Rationale: As professionals who intervene on behalf of vulnerable populations, social workers leaders have an ethical obligation to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions with the individuals, families, organizations, and communities they serve. With sharp reductions in the availability of public funding leading to competition for scarce resources, the increased emphasis on accountability, evaluation, and performance measures is profoundly shaping the profession of social work. Therefore, contemporary social work practice requires that administrators, educators, and practitioners be accountable to multiple stakeholders, including policy makers, funders, agency executives, and staff and clients. Social workers must be prepared to respond to stakeholders using quantitative and qualitative research and evaluation methodologies, while at the same time recognizing the political and organizational context of evaluation.

Purpose: The purpose of this course is to prepare students for social work leadership roles that require proficiency in evaluating agency and community-based programs. Students who take this course will learn about a variety of evaluation methods, including their purpose, effectiveness, and efficiency. The range of philosophies, methods, and skills commonly used for evaluating human service programs and social work practice interventions will be covered. Special attention is placed on evaluating the extent to which social programs address issues of social justice, ethics, diversity, and empowerment across diverse populations and settings.

This is a doctoral level course which is open to advanced masters students. Students must have a firm grasp of basic research principles and methodologies as a basis for this class.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. Review the evaluation literature and demonstrate the ability to critically evaluate published evaluation research for use in developing an evaluation plan.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of various evaluation models and quantitative and qualitative methodologies and the ability to select the best method for evaluating a specific program or policy.
3. Design an agency-based evaluation study (e.g., needs assessment, program evaluation, program monitoring, outcome evaluation, and cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis).
4. Design appropriate sampling plans and identify (or develop) measurement instruments to meet evaluation objectives.
5. Demonstrate the integration of social work values and research ethics in the evaluation process.
6. Demonstrate the ability to interact with various program stakeholders (i.e., agency administrators, clients) when preparing for and/or planning or implementing an evaluation.
7. Demonstrate an understanding of cultural competence in planning all phases of the evaluation project, with respect to the individuals, groups, communities, and organizations involved.
8. Demonstrate an understanding of ethical, social, political, and cultural issues confronted by program evaluators.
9. Demonstrate skills to analyze and present, orally and in writing, evaluation data in ways that maximize utility.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE

Course content will be covered through lectures, class discussions, readings, individual presentations and written assignments. Students are expected to complete all reading assignments prior to the appropriate class and to use them as the basis for informed discussion. The focus of class sessions will be on the discussion, rather than simple review, of readings and assignments. Lectures and readings are meant to supplement, not substitute for, each other.

The instructor will post announcements and course materials at the Blackboard website associated with the course, or via your Fordham email. Please plan on checking your Fordham email daily.

The students are expected to: attend each class on time; complete all assignments on time; come to class prepared having read all assigned readings; participate in class discussions; seek any clarifications from the instructor; and provide the instructor with feedback about course methods. Students are strongly advised to discuss any problems with attendance, meeting deadlines or completion of assignments at the earliest possible time. Students are expected to notify the instructor via e-mail at least 24 hours in advance if they are going to miss a class.

REQUIRED TEXT:


RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL TEXT: (selected readings will be assigned):


ADDITIONAL REFERENCE TEXTS/RESOURCES:


Campbell Collaboration http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/library


**ADDITIONAL READINGS**


**EVALUATION STUDIES FOR CRITIQUE**

**Needs Assessment:**


**Process Evaluation:**


**Client Satisfaction Studies:**


**Outcome Studies:**


**Cost-Benefit/Cost-Effectiveness:**


**GUIDED INSTRUCTION: (MASTERS STUDENTS ONLY)**

1. **Human Subjects Training**  
   Due: Before Spring Break  
   a) Complete web-based course: CITI: Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative for Social and Behavioral Researchers ([https://www.citiprogram.org/Default.asp](https://www.citiprogram.org/Default.asp)) (This takes 4-5 hours). Print and submit certificate; OR  
   b) If basic course has been taken, submit certificate, complete refresher and submit refresher certificate

2. **Agency Case Study and Interview with Stakeholder**  
   Due: Session 3  
   • Describe the agency mission and provide an overview of the programs and services provided. (1 page)  
   • Describe the current model of evaluation and resources (staffing, money) devoted to evaluation within the agency. (1-2 pages)
• Conduct an informal interview with at least one agency stakeholder (e.g., administrator, board member, program funder) covering their perspective on the role of evaluation and the evaluation needs of the agency. Summarize and critique interview findings. (2-3 pages).
• Prepare 5 minute oral class presentation on report.

ASSIGNMENTS

All written assignments must adhere to the format as described in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Sixth Edition. All papers should have page numbers and use either Times Roman or Arial, a 12-point font, and 1” margins on all sides of the document. 
**Do not go over page limits for written assignments or points will be deducted.**

All written assignments must be sent to the instructor as an email attachment prior to the start of the class at which they are due. In addition, masters students should upload their written assignments on TK-20. File names should follow the following convention: Last name - Assignment title. For example, the file name for the Study Aims assignment would be: (Smith - Study Aims Draft). The file name for an article critique would be (Smith – Article Critique – <Author last name>). Incorrectly named files will be returned. For most assignments, I will use the Track Changes feature in Word to edit and/or comment on the written assignments you submit. If you have not used these features in Word, you will find it helpful to look at these topics in the Help function of Word.

Late papers will typically have a 5-10% reduction in grade, depending on time overdue. Late papers will only be accepted at the discretion of the instructor, and only with prior notice and documentation of an acceptable reason for delay; e.g., illness of self or family. Please note that program evaluators often work on very strict timelines that are dictated by federal or other grant funding agencies. Missing deadlines can mean losing your funding.

Assignment #1 Article Critique
Due: Sessions 4-12 depending on topic

Students will be randomly assigned one evaluation article from reading assignments which is illustrative of a specific evaluation design and will:
1. Prepare a written critique summarizing the elements of the evaluation study (study objectives, methodology, major findings) and the major strengths and weaknesses of the study). Maximum 5-7 pages.
2. Present the critique to the class (5-10 minutes) and lead a class discussion of the article. (If more than 1 student is assigned the same article, 1st and 2nd presenter will be randomly selected).

(See Appendix A for detailed outline for the report and presentation).

Assignment #2 Evaluation Study Proposal

Students will apply the concepts of this course by developing an evaluation research proposal for a program of interest to them. The student will develop the proposal up to the point of actual data collection.
Doctoral students must design individual projects. Masters students may work in teams of 2-3 students. All members of the team will receive the same grade for the assignment. In both cases, these proposals are expected to represent original, unpublished work which has not been used to fulfill the requirements of another course.

The study design may be for a needs assessment, client satisfaction study, process evaluation, or outcome-based program evaluation. The proposal will be divided into several mini-assignments. The purpose is to work on study components that build upon each other and to use instructor and class feedback to develop the final project proposal.

1. **Introduction: Due Session 5 (3 pages + 1 page for logic model maximum)**
   - Problem statement, need program is addressing
   - Description of agency, agency mission
   - Description of program, including program goals and objectives
   - Evaluation objectives
   - Logic Model

2. **Literature Review: Due Session 7 (2 pages maximum)**
   - Review of related literature on problem, program, and prior evaluation findings

3. **Evaluation Design: Due Session 9 (3 pages maximum)**
   - Type of evaluation study (e.g., process, outcome, need assessment, client satisfaction study)
   - Specific evaluation questions/hypotheses
   - Evaluation Design (e.g., survey, pre-experimental, quasi-experimental, experimental)
   - Sampling plan
   - Data collection methods

4. **Measurement and Data Analysis Plan: Due Session 12 (3 pages maximum)**
   - Conceptual and operational definitions of key variables.
   - Primary analytic strategy

5. **Final Proposal: Due 4/17**
   - A cumulative report of the prior sections including revisions as necessary and a summary section critically analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the design and what potential problems may emerge in implementing the evaluation study

See Appendix B for detailed outline for Final Evaluation Proposal

**Assignment #3**

**Presentation of Evaluation Proposal to the Class.** 10 minute powerpoint presentation summarizing your evaluation proposal with time for discussion with the class.

See Appendix C for detailed outline for Presentation of Proposal to Class

**Submission instructions for final proposal:**
The due date for the final proposal is Saturday 6 pm 4/21 - before the 14th class session when the proposals will begin to be presented to the class. The proposal should be emailed to me on that date and also to all the students in the class. The proposals are the assigned reading for the two class sessions during which the proposals are presented. All students are expected to be knowledgeable about each of the proposals critiqued that week and to actively participate in
the discussion. Students should consider themselves as consultants to the presenter with the
goal of constructive criticism to strengthen the proposal. Proposal presentations should be
approximately 10 minutes, with an additional 10 minutes for class discussion.

QUizzes

There will be 6 quizzes during the semester, all announced in advance. The quizzes
will be based on readings and classroom material covered in the previous weeks. Most
quizzes will contain short answer questions and there will be about 10-20 questions on
each quiz. The quiz will be handed out at the beginning of the class at 1:30 and be
collected 5 or 10 minutes later based on the number of questions. Students who are late
will miss the quiz. There are no make-up quizzes. The lowest quiz score will be
dropped and the grade for the quizzes will be based on the remaining scores. Although
students may view their quizzes at any time during the semester, the quizzes will be
kept by the instructor.

The quizzes are in lieu of a midterm and final exams and, as noted below, represent
20% of your grade. It is therefore very important for you to be current in your reading
and proactive in class discussions to clarify any questions you may have.

Grading Criteria:

1. Case Study
   0 points (-5 if not submitted)
2. Human Subject training certificate
   0 points (-5 if not submitted)
3. Critique and Presentation of Evaluation Study
   20 points
4. Evaluation Proposal
   a. Introduction, objectives, logic model
      5 points
   b. Literature Review
      5 points
   c. Evaluation Design
      5 points
   d. Measurement and Data Analysis
      5 points
4. Final Proposal
   25 points
5. Presentation
   5 points
6. Class participation, attendance
   10 points
7. Quizzes
   20 points
## CLASS SCHEDULE AND ASSIGNMENTS

**Note:** Changes may be made in the syllabus in content and/or order depending on the pace and interests of the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings (Additional articles as case examples will be assigned)</th>
<th>Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Course Overview and Introduction to Program Evaluation | **Required Readings:**
**Optional:**
Rossi et al (2004):
Chapter 1: An overview of program evaluation  
Chapter 2: Tailoring evaluations | |
| 2     | Ethic and Cultural Contexts of Evaluation | **Required Readings:**
Royse et al (2010):
Chapter 2: Ethical issues in program evaluation  
**Optional:**
### Designing Client-Centered Programs & Development of Logic Models

**Required:**
- Chapter 5: Expressing and Assessing Program Theory

**Optional**

### Needs Assessment and Capacity Mapping

**Required:**
  - Chapter 3: Needs Assessment
  - Chapter 4: Assessing the Need for a Program

Selected article(s) for critique

1/31: Agency Case Study and Interview with Stakeholder
| 5 & 6 | Formative and Process Evaluation, Client Satisfaction Surveys, Program Monitoring, Evaluation vs. Performance Improvement Studies. | **Required:**  
Royse et al (2010):  
Chapter 5: Formative and Process Evaluation  
Chapter 7: Client Satisfaction  
Chapter 13: Pragmatic Issues (focus on fidelity)  
Selected article(s) for critique  
**Optional:**  
Process Evaluation Workbook (on blackboard)  
2/14: Introduction:  
- Problem statement, need program is addressing  
- Description of agency, agency mission  
- Description of Program, including program goals and objectives  
- Evaluation objectives  
- Logic Model | 2/28: Literature Review  
- Review of related literature on problem, program, and prior evaluation findings |
|---|---|---|
| 7 & 8 | Outcome Evaluations | **Required:**  
Royse et al (2010):  
Chapter 9: Group Research Designs  
Selected article(s) for critique  
**Optional:**  
Rossi et al (2004):  
Process Evaluation Workbook (on blackboard)  
2/28: Literature Review  
- Review of related literature on problem, program, and prior evaluation findings |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/27</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation Design:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Type of evaluation study (process, outcome, need assessment, client satisfaction study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Specific evaluation questions/hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evaluation Design (survey, pre-experimental, quasi-experimental, experimental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sampling plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Data collection methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10</td>
<td><strong>Efficiency Evaluations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conceptual and operational definitions of key variables. Identify potential measures of key variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 7: Measuring and Monitoring Program Outcomes**

Chapter 8: Assessing Program Impact: Randomized Field Experiments

Chapter 9: Assessing Program Impact: Alternative Designs

**NO CLASS**

**SPRING BREAK**

**9 & 10**

**Evaluation Designs:**

- Qualitative vs. Quantitative, Data Sources, Sample, Data Collection, Measurement

**Required:**

  - Chapter 4: Qualitative and Mixed Methods in Evaluation
  - Chapter 8: Sampling
  - Chapter 11: Measurement Tools and Strategies
  - Chapter 12: Illustrations of Instruments.

**Optional:**


**11**

**Quantitative and Qualitative Data Analyses**

**Required:**

  - Chapter 14: Data Analyses
  - Review Chapter 4: Qualitative and Mixed Methods

**12**

**Efficiency Evaluations:**

- Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness

**Required:**

- Royse et al (2010):
  - Chapter 10: Cost-Effectiveness and Cost Analysis


- Kane, RL., & Kane, RA (2010). We’ve looked at care from both sides now: The effects of alternative evaluation strategies on study conclusions. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy,* 21, 246-255.

**Selected article(s) for critique**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Presentation of Final Proposals</td>
<td>Student Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Presentation of Final Proposals</td>
<td>Student Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Presentation of Final Proposals</td>
<td>Student Proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A. – Guidelines for Assignment 1: Evaluation Study Critique

Areas to be covered in the written and oral presentation include:

- Briefly describe the problem/need addressed by the program being evaluated.
- Briefly describe the program’s goal, target group, intended effect, supposed mechanism (theory of change), and intervention to address the problem/need, as relevant.
- Type of evaluation design (e.g., process, outcome, mixed)
- Evaluation research questions and/or hypotheses
- Describe sampling procedures and response; discuss strengths and weaknesses
- Describe primary variables and their measurement; discuss strengths and weaknesses
- Evaluation results
- Were there any practical limitations or “flies in the ointment” in conducting the evaluation? Were these anticipated by the investigators?
- Were there any human subject issues of concern?
- In your opinion, did the overall evaluation plan fit the goals and objectives of the program? (including sampling, measurement, and data analyses elements).
- What would you have done differently in evaluating the program (if anything?).
- Do you think the evaluation represents strong, medium, or weak evidence relative to the research questions and the evaluation design?
- Anything else you think important to address.
Appendix B: Outline for Final Evaluation Proposal (15 pages maximum excluding references and logic model)

1. Introduction
   a. Statement of the problem that the particular program or policy is aimed at ameliorating, preventing, or resolving.
   b. Overview of the agency and the program to be evaluated, including a statement of the program goals (e.g., process goals, outputs, short, medium, and long-term impacts), and the underlying program theory (that is, the mechanisms through which the intervention is expected to produce its intended outcomes.
   c. Description of the evaluation environmental, including the receptivity of the administration staff, and other stakeholders to an evaluation
   d. Logic model for the program which is guiding the evaluation
   e. Evaluation Objectives and hypotheses

2. Literature Review
   a. A critical review of the literature which provides a foundation for the need for the program, state of the knowledge regarding current evidence of program impacts, need for the proposed evaluation, and literature supporting proposed methods and measures.

3. Methodology
   a. Type of evaluation design
   b. Sampling plan – describe the sample and recruitment strategies
   c. Identification of conceptual and operational definitions of study variables. Specify sources of data and specific measures. (Attach copies of the actual instruments and protocols to be used).
   d. Data collection procedures – what steps will be taken and by whom to collect data and provide informed consent. (Attach copy of draft informed consent or waiver of consent form).
   e. If relevant, specify how program fidelity will be assessed
   f. Data analyses plan
   g. Timeline

4. Discussion
   a. Discussion of possible limitations of the evaluation design and alternates considered.
   b. Discussion of possible challenges to your evaluation plan, including implementation problems, professional or ethical considerations, and ways they might be handled during the evaluation process.
   c. Description of the potential uses of the evaluation information
   d. Plans for dissemination to specific stakeholders (What presentations and written reports are planned, for which media, and for which specific stakeholders)

5. References
Appendix C: Powerpoint Presentation of Final Proposal

The presentation should include:

- A title slide
- Problem statement (1 slide)
- Description of Program and theory of change (1-2 slides)
- Evaluation questions/hypotheses (1 slide)
- Evaluation design (3-4 slides)
  - Type of evaluation
  - Sampling plan
  - Measures
  - Data Collection plan
  - Plan of analyses
- Potential obstacles and possible alternative plans (1 slide)
- Limitations (1 slide)
- Questions for consultants (1 slide)
APPENDIX C: PLAGARISM

University Policies of Academic Integrity

A university, by its nature, strives to foster and recognize originality of thought. Originality can only be recognized, however, when people acknowledge the sources of ideas and works that are not their own. Therefore, students must maintain the highest standards with regard to honesty, effort and performance. Violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, plagiarism, cheating on exams, false authorship and destruction of library materials needed for a course. This policy gives definitions and instances of violations of academic integrity, the procedures used to arrive at a judgment, possible sanctions and the processes of appeal. This policy will be enforced rigorously and without discrimination.

Violations of Academic Integrity:

A. **Plagiarism:** Plagiarism occurs when individuals attempt to present as their own what has come from another source. Plagiarism takes place whether such theft is accidental or deliberate. Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to:
   - Using the ideas of another person, whether or not such ideas are paraphrased, from whatever source including oral, print, broadcast or computer-mediated communication.
   - Rewriting borrowed material by simply dropping a word here and there, substituting a few words for others, or moving around words or sentences.
   - Presenting borrowed material without placing quotation marks around borrowed material in the approved style. It is no defense to claim that one has “forgotten” to do so.
   - Presenting as one’s own an assignment, paper or computer program partially or wholly prepared by another person, whether by another student, friend, or by a business or online service that sells or distributes such papers and programs.

B. **Cheating:** Cheating occurs when individuals share course materials or information when it is unauthorized or prohibited. Examples of cheating include but are not limited to:
   - Having or using unauthorized material at an examination, test or quiz, or copying another student’s assignment or laboratory report.
   - Permitting another student to copy an assignment, paper, computer program, project, examination, test or quiz.
   - Obtaining and/or using an examination, test or quiz prior to its administration.
   - Having another person act as proxy and take an examination, test or quiz.

C. **Additional Violations of Academic Integrity:** Additional violations of academic integrity include but are not limited to:
   - Theft, destruction or tampering with library materials, audio and videotapes, computer hardware or software, or other materials necessary for a course.
   - The submission or presentation of a falsified excuse for an absence from a course requirement, examination, test or quiz.
   - The presentation of false identification or credentials in order to gain admission to a course, examination, test, quiz or degree program.
Submission of a paper or project to more than one course during the time in which a student is attending Fordham University, without explicit permission from the instructors. The penalty for students found guilty of plagiarism and other violations of academic integrity may range from failure for the assignment or course to dismissal from the program.
APPENDIX D: STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Office of Disability Services  The Office of Disability Services at Fordham University helps to ensure equal educational access and opportunity for all members of our community. In the Jesuit tradition of cura personalis, members of the ODS staff work individually with each student to understand his or her strengths and limitations in order to develop their most effective and comprehensive accommodation plan. In addition to working in a direct service capacity with our students, the Office of Disability Services also collaborates with administrators, faculty, and staff to ensure that the facilitation of reasonable and appropriate accommodations for students with documented disabilities is provided. As a University, Fordham will offer reasonable and appropriate auxiliary aids and services to assist otherwise qualified persons in achieving access to its programs, services, and facilities once documentation is submitted to ODS and an intake appointment is conducted to develop an accommodation plan directly with the student in accordance with Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

The Office of Disability Services believe that their policies and mission carry out the intent of Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act, which states:

"No otherwise qualified individual with a disability in the United States, as defined in section 7(20), shall solely by reason of his or her disability, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Please go to the Office of Disabilities for documentation guidelines according to type of disability. The website address is: http://www.fordham.edu/campus_resources/student_services/disability_services/

You can also contact the Office of Disability at 718-817-0655.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-100</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-89</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-86</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-82</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-79</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-75</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 70</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>