MMC 6936
Measuring Change

Spring 2018

Instructor

Sarah Parvanta, PhD, MPH

sparvanta@ufl.edu

Contact

Please contact me with questions and comments via email. If you would like to talk via phone, please email me with that request and we can schedule a time to do so.

Office Hours:

Please feel welcome to set up a time to meet with me via phone on Tuesdays. Please email me with your requested time.

Instructor Bio:

While pursuing a master's of public health from the University of North Carolina, I made the deliberate decision to become someone who *evaluates* behavior change campaigns and works with the people who implement them. With that goal in mind, I completed a doctorate in communication at the University of Pennsylvania, where I conducted research on communication effects, formative research for campaign development, and evaluation of communication campaigns. I have training in evaluation research methods, behavior change theory, study design, statistics, message strategy selection, and, importantly, reporting on evaluation results. Now, in addition to instructing this new course, I am a social scientist and research analyst in the Center for Communication Science at RTI International, a non-profit research organization charged with turning knowledge into practice to improve the human condition (www.rti.org).

Course Website and Login

Your course is Canvas (UF e-Learning). Go to http://lss.at.ufl.edu. Click the blue e-Learning button. Login with your GatorLink account. Your course will be in the Courses menu on the left navigation. You might have to click All Courses at the bottom depending on how many courses you have taken at UF.

Contact UF Helpdesk http://helpdesk.ufl.edu/ (352) 392-HELP (4357) if you have any trouble with accessing your course.

Course Description:

Good communication strategists make a habit of confronting important questions about the campaigns that they develop. Before a campaign begins, they want to know their audience. During the campaign, they investigate whether it is functioning as planned. After the campaign, they ask whether it had the intended impact. To answer these questions reliably, strategic communication developers work

alongside evaluators who carry out research before, during, and after campaigns are developed and launched. Funders, policymakers, and the public often want to know if a campaign "worked" in the past or will work in the future. Evaluation affords us the opportunity to answer those questions with some certainty, rather than simply guessing or assuming based on anecdotal experience. This course takes a broad look at the role of research and evaluation in strategic communication campaigns, and provides a foundation and tactics for working productively with evaluators. Students will become familiar with evaluation phases (formative, monitoring, and summative) and the types of research designs that evaluators use to measure campaign impact. We will consider why evaluation is ultimately important to successful campaigns and establish a set of tools for conducting and leveraging research as part of strategic communication practice.

Course Objectives:

By the end of this course, students will learn:

- the role of evaluation research in strategic communication campaigns;
- when and how to assemble evaluation support;
- evaluation "lingo" to facilitate conversations and partnerships with researchers;
- formative research approaches to drive campaign strategy, including how to glean useful insights from existing literature and how to conduct research with target audiences;
- drawbacks and advantages of different evaluation designs; and
- how to communicate about research findings responsibly and effectively with the news media, policymakers, and funders.

Course Expectations:

Given your decision to pursue public interest communication, I imagine that you will work with evaluators or conduct some or all parts of communication campaign evaluations at some point during your career. My hope is that this course will spark your interest in evaluation and cultivate a new or enhanced appreciation for this type of social science. Toward that end, this course includes 12 modules over 12 weeks, each of which will cover different evaluation components and examples. In addition to readings and module videos, this course includes **nine assignments** of varying intensity. Students are expected to complete work on time and participate in a professional manner while respecting the instructor and fellow students. Students who complete quality assignments on time will do well in this course.

Ownership Education:

As graduate students, you are not passive participants in this course. All students in this Program have a background in marketing, advertising, public relations, journalism, or similar fields. This class allows you to not only take ownership of your educational experience but to also provide your expertise and knowledge in helping your fellow classmates. The Canvas shell will have an open Q&A thread where you should pose questions to your classmates and instructor when you have a question as it relates to an assignment. Your classmates along with your instructor will be able to respond to these questions and provide feedback and help. This also allows everyone to gain the same knowledge in one location rather than the instructor responding back to just one student which limits the rest of the class from gaining

this knowledge. For questions or comments pertaining to personal matters, please email your instructor directly.

Recommended Texts:

You are not required to purchase these textbooks, but you may prefer to have them in your own library. Links to all required book excerpts and journal articles will be provided in Canvas.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach* (1st ed.). New York: Psychology Press Taylor & Francis Group.

Hornik, R. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Public health communication: Evidence for behavior change.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rice, R. E., & Atkin, C. K. (2012). *Public communication campaigns* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schutt, R. K. (2011). *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Prerequisite knowledge and skills:

We will read a number of research articles pertaining to campaign evaluations. These articles will often contain statistical information. While a background in statistics is not a formal prerequisite for this course, the material that we cover may be more intriguing if you have a general sense for basic statistical principles (e.g., what does it mean for an estimate to be "statistically significant"?). For those who do not have statistics resources available from previous training, I recommend "googling" various statistical terms as you come across them in the readings (e.g., "regression," "weighting," "interaction terms") if you want to know more. One of my favorite free resources for learning about statistics and statistical analysis is the UCLA Institute for Digital Research and Education (https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/other/mult-pkg/faq/general/). I consult this web site regularly.

Course Policies:

Attendance Policy:

Because this is an online asynchronously delivered course, attendance in the form of calling roll will not occur; however, students are expected to sign onto the course site at least once each day, Monday – Friday, to check for course updates in the **Announcements, Q&A, and Discussion** sections of the site.

Late Work and Make-up Policy:

Deadlines are critical to this class. All work is due on or before the due date. Extensions for deadlines will only be for preapproved emergencies. Minor inconveniences such as family vacation or minor illness are not valid reasons for extensions. If work is submitted late, it will also be evaluated late. Point deductions for late work are as follows:

- More than 24 hours late but less than 48 hours late   05 points off
- 48 hours late   10 points off

- More than 48 hours late but less than 5 days late   15 points off
- 5 days or more late   Not accepted at all

Issues with uploading work for a grade is not an excuse. If a student is having technical difficulties with Canvas, there are other means to submit completed work. Student may email .zip files or even links to Dropbox folders to Instructor via UF email. Students should compensate for technical difficulties by not waiting until the last minute to submit work.

Suggested technical issue policy: Any requests for make-ups due to technical issues MUST be accompanied by the ticket number received from LSS when the problem was reported to them. The ticket number will document the time and date of the problem. You MUST e-mail your instructor within 24 hours of the technical difficulty if you wish to request a make-up. Contact UF helpdesk (352) 392-HELP.

Emergency and extenuating circumstances policy: Students who face emergencies, such as a major personal medical issue, a death in the family, serious illness of a family member, or other situations beyond their control should notify their instructors immediately.

Students are also advised to contact the Dean of Students Office if they would like more information on the medical withdrawal or drop process: https://www.dso.ufl.edu/care/medical-withdrawal-process/ .

Students MUST inform their academic advisor before dropping a course, whether for medical or non-medical reasons. Your advisor will assist with notifying professors and go over options for how to proceed with their classes. Your academic advisor is Tiffany Robbert, and she may be reached at trobbert@jou.ufl.edu .

Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work in this course are consistent with university policies that can be found in the online catalogue at: https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx

Coursework Submissions:
All assignments will be submitted electronically through the Assignments section in Canvas.

Deadlines:
This class, like others, involves deadlines. Here is a reminder. The new lecture starts on Mondays. Specific due dates for each assignment are listed in the weekly schedule later in this syllabus.

- Weekly assignments   See due dates listed later in this syllabus
- Final assignment   Last Friday of the semester (March 30, 2018)

Grading:
Your work will be evaluated according to the following distribution:

- Assignments (not including final assignment)   65%
- Final assignment   20%
- Participation (including completion of assignments)   15%

The final grade will be awarded as follows. I do not round up to next decimal. For example, 92.7 is an A-

A	100%	to	93%
A-	< 93%	to	90%
B+	< 90%	to	87%
B	< 87%	to	83%
B-	< 83%	to	80%
C+	< 80%	to	77%
C	< 77%	to	73%
C-	< 73%	to	70%
D+	< 70%	to	67%
D	< 67%	to	63%
D-	< 63%	to	60%
F	< 60%	to	0%

Current UF grading policies for assigning grade points:
https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/grades.aspx

Course and Assignment Details

Weekly Lectures:

The instructor will post a lecture video or videos to Canvas for each week and two additional videos – one is an introduction to the course and course topic and the other will cover the syllabus. These videos will vary in length depending on the material. It is your responsibility to watch each of the videos.

Although it is possible to watch the pre-recorded video lectures at any time and at any pace, keeping up with the videos week to week according to the schedule will be easier as many build off the other along with the assignments and weekly readings.

Assignment 1 Details:

Discussion post 1: On the Discussion section of the course site on Canvas, please respond to the following questions in ONE post:

1) Name a past or current strategic communication campaign for social change that has interested you. If there is a website for this campaign, please provide it.
2) What about this campaign seemed effective? What about the campaign didn't seem effective?
3) Do you know if the campaign was successful? If so, how do you know?
4) In 2-5 sentences, please describe what you know about <u>evaluation</u> of campaigns (or programs). If you don't know a lot about evaluation (which is totally fine), please take a guess as to what it is.

Assignment 1 Rubric

Assignment 1: **Discussion post 1**		
Ratings		
Completed all 4 questions	**Completed only 0-3 questions**	**Score**
100 pts	0 pts	100 pts
		Total Score: 100

Note. Completing this assignment will count toward your participation grade.

Assignment 2 Details:

Discussion post 2: On the Discussion section of the course site on Canvas, please respond to the following questions in ONE post:

1) Indicate what is confusing about the syllabus, if anything.
2) Indicate what was especially clear or helpful on the syllabus, if anything.

Assignment 2 Rubric

Assignment 1: *Discussion post 2*		
Ratings		
Completed both questions	**Completed only 0-1 questions**	**Score**
100 pts	0 pts	100 pts
		Total Score: 100

Note. Completing this assignment will count toward your participation grade.

Assignment 3 Details:

Elicitation interviews: Please write this assignment in MS Word and upload the .docx file to the Assignments section on Canvas. The file name should include your first and last name, and assignment number (e.g., SarahParvanta_Assignment3.docx). Think of a behavior that you would like to change through a strategic communication campaign. Identify <u>two</u> people (friends, family members, and/or coworkers) for whom the behavior is relevant. For example, perhaps your behavioral objective is filling out a voter registration form in the next three months.

1) Define the action, target, context, and time of this behavior as explained on pages 29-30 in Fishbein and Ajzen (2010). See Week 2 readings for this chapter.
2) Identify two people in your target audience and ask them 5 questions to elicit their salient behavioral beliefs, normative referents, and control factors regarding this behavior. You may ask them to write down their beliefs, or you ask for verbal responses and take notes. You can also record the interviews, but you must ask for permission from your participant before doing so. CONDUCT THE INTERVIEWS INDIVIDUALLY (I.E., SEPARATELY), RATHER THAN IN A GROUP.
3) Here is a summary of the 5 questions. Further details on how to ask these questions is on pages 451-452 in Fishbein and Ajzen (2010). Please follow the question format on those two pages.
   - Question 1. What are the advantages of performing this behavior
   - Question 2. What are the disadvantages of performing this behavior?
   - Question 3. Are there individuals who think you should/should not do this behavior?
   - Question 4. What factors would enable you to do this behavior?
   - Question 5. What factors would hinder you from doing this behavior?
4) In your write-up, indicate the behavioral objective that you are evaluating. Report all of the beliefs, referents, and control factors that each participant lists in the exact order that the participants list them. Do not combine the two participants' responses into one list. Instead, present the responses for each participant separately so you can see how the lists differ or align. Underline, highlight, or boldface the first five beliefs, normative referents, and control factors

for each participant. (If the participant lists fewer than 5 beliefs, referents, or control factors, indicate that in your write-up.)

Notes: 1) If you choose a behavioral objective that is a sensitive topic and you would not feel comfortable asking close others about this behavior, then please identify a different behavior that is more easily discussed with your interview participants for this assignment. Do not list any identifying information about your interview participants on the one-page write-up that you submit. 2) If one (or both) of your participants provide very little usable data, leaving you with little information on their salient beliefs for one or more of the questions, you may need to interview an additional participant (or two) to yield a more comprehensive set of salient beliefs. However, watch the Assignment 3 video for suggestions on how to encourage your participants to provide richer responses.

Assignment 3 Rubric

Assignment 3: *Elicitation interviews*				
	Ratings			
Criteria	**Clear and easy to understand**	**Not clear or easy to understand**	**Not provided**	**Score**
Behavioral objective	12 pts	6 pts	0 pts	12 pts
Advantages for participant 1	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Disadvantages for participant 1	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Normative referents for participant 1	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Facilitating control factors for participant 1	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Inhibiting control factors for participant 1	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Advantages for participant 2	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Disadvantages for participant 2	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Normative referents for participant 2	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Facilitating control factors for participant 2	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Inhibiting control factors for participant 2	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
Document formatting	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
				Total Score: 100

Assignment 4 Details:

Secondary research: Please write this assignment in MS Word and upload the .docx file to the Assignments section on Canvas. The file name should include your first and last name, and assignment

number (e.g., SarahParvanta_Assignment4.docx). Using the same behavioral objective that you investigated in Assignment #3:

1) Identify 1-3 journal articles or other peer-reviewed sources describing empirical research on factors that may be associated with your behavioral objective, including the factors listed in the Integrative Model (beliefs, attitudes, perceived social norms, self-efficacy, skills, environmental factors; Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010).
2) Please identify at least 5 factors within the sources that you collect in Step 1. It may be difficult to find literature on the exact behavior you have chosen. In that case find literature on similar behaviors that you think are pertinent.
3) On one page, list the behavioral objective, and list each of the factors that you identified in your literature review. Cite each of the factors. Include a reference list at the bottom of the page in *American Psychological Association* format.

Note, it is fine if you're interested in identifying more than 3 articles and/or if your write-up requires 2 pages rather than 1 page. However, you will not receive extra credit for this extra work.

Assignment 4 Rubric

Assignment 4: *Secondary research*				
	Ratings			
Criteria	**Clear and easy to understand**	**Not clear or easy to understand**	**Not provided**	**Score**
Behavioral objective	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
1-3 sources	20 pts	10 pts	0 pts	20 pts
At least 5 factors associated with behavioral objective	40 pts	20 pts	0 pts	40 pts
All factors cited using APA style	11 pts	6 pts	0 pts	11 pts
Reference list in APA style	11 pts	6 pts	0 pts	11 pts
Document formatting	8 pts	4 pts	0 pts	8 pts
				Total Score: 100

Assignment 5 Details:

Questionnaire development: Please write this assignment in MS Word and upload the .docx file to the Assignments section on Canvas. The file name should include your first and last name, and assignment number (e.g., SarahParvanta_Assignment5.docx). Design a closed-ended questionnaire based on the behavioral objective that you selected in Assignment #3 and the beliefs that you identified in Assignment #3 and Assignment #4. The questionnaire will include 8-12 questions. Three questions will measure intentions to perform the behavior. The remaining 5-9 questions will ask about the top five salient beliefs that emerged in Assignment #1, and the factors that you identified in your literature review in Assignment #3. The questions should include response options. Use the question examples on pages 457-463 in Fishbein & Ajzen (2010) to help you write your questions. You are also permitted to model your question design on other examples in the literature or on surveys from reputable organizations. Cite all sources that you use and include a reference list in *American Psychological Association* format at the end of your questionnaire.

Assignment 5 Rubric

Assignment 5: *Questionnaire development*				
	Ratings			
Criteria	All listed in questionnaire	Only some listed in questionnaire	None listed in questionnaire	Score
3 intention questions	35 pts	15 pts	0 pts	35 pts
5-9 belief questions	45 pts	20 pts	0 pts	45 pts
Citations in APA style	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Reference list in APA style	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
			Total Score: 100	

Assignment 6 Details:

Campaign brief: Write a campaign brief describing the analysis of potential messages for campaigns and your recommendations based on the findings. See the Week 4 lecture video for instructions on completing this assignment. Please write this assignment in MS Word and upload the .docx file to the Assignments section on Canvas. The file name should include your first and last name, and assignment number (e.g., SarahParvanta_Assignment6.docx).

Assignment 6 Rubric

Assignment 6: *Campaign brief*				
	Ratings			
Criteria	Excellent	Satisfactory	Not completed	Score
Correct interpretation of behavior distribution	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Correct % to convince calculations	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Correct % to gain calculations	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Analysis on belief performance	20 pts	10 pts	0 pts	20 pts
Subgroup analysis	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Media channels analysis	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Full write-up	20 pts	10 pts	0 pts	20 pts
Document formatting is clear	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
			Total Score: 100	

Assignment 7 Details:

Critique of ad strategies (Discussion post): Please watch the following three ads. The first two ads were identified as some of the best recent examples of social change campaigns by *Campaign*, a web platform for industry (http://www.campaignlive.com/article/100-years-ads-best-campaigns-social-good/1443762). The third ad is another example from the Ad Council, and organization that produces public service advertising for social change (https://www.adcouncil.org/).

1. "Love Has No Labels"
2. "The Talk"
3. "Never Give Up Until They Buckle Up"

Watch each ad and respond to the following <u>two questions for each of the three ads</u>. Submit your responses on the Discussion section of the course site on Canvas and then review how your ideas were similar or different from other students' ideas.

1) What behavior or behaviors is the ad targeting?
2) What belief or beliefs is the ad targeting? If you struggle to identify the specific behavior(s) or belief(s) indicate why you think the target behavior(s) or belief(s) are ambiguous.

Assignment 7 Rubric

Assignment 7: ***Critique of ad strategies (Discussion post)***				
	Ratings of Responses			
Criteria	**Clear and easy to understand**	**Not clear or easy to understand**	**Not provided**	**Score**
Ad 1: Question 1	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Ad 1: Question 2	20 pts	10 pts	0 pts	20 pts
Ad 2: Question 1	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Ad 2: Question 2	20 pts	10 pts	0 pts	20 pts
Ad 3: Question 1	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Ad 3: Question 2	20 pts	10 pts	0 pts	20 pts
Posting of responses on the Discussion section on Canvas	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	10 pts
				Total Score: 100

Assignment 8 Details:

Impact evaluation critique: Please write this assignment in MS Word and upload the .docx file to the Assignments section on Canvas. The file name should include your first and last name, and assignment number (e.g., SarahParvanta_Assignment8.docx). Identify an article describing a summative/impact evaluation of a strategic communication campaign. Describe the evaluation design, behavioral objective, independent variable(s), dependent variable(s), sample recruitment method, and the main findings. Did the authors evaluate exposure level and if so, how? What are the strengths of the evaluation approach. What are the weaknesses? What would you change about the evaluation approach, if anything? Your

assessment should be 1-3 pages. Include the reference to the article you present in *American Psychological Association* (APA) format.

Assignment 8 Rubric

Assignment 8: *Impact evaluation critique*					
	Ratings				
Criteria	**Excellent**	**Very good**	**Satisfactory**	**Not provided**	**Score**
Evaluation design	25 pts	20 pts	10 pts	0 pts	25 pts
Behavioral objective	5 pts	3 pts	1 pts	0 pts	5 pts
Independent variable(s)	10 pts	7 pts	3 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Dependent variable(s)	10 pts	7 pts	3 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Sample recruitment method	5 pts	3 pts	1 pts	0 pts	5 pts
Main findings	10 pts	7 pts	3 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Strengths and weaknesses	25 pts	20 pts	10 pts	0 pts	25 pts
Document formatting	10 pts (clear)	NA	NA	0 pts (not clear)	10 pts
					Total Score: 100

Final Assignment Details:

Campaign evaluation design: I strongly recommend that you re-read Hornik & Yanovitzky (2003) for insight on most of the questions below. See Week Two readings for this article. For all of your responses, provide justification based on credible literature, your own theories or experiences, or both. Prioritize published and peer-reviewed literature where possible. Cite all sources that you use within the text and provide full references at the end of the document. Use American Psychological Association (APA) formatting for in-text citations and references. Please write at least one paragraph in response to each question. The paper should be no more than 10 or 12 pages long including figures and references, double-spaced, 12-point font, 1-inch margins. If you can write a well-informed paper in less than 10 pages, that is also acceptable. Please write this assignment in MS Word and upload the .docx file to the Assignments section on Canvas. The file name should include your first and last name, and assignment number (e.g., SarahParvanta_FinalAssignment.docx).

For the final assignment, you will design an evaluation for a communication campaign. You may use initiative A or B as a basis for the communication campaign that you would evaluate, if you choose.

A. Face Value Project: http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2010/12/15/lgbt-research-face-people/
B. The Foundation for the Conservation of Water in the Metropolitan Region of Guatemala (FUNCAGUA) has assembled to protect water resources in Guatemala, and is working with Universidad del Valle de Guatemala (UVG) and the Private Institute for Climate Change Research (ICC) to create water conservation strategies for Guatemala City. UVG and ICC aim to improve water quality and quantity for Guatemala City residents located near Lake Amatitlan. Guatemala City has a growing population which presents increasing demand for drinking water. Lake Amatitlan would be an important source of drinking water, but the reservoir is currently unsafe due to pollution from human and industrial waste from nearby Guatemala City. The community and relevant local agencies, including the authorities who manage the lake

watershed, have not mobilized to treat the current pollution or prevent new pollution. This issue has also attracted little political attention or support thus far. UVG and ICC intend to design, implement, and evaluate a communication campaign that informs the population, farmers, and/or governing agencies about water quality and quantity in Lake Amatitlan. Ultimately, the organization hopes to generate public demand for pollution mitigation in the lake and improved access to a high-quality water supply. This public demand, UVG and ICC hope, will mobilize agencies and policy makers to implement structural and environmental changes that address public demand.

These initiatives do not have existing communication campaigns, and so you will need to envision a campaign that builds on the formative research approach that you propose, and then design the evaluation plans for that campaign. Do not spend excessive time thinking about the campaign's creative approach (e.g., advertisements, PSAs); this course is not focused on message effects research. Instead, focus on designing an evaluation tailored to your campaign. If you don't want to design a communication campaign evaluation for initiatives A or B above, but you have another real-world initiative in mind that has not been evaluated, please contact me to discuss. Students should not use an imaginary initiative for this paper. Evaluators are often asked to design research around initiatives that clients and campaign planners have already chosen. Therefore, using an existing initiative for this assignment provides an opportunity for real-world evaluation practice. The prompts above do not provide you with detailed information on behavioral objectives, routes of effect, target populations, etc. Very often, organizations aiming to roll out a campaign have not clearly defined these important components and so the evaluator must make these recommendations. In writing your paper, please address the following questions:

1) Define the specific behavior that the campaign will change. Include the behavioral criteria laid out by Fishbein & Ajzen (2010). See Assignment #3.
2) What are the routes of effect? Will the campaign affect behavior through individuals, institutions, social networks, or a combination of these routes? Draw a general model showing how the campaign will influence the behavior. See Figure 1 in Hornik & Yanovitzky (2003) for guidance.
3) How long do you expect it to take for the campaign to have an effect (i.e., what kind of lag time do you expect between when the campaign launches and when you will be able to observe an impact on behavior)?
4) Which population or subpopulations will the campaign target?
5) Which individual-level beliefs predict the behavior, if any? What are potential obstacles to performing the behavior (e.g., skills, environmental factors)? See Assignment #3 and Fishbein & Ajzen (2010) for guidance. (It is not possible during this course to conduct surveys or interviews with the target audience to answer Question 5. However, you should conduct secondary research using credible sources to identify the possible predictors of the behavior.) Of the beliefs that you identify through secondary research, which ones should the campaign aim to change, if any?
6) Based on your informed responses to Questions 1-5, how would you implement your campaign? Which channels, message strategies, or other communication strategies would you use? This section does not need to be extensive as this course focuses on evaluation rather than actual ad design or campaign implementation. This section simply helps to set up priorities for your evaluation design (see Questions 7-8).

7) How would you evaluate the campaign's effects (i.e., what is your impact evaluation design)? Create a figure illustrating your evaluation model. See Figure 2 in Hornik & Yanovitzky (2003) for guidance. How would you measure each of the factors in your evaluation model, including exposure, changes in beliefs, and all other factors? Would you measure these factors before and after the campaign (i.e., a pre-post design), at more than two timepoints, or using another type of design? Would your evaluation methods use closed-ended surveys, in-person interviews, observation, secondary data sources, and/or other data sources? When would you conduct your measurements?

8) What are the weaknesses of the evaluation design that you proposed in Question 7? How would you monitor the campaign to identify its weaknesses early on? Describe the strengths of your evaluation design.

Final Assignment Rubric

Final Assignment: ***Campaign evaluation design***						
	Ratings					
Criteria	**Excellent**		**Satisfactory**		**Insufficient**	**Score**
Question 1	10 pts	8 pts	6 pts	4 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Question 2	15 pts	10 pts	8 pts	6 pts	0 pts	15 pts
Question 3	10 pts	8 pts	6 pts	4 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Question 4	10 pts	8 pts	6 pts	4 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Question 5	15 pts	10 pts	8 pts	6 pts	0 pts	15 pts
Question 6	5 pts	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	0 pts	5 pts
Question 7	20 pts	15 pts	10 pts	5 pts	0 pts	20 pts
Question 8	10 pts	8 pts	6 pts	4 pts	0 pts	10 pts
Follows formatting instructions	5 pts	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	0 pts	5 pts
					Total Score: 100	

University Policies

University Policy on Accommodating Students with Disabilities:

Students requesting accommodation for disabilities must first register with the Dean of Students Office (http://www.dso.ufl.edu/drc/). The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the instructor when requesting accommodation. You must submit this documentation prior to submitting assignments or taking the quizzes or exams. Accommodations are not retroactive, therefore, students should contact the office as soon as possible in the term for which they are seeking accommodations.

Students with Disabilities who may need accommodations in this class are encouraged to notify the instructor and contact the Disability Resource Center (DRC) so that reasonable accommodations may be implemented. DRC is located in room 001 in Reid Hall or you can contact them by phone at 352-392-8565.

Netiquette: Communication Courtesy:

All members of the class are expected to follow rules of common courtesy in all email messages, threaded discussions and chats. http://teach.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/NetiquetteGuideforOnlineCourses.pdf

Class Demeanor:

Mastery in this class requires preparation, passion, and professionalism. Students are expected, within the requirements allowed by university policy, be on time, and meet all deadlines. Work assigned in advance of class should be completed as directed.

My role as instructor is to identify critical issues related to the course, direct you and teach relevant information, assign appropriate learning activities, create opportunities for assessing your performance, and communicate the outcomes of such assessments in a timely, informative, and professional way. Feedback is essential for you to have confidence that you have mastered the material and for me to determine that you are meeting all course requirements.

At all times it is expected you will welcome and respond professionally to assessment feedback, that you will treat your fellow students and me with respect, and that you will contribute to the success of the class as best as you can.

Other Resources:

Other are available at http://www.distance.ufl.edu/ getting-help for:

- Counseling and Wellness resources
  - http://www.counseling.ufl.edu/cwc/ 352-392-1575
- Disability resources
- Resources for handling student concerns and complaints
- Library Help Desk support

Should you have any complaints with your experience in this course please contact your program director and/or student support coordinator at distancesuppport@jou.ufl.edu or visit http://www.distance.ufl.edu/student-complaints to submit a complaint.

Course Evaluation:

Students are strongly encouraged to provide feedback on the quality of instruction in this course based on 10 criteria. These evaluations are conducted online at https://evaluations.ufl.edu

Evaluations are typically open during the last two or three weeks of the semester. Students will be given specific times when they are open. Summary results of these assessments are available to students at https://evaluations.ufl.edu/results

University Policy on Academic Misconduct:

Academic honesty and integrity are fundamental values of the University community. Students should be sure that they understand the UF Student Honor Code at http://www.dso.ufl.edu/students.php

The University of Florida Honor Code was voted on and passed by the Student Body in the fall 1995 semester. The Honor Code reads as follows:

Preamble: In adopting this Honor Code, the students of the University of Florida recognize that academic honesty and integrity are fundamental values of the University community. Students who enroll at the University commit to holding themselves and their peers to the high standard of honor required by the Honor Code. Any individual who becomes aware of a violation of the Honor Code is bound by honor to take corrective action. A student-run Honor Court and faculty support are crucial to the success of the Honor Code. The quality of a University of Florida education is dependent upon the community acceptance and enforcement of the Honor Code.

The Honor Code: "We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honesty and integrity."

On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied:

"On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment."

For more information about academic honesty, contact Student Judicial Affairs, P202 Peabody Hall, 352-392-1261.

Academic Honesty

All graduate students in the College of Journalism and Communications are expected to conduct themselves with the highest degree of integrity. It is the students' responsibility to ensure that they know and understand the requirements of every assignment. At a minimum, this includes avoiding the following:

Plagiarism: Plagiarism occurs when an individual presents the ideas or expressions of another as his or her own. Students must always credit others' ideas with accurate citations and must use quotation marks and citations when presenting the words of others. A thorough understanding of plagiarism is a precondition for admittance to graduate studies in the college.

Cheating: Cheating occurs when a student circumvents or ignores the rules that govern an academic assignment such as an exam or class paper. It can include using notes, in physical or electronic form, in an exam, submitting the work of another as one's own, or reusing a paper a student has composed for one class in another class. If a student is not sure about the rules that govern an assignment, it is the student's responsibility to ask for clarification from his instructor.

Misrepresenting Research Data: The integrity of data in mass communication research is a paramount issue for advancing knowledge and the credibility of our professions. For this reason any intentional 14 misrepresentation of data, or misrepresentation of the conditions or circumstances of data collection, is considered a violation of academic integrity. Misrepresenting data is a clear violation of the rules and requirements of academic integrity and honesty.

Any violation of the above stated conditions is grounds for immediate dismissal from the program and will result in revocation of the degree if the degree previously has been awarded.

Students are expected to adhere to the University of Florida Code of Conduct
https://www.dso.ufl.edu/sccr/process/student-conduct-honor-code

If you have additional questions, please refer to the Online Graduate Program Student Handbook you received when you were admitted into the Program.

Schedule

Weekly module dates:

The weekly modules start on Monday, January 8th. Each module (e.g., Week 1, Week 2, Week 3, etc.) will start on a Monday and the module ends the following Sunday. Modules will remain on Canvas even after they end.

 MODULES

- Week 1: January 8 - January 14
- Week 2: January 15 - January 21
- Week 3: January 22 - January 28
- Week 4: January 29 - February 4
- Week 5: February 5 - February 11
- Week 6: February 12 - February 18
- Week 7: February 19 - February 25
- Week 8: February 26 - March 4
- Week 9: March 5 - March 11
- Week 10: March 12 - March 18
- Week 11: March 19 - March 25
- Week 12: March 26 - April 1

Course Schedule:

Overview of module dates, weekly topics, and assignment due dates

Module	Topic	Assignment	Assignment due date*
Week 1: January 8 - January 14	Defining Campaigns and Evaluation	Assignment 1: Discussion post 1	January 11
		Assignment 2: Discussion post 2	January 11
Week 2: January 15 - January 21	Influencing Behavior Change	Assignment 3: Elicitation interviews	January 25
Week 3: January 22 - January 28	Formative Research	Assignment 4: Secondary research	February 8
Week 4: January 29 - February 4	Choosing Message Strategies for Campaigns	Assignment 5: Questionnaire development	February 15
Week 5: February 5 - February 11	Message Testing and Campaign Segmentation	Assignment 6: Campaign brief	February 21
Week 6: February 12 - February 18	Applying Formative Research	Assignment 7: Critique of ad strategies (Discussion post)	March 1
Week 7: February 19 - February 25	Campaign Monitoring and Measuring Impact	None	--
Week 8: February 26 - March 4	Alternative Impact Evaluation Designs	Assignment 8: Impact evaluation critique	March 8
Week 9: March 5 - March 11	Applying Evaluation Design	None	--
Week 10: March 12 - March 18	Building Partnerships between Campaign Planners and Evaluators	None	--
Week 11: March 19 - March 25	Disseminating Research Findings	None	--
Week 12: March 26 - April 1	Summarizing the Evaluation Spectrum	Final assignment: Campaign evaluation design	March 30

*Assignments are due by 11:59PM EST, CST, or PST (the time zone is your choice).

Week One: Defining Campaigns and Evaluation

Learning Objectives:
- Introduce the course and syllabus.
- Recognize why evaluation is a central part of comprehensive campaign planning.

Watch:
- Provide link to recorded course introduction
- Provide link to recorded syllabus introduction
- Provide link to recorded lectures.

Required Readings:
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **Read pages 3, 6-7, 32-65**

Assignments:
- Assignment 1 – Discussion post 1 – due January 11, 2018
- Assignment 2 – Discussion post 2 – due January 11, 2018

Week Two: Influencing Behavior Change

Learning Objectives:
- Understand why it is necessary to apply behavior change theory to the design of campaign evaluations.
- Conceptualize a campaign's route(s) of effect as one of the first steps in campaign planning.
- Learn a comprehensive theory of behavior change and how it can be leveraged to plan campaign messages empirically, rather than sporadically.
- Apply elicitation interview methods.

Watch:
- Provide link to recorded lectures.

Required Readings:
- Hornik, R. C., & Yanovitzky, I. (2003). Using Theory to Design Evaluations of Communication Campaigns: The Case of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. *Communication Theory, 13*(2), **204-224.**
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach* (1st ed.). New York: Psychology Press Taylor & Francis Group.
  - **Read pages 1–30 in Week 2.**
  - **Follow pages 451-452 for Assignment 3.**
  - **Review pages 457-463 for Assignment 5.**
- Fishbein, M., & Yzer, M. C. (2003). Using Theory to Design Effective Health Behavior Interventions. *Communication Theory, 13*(2), 164-183. **Read pages 164–172.**

Assignments:
- Assignment 3 – Elicitation interviews – due January 25, 2018.

Week Three: Formative Research

Learning Objectives:

- Review various approaches to conducting formative research as part of a campaign and evaluation planning. Approaches include secondary review of literature, focus groups, and in-depth interviews.

Watch:

- <mark>Provide link to recorded lectures.</mark>

Required Readings:

- Atkin, C. K. & Freimuth, V. (2012). Guidelines for Formative Evaluation Research in Campaign Design. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.), *Public communication campaigns* (4th ed., pp. 53-68). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE. **Read chapter 4.**
- Damon, S. A., Poehlman, J. A., Rupert, D. J., & Williams, P. N. (2013). Storm-related carbon monoxide poisoning: An investigation of target audience knowledge and risk behaviors. *Social Marketing Quarterly, 19*(3), 188–199. **Focus on the Method and Findings sections, pages 2–8.**
- Namey, E., Guest, G., McKenna, K., & Chen, M. (2016). Evaluating Bang for the Buck: A Cost-Effectiveness Comparison Between Individual Interviews and Focus Groups Based on Thematic Saturation Levels. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *37*(3), 425–440. **Read pages 425-427, Appendix A, Appendix B.**
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & McKenna, K. (2017). How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for nonprobability sample sizes. *Field Methods*, *29*(1), 3-22. **Read pages 3-12, 16-19.**
- Rupert, D. J., Poehlman, J. A., Hayes, J. J., Ray, S. E., & Moultrie, R. R. (2017). Virtual versus in-person focus groups: Comparison of costs, recruitment, and participant logistics. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 19*(3), e80.

Assignments:

- Assignment 4 – Secondary research – Due February 8, 2018.

Week Four: Choosing Message Strategies for Campaigns

Learning Objectives:

- Practice a highly useful approach for empirically selecting promising strategies (i.e., topics) for campaign messages.

Watch:

- <mark>Provide link to recorded lectures.</mark>

Required Readings:

- Hornik, R., & Woolf, K. D. (1999). Using Cross-Sectional Surveys to Plan Message Strategies. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, *5*(2), **34–41**.
- Brennan, E., Gibson, L. A., Kybert-Momjian, A., Liu, J., & Hornik, R. C. (2017). Promising Themes for Antismoking Campaigns Targeting Youth and Young Adults. *Tobacco Regulatory Science*, *3*(1), 29–46.

- Fishbein, M., & Yzer, M. C. (2003). Using Theory to Design Effective Health Behavior Interventions. *Communication Theory*, *13*(2), 164-183. **Read pages 172–181.**

Assignments:

- Assignment 5 – Questionnaire development – Due February 15, 2018.

Additional readings if interested (not required):

- Niederdeppe, J., Porticella, N., & Shapiro, M. A. (2011). Using Theory to Identify Beliefs Associated With Support for Policies to Raise the Price of High-Fat and High-Sugar Foods. *Journal of Health Communication*, *17*(1), 90–104.
- Niederdeppe, J., Connelly, N. A., Labuer, T. B., & Knuth, B. A. (2015). Using Theory to Identify Beliefs Associated with Intentions to Follow Fish Consumption Advisories Among Anglers Living in the Great Lakes Region: Fish Consumption Advisories.
- Robbins, R., & Niederdeppe, J. (2015). Using the Integrative Model of Behavioral Prediction to Identify Promising Message Strategies to Promote Healthy Sleep Behavior Among College Students. *Health Communication*, *30*(1), 26–38.
- Brennan, E., Gibson, L., Momjian, A., & Hornik, R. C. (2015). Are Young People's Beliefs About Menthol Cigarettes Associated with Smoking-Related Intentions and Behaviors? *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, *17*(1), 81–90.

Week Five: Message Testing and Campaign Segmentation

Learning Objectives:

- Identify approaches for formatively testing campaign messages.
- Compare the advantages and pitfalls of targeting audiences through segmentation versus unified campaigns.

Watch/Listen:

- Provide link to recorded lectures.
- [PODCAST EPISODE] Southwell, B. (2016). *Perceived Ad Effectiveness*. *The Measure of Everyday Life*. Retrieved 20 October 2017, from https://measureradio.libsyn.com/size/5/?search=yzer
  - After reading Yzer, Lorusso, and Nagler (2015), listen to the first 13 minutes of this podcast episode, which features an interview with the lead author, Marco Yzer, and further explanation on evaluating the effectiveness of campaign messages. **Listen from 00:00 – 13:20.**

Required Readings:

- Atkin, C. K. & Freimuth, V. (2012). Guidelines for Formative Evaluation Research in Campaign Design. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.), *Public communication campaigns* (4th ed., pp. 53-68). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE. **Review pages 61–63, which you read during Week 3.**
- Yzer, M., LoRusso, S., & Nagler, R. H. (2015). On the Conceptual Ambiguity Surrounding Perceived Message Effectiveness. *Health Communication*, *30*(2), 125–134.
- Cantrell, J., Vallone, D. M., Thrasher, J. F., Nagler, R. H., Feirman, S. P., Muenz, L. R., … Viswanath, K. (2013). Impact of Tobacco-Related Health Warning Labels across Socioeconomic, Race and Ethnic Groups: Results from a Randomized Web-Based Experiment. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(1), e52206.

- Hornik, R. C., & Ramirez, A. S. (2006). Racial/Ethnic Disparities and Segmentation in Communication Campaigns. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *49*(6), 868–884.
- Parvanta, S., Gibson, L., Moldovan-Johnson, M., Mallya, G., & Hornik, R. C. (2013). Race and gender moderation of the relationship between cessation beliefs and intentions: is race or gender message segmentation necessary in anti-smoking campaigns? *Health Education Research*, *28*(5), 857–868.

Assignments:
- Assignment 6 – Campaign brief – Due February 21, 2018

Week Six: Applying Formative Research

Learning Objectives:
- Review the application of formative research methods in real-world campaign contexts.
- Learn about formative research approaches from a guest expert.

Watch:
- Provide link to recorded lectures.
- Guest Lecture: Alyssa Jordan, MPH

Required Readings:
- Parvanta, S., Gibson, L., Forquer, H., Shapiro-Luft, D., Dean, L., Freres, D., … Hornik, R. (2013). Applying Quantitative Approaches to the Formative Evaluation of Antismoking Campaign Messages. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, *19*(4), 242–264.
- Fishbein, M., Hall-Jamieson, K., Zimmer, E., von Haeften, I., & Nabi, R. (2002). Avoiding the boomerang: Testing the relative effectiveness of antidrug public service announcements before a national campaign. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*, 238–245.

Additional readings if interested (not required):
- Cialdini, R. B. (2003). Crafting normative messages to protect the environment. *Current directions in psychological science*, *12*(4), **105-109.**
- Hull, S. J., Gasiorowicz, M., Hollander, G., & Short, K. (2013). Using Theory to Inform Practice: The Role of Formative Research in the Construction and Implementation of the Acceptance Journeys Social Marketing Campaign to Reduce Homophobia. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, *19*(3), 139-155.

Assignments:
- Assignment 7 – Critique of ad strategies (Discussion post) – Due March 1, 2018.

Week Seven: Campaign Monitoring and Measuring Impact

Learning Objectives:
- Distinguish between monitoring and summative evaluation phases.
- Describe the utility of campaign monitoring.
- Introduce summative evaluation.

Watch:
- Provide link to recorded lectures.

- **Guest Lecture: Katherine Cullen**

Required Readings:
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **Read pages 171-177 and 208-222.**
- Hornik, R. C. (2002). Exposure: Theory and Evidence about All the Ways It Matters. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, *8*(3), 31–37. Cialdini, R. B. (2003). Crafting normative messages to protect the environment. *Current directions in psychological science*, *12*(4)**, 105-109.**

Assignments:
- None

Additional readings if interested (not required):
- Cho, H., & Salmon, C. T. (2007). Unintended Effects of Health Communication Campaigns. *Journal of Communication*, *57*(2), 293–317.

Week Eight: Alternative Impact Evaluation Designs
Learning Objectives:
- Examine a variety of evaluation designs for testing campaign effects.
- Understand why randomized controlled trials are not always the most valid designs for evaluating the impact of communication campaigns.
- Demonstrate an ability to interpret methods and findings in published evaluations.

Watch:
- Provide link to recorded lectures.

Required Readings:
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **Read pages 234–238, 290–297.**
- Hornik, R. C. (Ed.). (2002). Epilogue. In *Public health communication: Evidence for behavior change* (pp. 385-405). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. **Read the Epilogue.**

Additional readings if interested (not required):
- Schutt, R. K. (2011). Causation and research design. In *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research* (pp. 171-232). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press. **Suggested pages 175-196.**

Assignments:
- Assignment 8 – Impact evaluation critique – Due March 8, 2018.
- Reminder that your final assignment is due March 30, 2018. Contact me if you have questions about this assignment.

Week Nine: Applying Evaluation Design
Learning Objectives:
- Breakdown existing evaluations into their component parts, such as measuring exposure and effects on behavioral outcomes.

Watch:
- ==Provide link to recorded lectures.==

Required Readings:
- Hornik, R., Jacobsohn, L., Orwin, R., Piesse, A., & Kalton, G. (2008). Effects of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign on Youths. *American Journal of Public Health*, *98*(12), **2229–2236.**
- Staats, H. J., Wit, A. P., & Midden, C. Y. H. (1996). Communicating the Greenhouse Effect to the Public: Evaluation of a Mass Media Campaign from a Social Dilemma Perspective. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *46*(2), **189–203.**

Assignments:
- None
- Course evaluations are available on Canvas.
- Reminder that your final assignment is due March 30, 2018. Contact me if you have questions about this assignment.

Additional readings if interested (not required):
- Thomas W. Valente, W. P. S. (2001). Campaign Exposure and Interpersonal Communication as Factors in Contraceptive Use in Bolivia. *Journal of Health Communication*, *6*(4), 303–322.

Week Ten: Building Partnerships between Campaign Planners and Evaluators

Learning Objectives:
- Adopt a set of best practices for enhancing communication and productivity between campaign sponsors and the evaluation team.

Watch:
- ==Provide link to recorded lectures.==

Required Readings:
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **Read pages 82–93.**

Assignments:
- None
- Course evaluations are available on Canvas.
- Reminder that your final assignment is due March 30, 2018. Contact me if you have questions about this assignment.

Week Eleven: Disseminating Research Findings

Learning Objectives:
- Explain the importance of sharing evaluation results responsibly, honestly, and with appropriate stakeholders including policymakers, funders, and the news media.

Watch/Listen:
- ==Provide link to recorded lectures.==

- Glass, I. (2016). *584: For Your Reconsideration*. *This American Life*. Retrieved 20 October 2017, from https://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/584/for-your-reconsideration
  - After reading Matthews (2017), listen to the first 30 minutes of this podcast episode, which describes a researcher who fabricated findings in the initial study on the canvasing campaign. **Listen from 00:00 – 30:00 (Prologue and Act 1).**

Required Readings:
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **Read pages 411-420.**
- Matthews, D. (2017, September 28). A massive new study reviews the evidence on whether campaigning works. The answer's bleak. *Vox*. Retrieved from https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/9/28/16367580/campaigning-doesnt-work-general-election-study-kalla-broockman
- Schutt, R. K. (2011). Reporting research. In *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research* (pp. 489-515). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press. **Read pages 511-513.**

Assignments:
- None.
- Course evaluations are available on Canvas.
- Reminder that your final assignment is due March 30, 2018.

Week Twelve: Summarizing the Evaluation Spectrum
Learning Objectives:
- Describe the components of comprehensive, well-designed and science-based campaign evaluations from start to finish, including formative research, monitoring, and impact evaluation.

Watch:
- Provide link to recorded lectures.

Required Readings:
- DeJong, W. & Smith, S. W. (2012). Closing the Gaps in Practice and Theory: Evaluation of the Scrutinize HIV Campaign in South Africa. In R. E. Rice & C. K. Atkin (Eds.), *Public communication campaigns* (4th ed., pp. 305-320). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE. **Read chapter 21, pages 308-319.**

Assignments:
- Final Assignment – Campaign evaluation design – Due March 30, 2018.

Have a nice spring!