is acceptable, but you will be responsible for identifying and tracking material per chapter titles.)
- *Statistics for Public Administration: Practical Uses for Better Decision Making*, 2nd edition, by Maureen Berner

In addition, there are several recommended texts. Two of these are available in their totality online for no cost from the U.S. Government Accountability Office.

- *Research Methods in Practice: Strategies for Description and Causation*, 2nd edition, by Dahlia Remler, and Gregg Van Ryzin.
- *Using Structured Interviewing Techniques* by the U.S. Government Accountability Office
- *Case Study Evaluations GAO/PEMD 91-10.1.9* by the U.S. Government Accountability Office

PLEASE NOTE: My main concern is that you understand the concepts. I prefer you read and understand the detailed O’Sullivan book material first and foremost. If you understand that material, you will not need the Berner text. However, if you have difficulty with the O’Sullivan text, the Berner book is more accessible to a general audience and a good option/supplement/practical interpretation. The two texts are also good examples of writing on the same issue for different audiences.

Other course readings (articles and book chapters) are available on the UNC Library Course Reserves website and in the Tool Box on the course website.

### Online Ethics Training

All students **must** complete the online ethics training for behavioral human subjects research required by UNC (and all universities) for students and faculty conducting any type of research studying people. This training will introduce you to the history of ethics in research, the role of the Institutional Review Board (IRB)—the board common to all universities and other organizations routinely conducting research that determines if research follows ethical guidelines—and the specific requirements for UNC IRB approval for student work. The training commonly takes two to three hours. It is due as part of Week 3 materials in Analysis and Evaluation I and must be completed to pass the course. **Due to frequently changing websites around the UNC ethics training, instructions for accessing the training should be obtained from your instructor at the beginning of the course.** When finished (or if you have already completed the training at UNC for another purpose or via another university), you’ll be asked to submit evidence (the completion certificate) for verification.

According to University rules, you do not *need* IRB review and approval for projects and papers restricted to class use, even if using human subjects. This applies for your paper for PUBA 719/720, if you use your paper only in this course and for the portfolio process. However, if you want to eventually share your class paper publically, you *may* need IRB approval. Your instructor can initially advise you and, if necessary, refer you to the appropriate IRB contact for the School of Government. Plan ahead. You cannot go back and get IRB approval on work already completed if you want to share detailed results in publications or public presentations. Whether or not you need to submit your research for IRB review depends on your project and is a case-by-case situation. Pursuing IRB review can mean significant delays in your project, perhaps even taking an incomplete to finish, so it should be undertaken with caution. Again, check with your instructor if you have a question.

It is possible to cheat on the IRB training and finish in a few minutes. I know this, and most of you probably already know this, and if you don't, you do now. If tempted, I would remind you this program is about public service leadership, and what would it say about you to cheat on an ethics requirement?

### **General Assignments**

There are six substantive assignments in the course, all focused on progressing through your paper development, starting from a short brainstorming of topics to a formal, well-written proposal. All are short, but I expect them to be well-written, thoughtful, and reflective of the class materials (the obvious exception being completion of the ethics training). All assignment should be single-spaced. Additional details on the assignments will be provided in class/online. Breakdown of how much each assignment is worth is provided below.

- **First shot at research paper idea (10% of final grade)**  
Provide a one- to two-paragraph description of your initial idea for your paper. Remember, you are not tied to this particular topic. The goal here is to allow you to understand the process. You can't just throw ideas out here and there, and then pick one and expect to have a successful paper experience. You need to go through the process of thinking through the topic, the research questions, what is most important to you, and what can be asked and answered as a hypothesis (if applicable). With this activity, step back and explain your idea in a more readable form with detailed ideas. While an initial idea and short, this assignment is expected to be well-done and not written at the last minute.
- **Annotated bibliography (20% of final grade)**  
An annotated bibliography, including at least five primary sources (expectation is five to ten, no more than twenty) relevant to your research question, should be prepared. You must include academic sources such as journal articles, substantive think tank or government reports, and other credible research (not newspaper articles). An annotated bibliography includes not just the full citation information, but also a brief summary of each source noting the most relevant information for use in your paper. Also, at the end, prepare a single, conclusionary paragraph summarizing what you found across all the items in terms of the body of research available for your topic. Bottom line: What do we know already, or not, about your topic?

- **Online ethics training** (details above - ungraded)
- **Literature review (20% of final grade)**  
Please prepare a full literature review, no more than 3 pages. Checking for newly published literature, especially in the journals or reports your audience would be reading, is important all the way up to when your paper is presented. This is developed from your annotated bibliography.
  1. You need to include academic (also called scholarly) peer reviewed research, as recent as possible, except for directly relevant, seminal works, which can be much older. You should also include major policy reports or studies by non-profits or government agencies that are directly related, but the foundation is peer-reviewed academic journal articles.
  2. Think of the writing as a funnel, where you go from broad to narrow.
  3. You must summarize overall trends in the literature. Do not go into detail on each item.
  4. By the end, you need to show how your work will fill a gap or extend the body of research into a next step or new direction because of some weakness or limitation of what has come before. That is why the literature review is a launch point for your study's methodology and findings.
  5. Remember, you need to show that you are an expert on your particular issue in the field, which you should be at the end of your project.
- **Draft project proposal (20% of final grade)**  
Prepare a draft proposal for your project. The proposal should include background on the issue, a brief literature review, your research question (and hypotheses, if applicable), methodology (plan for data collection and analysis), a timeline, and references. The body of the proposal should be no more than three pages. It should be clear and concise. Draft survey instruments or interview/focus group protocols should be included as appendix items.
- **Final project proposal (30% of final grade)**  
This is a revised version of your draft proposal. No more than 3 pages. At this point, your literature review should be finished (but you will need to boil it down yet again to the main points), your methodology chosen, and your research plan complete. A detailed rubric will be provided by your instructor. Your proposal will obviously be focused on plans (research question, data sources, methodology, timelines) and expected findings rather than on actual results and discussion.

In addition, almost every week there are short, informal activities. These are not included as graded assignments for the course but will be part of the overall participation assessment used by your instructor (see participation rubric below). They are activities meant to spur thinking about the weekly topic and how it could be applied in a public administration context or in your major paper. You are expected to complete them and participate in the related classroom discussion.

### **Quizzes**

Quizzes can be a useful tool for both the student and instructor to focus attention on readings, content, and concept comprehension. Use of quizzes as well as their timing and form are up to the discretion of the individual instructor.

### **Individual Research Paper**

A major learning experience of these courses is conducting original research and presenting to a lay audience. The process starts in this course, PUBA 719, where each student must choose a topic, use literature and consultation with SOG experts in the field to narrow the topic, and finally settle on an answerable research question. Initial data gathering and methods can be explored. The six substantive assignments in PUBA 719 and subsequent substantive assignments in PUBA 720 are designed as building blocks to help you progress through the research paper process.

The paper should focus on an issue or practical problem of public administration of immediate relevance to some public stakeholder (cities, the state government, citizens, libraries, nonprofit community leaders, county government, etc.). In the end, original or secondary data must be gathered, cleaned, and organized, and a rigorous analysis methodology must be used. The paper must be thoroughly researched and conclusions solidly supported. The final paper, due at the end of PUBA 720, must be condensed to five pages with an accompanying short formal presentation, requiring you to distill key concepts and write/present in a concise style appropriate for all audiences.

This is an independent research paper. If you work systematically through the process as we cover corresponding material in class, you are **likely to have a positive learning experience**. Your instructor and I are here to help you through the process, but the paper is ultimately your responsibility. Students are expected to work on this paper **throughout** the two courses. Confirming data sources and availability, even gathering data and exploring analysis options, and writing sections of the paper are part of a successful paper proposal process in PUBA 719.

### **Public Health Dataset**

Throughout this course sequence, we will be using a database from a public health study co-led by Dr. Berner that examines how local public health departments were organized in the state of North Carolina. For more information about the Public Health Study, visit the School of Government's [NC Public Health Systems Research](#) microsite.

**Students who delay starting the substantive research process, change topics in a significant way and/or try to write the paper entirely in the second course will struggle in PUBA 719 and may not be successful in PUBA 720.**

**GENERAL GRADING POLICY**

All assignments are graded individually on a 100-point scale. You should expect to see a score such as 75, 84, or 93 on each piece of returned work. The Online Ethics Training will be graded on a credit/no credit scale based on submission of evidence of successful completion, such as a PDF or screenshot of completion certificate provided by the UNC system.

The overall course score will be on a 100-point scale, and students will receive a grade as follows:

<u>Final Score</u>	<u>Grade</u>
0–69	Fail
70–79	Low Pass
80–95	Pass
96–100	High Pass

The instructor and I retain the right to adjust final grades if justified, but this rarely happens.

**GENERAL ASSIGNMENT RUBRIC**

The following general grading rubric will be used for all assignments as appropriate. For example, all assignments are expected to be turned in on time, but if the assignment does not ask for a figure or table, the comments below on tables and figures do not apply. Scores within categories will vary by the amount and extent of criteria met.

Score	Criteria
96–100	Assignment is turned in on time. Demonstrates excellent understanding of week’s reading material. Has no spelling or grammar errors. Addresses question or task in assignment in a clear and direct way. Goes beyond standard length or format requirements, showing superb use of professional writing structure, presentation, figures, and tables to communicate message. Knows facts, case, or evaluation report details exceptionally well; has thought through their implications. Offers evaluation, analysis, and synthesis of material. Chooses best method for task; correctly uses method and interprets results. Offers interpretation or analysis of week’s readings and class discussion as it applies to assignment; supports analysis, argument, and conclusions well. Keeps analysis focused. Writing is of the highest quality: flows well, engaging to the reader, convincing, clear, concise, and free from ambiguity; no use of academic language. Demonstrates very active engagement in the material.
80–95	Assignment is turned in on time. Demonstrates good understanding of week’s reading material. Contains at least one typographical spelling or grammar error, but only a few. Addresses question or task in assignment. Shows good use of professional writing structure, presentation, figures, and tables as appropriate to communicate message. Knows facts and case or evaluation report details well, has thought through their implications; offers interpretation or analysis of week’s readings and class discussion as it applies to assignment; supports analysis, argument, and conclusions well. Chooses an appropriate method for task; method use and result interpretation is correct but unsophisticated. Overall quality of writing is adequate to good—simple transitions, appropriate use of technical terms and acronyms, active voice, clear, concise, minimal use of academic language ( <i>utilize</i> instead of <i>use</i> ).
70–79	Assignment is turned in on time. Demonstrates adequate understanding of week’s reading material. Contains several typographical, spelling, or grammar errors. Addresses question or task in assignment. Adheres to length or format requirements of assignments. Seems to know basic facts of case or evaluation report but does not show evidence of having tried to analyze or interpret; offers one or two examples of information from readings or case or evaluation report without elaboration or clear connection to assignment. Chooses an inappropriate method for task; method is implemented incorrectly or in a sloppy way, and/or result interpretation is unsupported. Overall quality of writing is poor to adequate—stilted, poor transitions, cluttered, poor use of jargon or acronyms, confusing, passive voice, overly wordy, some overuse of academic language ( <i>utilize</i> instead of <i>use</i> ).
1–69	Assignment is turned in on time. Demonstrates poor understanding of material covered in week’s reading or in-class discussions (for example, providing only one obvious example). Contains numerous obvious typographic, spelling, or grammatical errors. Only indirectly addresses question or task in assignment. Does not meet length or other format requirements of assignment. Chooses a completely inappropriate method for task; implementation is so poor that any information from study is questionable, and/or result interpretation is wrong. Overall writing quality is bad—incomplete sentences, incomprehensible sentences or paragraphs, no transitions, high use of jargon or acronyms, passive tone, overly wordy, dramatic overuse of academic language ( <i>utilize</i> instead of <i>use</i> ).
0	Assignment not turned in, not complete, or turned in late without prior approval (see late policy).

## GENERAL CLASS PARTICIPATION

We will use the following rubric in general, but how participation is included in your final grade is at the discretion of the individual instructor. For example, instructors may use participation as the determining factor for a borderline performance between a High Pass, a Pass, or a Low Pass. If you have questions on the assessed level of participation, check this rubric and discuss with your instructor.

Score	Criteria
Excellent	Demonstrates excellent preparation; has analyzed material exceptionally well; relates it to other readings and materials (personal experience, other cases, lectures, etc.); offers evaluation, analysis, and synthesis of material; makes connections that take the class further; contributes extensively in discussion, keeps analysis focused; responds very thoughtfully to others' opinions, contributes to cooperative argument building, suggests alternative ways to approach material, and helps class analyze which approaches are appropriate. Demonstrates very active engagement in the material.
Good	Demonstrates good preparation, knows facts and details of material well, has thought through implications well; offers interpretation or analysis of readings or other materials to class; contributes well to discussions in an ongoing way; responds to other students' points, thinks through own points; questions others in a constructive way; offers and supports points that may be counter to the majority opinion; demonstrates consistent, ongoing involvement.
Average	Demonstrates adequate preparation; knows basic facts from material but does not show evidence of having tried to analyze or interpret them; offers straightforward information from readings or other material without elaboration or very infrequently; does not offer to contribute to discussion but responds moderately when called on; demonstrates sporadic involvement. Joins class late once or twice without explanation.
Poor	Present, not disruptive, tries to respond when called upon but does not offer much. Demonstrates very infrequent participation in discussions (say, once per class). Absent once or twice without explanation. Joins class late frequently. Appears more focused on class ending exactly on time or early than allowing other student or instructor bringing a point to a close. Sometimes involved in discretionary nonclass activities (Blackberry, texting, Facebook, crosswords, etc.). Disrupts class occasionally through side conversations or unrelated messages.
Very Poor	Absent often, no effort to participate, clear disrespect for instructor and other students as demonstrated by engaging in discretionary nonclass activities (Blackberry, texting, Facebook, reading for other courses, crosswords, etc.) while in class. Has not prepared for class discussion, and does not know required material. Does not make an effort to respond when called upon. Disrupts class often through side conversations or unrelated messages.

### PLEASE NOTE:

**RUBRICS FOR SPECIFIC ASSIGNMENTS WILL BE PROVIDED BY YOUR INSTRUCTOR AND POSTED ON THE COURSE PAGE**

### LATE WORK POLICY

Late work policies are the discretion of the individual instructor. In general, as a professional program, we emphasize deadlines as you would expect in a work environment. Late or make-up work will not be accepted unless your instructor has approved in advance your reason or in special circumstance, and in most cases, will then will receive only half credit maximum.

### ACCOMMODATIONS

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill facilitates the implementation of reasonable accommodations, including resources and services for students with disabilities, chronic

medical conditions, a temporary disability, or pregnancy complications resulting in difficulties with accessing learning opportunities.

In order for School of Government faculty to facilitate accommodations, students must be approved and registered for accommodations through the Accessibility Resources and Service Office.

All accommodations are coordinated through the Accessibility Resources and Service Office. In the first instance students should visit their website: <http://accessibility.unc.edu>; telephone: 919-962-8300; or e-mail: [accessibility@unc.edu](mailto:accessibility@unc.edu). A student is welcome to initiate the registration process at any time; however, the process can take time. ARS is particularly busy in the run-up to finals and during finals. Students submitting Self-ID forms at that time are unlikely to have accommodations set until the following semester.

Please contact ARS as early in the semester as possible.

### **WEATHER EVENTS**

In the event of a weather emergency or other emergency necessitating the cancellation of class, I or your instructor will send a message as soon as possible to students.

### **HONOR CODE**

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has had a student-led honor system for over 100 years. Academic integrity is at the heart of Carolina and we all are responsible for upholding the ideals of honor and integrity. The student-led Honor System is responsible for adjudicating any suspected violations of the Honor Code and faculty are obliged to report all suspected instances of academic dishonesty to the honor system. Information, including your responsibilities as a student is outlined in the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance. Your full participation and observance of the Honor Code is expected.

Plagiarism in the form of "deliberate" or "reckless" representation of another's words, thoughts, or ideas as one's own without appropriate attribution to the original author in connection with submission of academic work, whether graded or otherwise, is a serious breach of the academic integrity demanded by the Honor Code and one of the most common forms of academic misconduct processed by the Honor System. Plagiarism can take many forms. Follow these guidelines:

- Quote and cite any words that are not your own.
- If you paraphrase the words of another, you must still give proper attribution.
- If you look it up, write it down.

Supporting learning by your classmates is strongly encouraged. However, all personally-ascribed academic work in this course, including homework, quizzes, and exams, is to be your own work, unless otherwise specifically provided. It is your responsibility if you have any doubt to confirm whether or not collaboration is permitted. For example, a classmate can show you how she performed a regression with her data or explain her results to help guide you, but you should perform a regression with your data and explain your results entirely on your own. You are expected to read and follow the information provided by the UNC Office of Student Conduct on the Honor Code.

## GENERAL SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF TOPICS, READINGS, &amp; ASSIGNMENTS

PUBA 719			
Week	Topic	Readings	Graded Assignments Due
1	Research topic	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 1 in O'Sullivan, et al.</li> <li>• Chapter 1 in Berner</li> <li>• Lipowski, Earlene E. "Developing great research questions." <i>American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy</i> 65, no. 17 (2008): 1667-1670.</li> <li>• Agee, Jane. "Developing qualitative research questions: a reflective process." <i>International journal of qualitative studies in education</i> 22, no. 4 (2009): 431-447.</li> </ul>	
2	Overview of research design	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapters 2 and 3 in O'Sullivan, et al.</li> <li>• Chapter 10: Qualitative Procedures," in Creswell, J. W. (1994). <i>Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 179–207.</li> <li>• "Evidence at the Crossroads, Part 1: What Works, Tiered Evidence, and the Future of Evidence-Based Policy," October 27, 2015, blog post found <a href="#">here</a>.</li> <li>• "Reconsidering Evidence: What It Means and How We Use It," January 8, 2016, blog post by Lisbeth Schorr, <i>Stanford Social Innovation Review</i>, found <a href="#">here</a>.</li> </ul>	<b>First shot at research paper idea</b>
3	Research feasibility and theory, models, and conceptual frameworks	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 2: Theory, Models, and Research Questions. In Remler, Dahlia K. and Van Ryzen, Gregg G. <i>Research Methods in Practice: Strategies for Description and Causation. 2nd Edition</i>. Sage Publications, 2015.</li> <li>• Chapter 3: Conceptual Framework: What Do You Think Is Going On? In Maxwell, Joseph A. (2013) <i>Qualitative research design: An interactive approach</i>. Vol. 41. Sage publications, 2012.</li> </ul>	<b>Annotated bibliography</b>
4	Research ethics	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 8 in O'Sullivan, et al.</li> <li>• "Science is often flawed. It's time we embrace that," May 13, 2015, by Julia Belluz and Steve Hoffman. <i>Vox</i>, found <a href="#">here</a>.</li> </ul>	<b>Online ethics training</b>

5	Operationalization, validity, and reliability	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapters 4 in O’Sullivan, et al.</li> <li>• Chapter 6: Reliability and Validity. In Salkind, Neil J. <i>Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics</i>. Sage Publications, 2016.</li> <li>• Ryzin, Gregg G. Van. "The measurement of overall citizen satisfaction." <i>Public Performance &amp; Management Review</i> 27, no. 3 (2004): 9-28.</li> </ul>	
6	Logic models	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">W. K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Development Guide</a>, 2006. This is for practitioners and includes many exercises and worksheets. You are expected to read through the entire guide, but skip through the exercises and simply skim the worksheets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supplemental:</b>  <i>These readings provide good examples of how to structure a literature review. They are longer than your literature review assignments, but may still be helpful as you work on your own literature review assignments.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• McCall, Jamie R., and Michele M. Hoyman. <i>Urban Economic Development Policy</i>. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2016.</li> <li>• Berner, Maureen. <i>Multi-Dimensional Measures of Poverty: The Potential Contribution of Non-Profit Food Pantry Data to Assess Community Economic Condition</i>. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2017.</li> </ul>	<b>Literature review</b>
7	Descriptive statistics and central limit theorem	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapters 11 in O'Sullivan et al.</li> <li>• Chapters 2, 3, and 4 in Berner</li> </ul>	
8	Basic probability	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 5 in O'Sullivan, et al.</li> <li>• Chapters 5, 6, and 7 in Berner</li> </ul>	<b>Draft project proposal</b>
9	Sampling and statistical and material significance	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 5: Sampling. In Remler, Dahlia K. and Van Ryzin, Gregg G. <i>Research Methods in Practice: Strategies for Description and Causation</i>. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Sage Publications, 2015.</li> </ul>	

10	Focus groups	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ospina, Sonia M., Marc Esteve, and Seulki Lee. "Assessing qualitative studies in public administration research." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 78, no. 4 (2018): 593-605.</li> <li>• Barbour, Rosaline. "Research Design." In <i>Doing focus groups</i>. Sage, 2008.</li> </ul>	
11	Surveys, part 1	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 6 &amp; 7 in O'Sullivan, et al.</li> <li>• Berner, Maureen, Ashley Bowers, and Laura Heyman. "<a href="#">So You Want to Do a Survey?</a>" <i>Popular Government</i> (Summer 2002): 23–32.</li> </ul>	
12	Surveys, part 2	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bladenboro draft survey—shared with permission. An example of how a municipality tried to create a survey</li> </ul>	
13	Survey administration and qualitative data analysis	<p><b>Required:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapters 1 &amp; 2 in Saldaña, Johnny. <i>The coding manual for qualitative researchers</i>. Sage, 2013.</li> <li>• DeCuir-Gunby, Jessica T., Patricia L. Marshall, and Allison W. McCulloch. "Developing and using a codebook for the analysis of interview data: An example from a professional development research project." <i>Field methods</i> 23, no. 2 (2011): 136-155.</li> </ul>	<b>Final project proposal</b>