

EVAL 683:002

Subject:

Credits:

PreReq:

**Evaluation in Social Work
Evaluation**

3

**SW522 or permission of
instructor**

Applies to & Method Type:

**CSS, CHLDY, AG, HLTH,
MHLTH, Evaluation**

Semester: Fall 2015

Meets: Wednesday, 9 to noon

Location: B798 SSWB

Instructor: Letha A. Chadiha, PhD, MSW

Office: 3692 SSW

Phone: 734.763.9396

Email: lethac@umich.edu

Office Hours: Tues., 11 AM-1 PM or BA

I. Course Description

This course will cover beginning level evaluation that builds on basic research knowledge as a method of assessing social work practice and strengthening clients, communities and their social programs as well as the systems that serve clients and communities. It addresses the evaluation of promotion, prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation services. Students will learn to assess and apply evaluation methods from various perspectives, including scientific, ethical, multicultural, and social justice perspectives.

II. Course Content

This course will focus on the direct application of the analytical skills associated with developing and implementing evaluation designs that are appropriate for social work practice. Students will examine the evaluation of social work programs with particular attention to dimensions of diversity (ability, age, class, color, culture, ethnicity, family structure, gender [including gender identity and gender expression], marital status, national origin, race, religion or spirituality, sex, and sexual orientation). Students will be introduced to models of evaluation derived from social science and social work theory and research. They will learn to apply these models as they develop skills in critically assessing evaluation methods within the social context.

III. Course Objectives

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

1. Identify and choose the type of evaluation that is appropriate to answer questions consonant with a program's developmental stage.

2. Specify a program for evaluation and its theory of change.
3. Recognize and apply evaluation and data collection methods that are appropriate to the evaluation context.
4. Plan an evaluation of social work practice, using a logic model framework.
5. Understand strategies that promote the involvement of practice and policy communities in disseminating results of evaluation activities in order to foster program and policy change.
6. Critically examine existing evaluation studies for their consistency with the values reflected in the curricular themes.

IV. Course Design

The course will use multiple pedagogical methods including short lectures; active and reflective learning; collaborative and focus group discussions; and case examples and experiential exercises. To promote active and reflective learning, students will engage in self-reflections on required readings when writing assignments and during in-class discussions. Guest presenters will address relevant topics to planning evaluations including ethical issues, cultural competency; reliable and valid measures; statistics and quantitative data analyses; and professional poster development.

V. Relationship of the Course to Four Curriculum Themes

Multiculturalism & Diversity: Students will develop the capacity to identify ways in which dimensions of diversity (ability, age, class, color, culture, ethnicity, family structure, gender [including gender identity and gender expression], marital status, national origin, race, religion or spirituality, sex, and sexual orientation) influence evaluation processes and outcomes. Because a collaborative, participatory process is critical to evaluation of social work interventions, attention to diversity is imperative for proper implementation of evaluation in social work contexts.

Social Justice: Students will develop the capacity to analyze the impact and efficiency of services and policies as they relate to social change and social justice. Participatory, collaborative, change-oriented evaluation processes and appropriate dissemination activities can promote the achievement of social justice and change and therefore are emphasized in the class. Also important are an examination of the role of power in evaluation and the development of knowledge, skills, and capacities that participants of evaluation can mobilize to shift imbalances of power and resources.

Promotion, Prevention, Treatment & Rehabilitation: Students will develop the capacity to develop and evaluate prevention and promotion as well as rehabilitation programs that are designed to reduce risk of onset of problems and promote healthy development.

Behavioral and Social Science Research: Students will strengthen their capacity to use theoretical and empirical social science literature to develop and understand whether interventions are appropriately designed and scientifically sound.

VI. Relationship of the Course to Social Work Ethics and Values

This course will emphasize the relationship of the NASW Code of Ethics, specifically the core values and ethical principles of the social work profession as well as the standards of research and evaluation for ethical behavior in the conduct of scientific evaluations. It will also consider the relationship between the NASW Code of Ethics and other ethical codes governing evaluation research, such as the Nuremberg Code, Declaration of Helsinki, the 1974 National Research Act (PL93-348), and the 1996 Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

VII. Intensive Focus on Privilege, Oppression, Diversity, and Social Justice (PODS):

Through the use of a variety of instructional methods, this course will support students developing a vision of social justice; learning to recognize and reduce mechanisms that support oppression and injustice; working toward social justice processes; applying intersectionality and intercultural frameworks; and strengthening critical consciousness, self-knowledge and self-awareness to facilitate PODS learning.

VIII. Role of Instructor and Students; Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Instructor's Role: She will encourage critical thinking and foster a positive learning environment that will facilitate the participation of all students within the classroom context. She will be available during office hours, or by appointment, and via e-mail to discuss all course matters.

Students' Role: Students are expected to attend class, complete readings/assignments when they are due, and participate in all class activities. They are expected to abstain from using personal electronic equipment (computers, cell phones, tablets) in class except for class-related purposes. If a student is unable to attend a class or complete a reading or an assignment when it is due, she/he should contact the instructor by e-mail or meet with the instructor to discuss class absenteeism and any late assignment. A student who fails to attend class regularly or complete readings/assignments when they are due will lose grade points (5 points for each infraction).

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: Please inform me on the first day of class if you need an accommodation for a disability. As soon as I am aware of your needs, we can work with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities, which you

can reach by telephone at (734) 763-3000, to determine appropriate accommodations for your needs. I will treat any information you give as private and confidential.

IX. Course Assignments

Students are required to complete five assignments and submit them on their due date by 11:55 p.m. via the assignment feature or drop box in CTools. The due date for each assignment is listed in the “Summary of Five Course Assignments” on page 6. Student may earn a total of 100 points for the five assignments.

Assignment #1. Collaborative Group Discussions facilitated by 2 or more students [15 points (5 points for generating questions and facilitating group discussions; 10 points for writing reflective statement). Each student will submit this reflective statement, which is due on the class date for which students signed up as facilitators.]

This assignment aims to enhance students’ knowledge base and communication skills in evaluating social work practice. It has two parts:

First, beginning the second week of class, students working as a team will be required to generate 2-3 questions on weekly readings, including articles and textbook chapters. Students will use these questions to facilitate in-class small group discussions. They will submit these questions via email to the instructor prior to the day of class. Students will sign up for their topic/session of interest on the 1st day of class. For helpful textbook resources in generating discussion questions, the instructor refers students to “Questions for Class Discussion” found at the end of relevant chapters in the class textbook by Royse et al (6th Edition).

Class discussions led by student facilitators will occur on these dates: **September 23 and 30; October 7, 21, 28; November 18 and 25**. Each student facilitator will earn 5 points for generating questions and leading discussions.]

Second, each student will submit a 1-2 page [double spaced] reflective statement in which they will demonstrate knowledge of the weekly readings when responding to the following questions:

1. **TASKS**: How might this assignment inform what I do in my placement and what I plan to do in my future social work career?
2. **SKILLS**: What evaluation skills, if any, did I acquired as a result of completing this assignment?
3. **BARRIERS**: What challenges, if any, I might face in applying what I learned from this assignment in my placement or future social work career?

[Facilitators may earn up to 10 points for their written reflective statement. They will submit this statement via CTools by 11:55 p.m. on the date they facilitate the class discussion.]

Note: All students are expected to read the weekly readings and contribute to the weekly class discussions.

Assignment #2. Conceptualization of Evaluation Plan Using Logic Modeling [Students may earn up to 10 points for this assignment, which is due on **October 14th** by 11:55 p.m.]

This assignment aims to enhance students' analytical skills in planning and designing evaluations in social work. Your logic model should include:

- The theory of change/assumption(s) underlying the program, intervention or service.
- Inputs or resources.
- Activities (i.e., tasks, actions, and events undertaken to change, prevent or treat the problem or need).
- Outputs (i.e., tangible products resulting from activities).
- Outcomes (i.e., positive consequences of the program, intervention or service for participants); these may be defined as short-term, intermediate, and long term.
- A short paragraph of 300 words or less that summarizes the logic model's content.

Assignment #3. Evaluation Proposal: Part 1 [Students may earn up to 20 points for this assignment; due on **November 4th** by 11:55 p.m.]

This assignment aims to provide students with research methods and analytical skills as well as professional proposal writing skills in planning and designing social work evaluations. Students will be required to plan and write a scholarly, innovative evaluation proposal worth 60 points and written in two parts (20 points for Part 1).

Assignment #4. Poster Presentation of the Evaluation Proposal [Students may earn up to 15 points for this assignment, which is due on **December 9th**. All students are required to post a copy of their poster document in CTools by 11:55 p.m. on **December 9th**.]

This assignment aims to enhance students' communication, presentation, and technical skills in the dissemination process when planning and designing social work evaluations. Students will be required to present a poster presentation based on their evaluation proposal in class on **December 9th**, which will include the research question(s) or goal(s), logic model, methodology (i.e., research design, sample, data collection and measures), limitations, strengths and next steps for the evaluation proposal. Students will earn full points for this assignment unless they fail to present their poster. The instructor will arrange for and provide poster resources, i.e., poster template, technical assistance, and funds to cover the cost of posters. The size of the poster should not exceed 31 inches (width) by 45 inches (length).

Assignment #5. Evaluation Proposal: Part 2 [40 points; due on **December 14th** by 11:55 p.m.]

This assignment aims to provide students with research methods and analytical skills as well as professional proposal writing skills in planning and designing social work evaluations. Students will be required to plan and write a scholarly, innovative evaluation proposal valued at 60 points and written in two parts (40 points for Part 2).

Summary of Five Course Assignments

- #1. Collaborative Group Discussions** facilitated by 2 students who complete 2-3 discussion questions on weekly readings (5 points) and write an individualized reflective statement (10 points) **[15 points; questions and reflective statement are due on the date of class that a student facilitates a class discussion. Students are required to send questions to instructor and submit their independent reflective statements via the assignment feature or Drop Box in CTools.]**
- #2. Conceptualization of Evaluation Plan Using Logic Modeling** [10 points; due on **October 14th** by 11:55 P.M.]
- #3. Evaluation Proposal: Part 1** [20 points; due on **November 4th** by 11:55 p.m.]
- #4. Poster Presentation** on Evaluation Proposal [15 points. Students are required to post their poster document on CTools on **December 9th** by 11:55 p.m.]
- #5. Evaluation Proposal: Part 2** [40 points; due on **December 14th** by 11:55 p.m.]

X. Guidelines for Writing the Evaluation Proposal: See pages 17-20.

XI. Grading Scale

Grading will be rigorous but fair. Grades are determined by academic performance, not effort. An A+ grade is possible but rarely assigned; it is earned by the exceptional student whose work exceeds the scope of course requirements.

A = 95-100	A- = 91-94	B+ = 86-90	B = 80-85
B - = 76-79	C+ = 72-75	C = 70-71	< 70 = not passing

XII. Required Textbook

Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. 2016. Sixth Edition. *Program evaluation. An Introduction to an evidence-based approach*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning. ISBN: 978—1-305-10196-8. This textbook is available in paperback for rental or purchase at Ulrich’s Bookstore on South University Street.

Reserved Readings: I have placed the class textbook and a resource for writing literature reviews [Writing Literature Reviews: A Guide for Students of the Social and Behavioral Sciences by Jose L. Galvan, 5th Edition] on University Reserves in the Undergraduate Shapiro Library.

All required weekly readings, except those from Royse et al. and web listings, are posted on CTools in resources under electronic reserve readings. For assistance with finding

peer review articles for the literature review of your evaluation proposal, Part I, contact Ms. Susan Wortman [swortman@umich.edu], Social Work Librarian, in the Hatcher Graduate Library. For assistance with writing skills when writing your proposal, contact Ms. Betsy Williams [betsywil@umich.edu], Writing Skills and Study Skills Coordinator, SSW Room 1696.

XIII. Dates of classes

Month	Day
September	16, 23, 30
October	07, 14, 21, 28
November	04, 11, 18, 25
December	02, 09

XIV. Course Topics, Required Readings, In-Class Activities, Guest Presenters

Session 1: September 16

Topic: Introductions, Course Overview, Evaluation Basics, and Ethical Issues in Research and Evaluation

First Half of Class: Introductions, Course Overview, Evaluation Basics, Groups Sign Up for Facilitating Discussions of Readings

Evaluation Basics:

- Why evaluate social work practice?
- What is the difference between evaluation and basic research?
- Types/Approaches of evaluation

Second Half of Class: Guest lecture on “Ethical Issues and Principles in Responsible Conduct of Research,” 10:30-11:30 Presentation; 11:30-11:45 Q&A

Adam J. Mrdjenovich, Ph.D.

Health and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board, Office of Research
University of Michigan

Required Readings:

Textbook Readings:

- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 2. Ethical Issues in Program Evaluation. Pp. 41-59.
- Online Article: **“Panel Hears Grim Details of Venereal Disease Tests”** by Donald G. McNeil Jr. An American-run study from the 1940s, brought to light

last year, involved gruesome treatment of Guatemalans. [Control + Click to follow Link or copy link into your Browser]

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/31/world/americas/31syphilis.html?_r=1&emc=eta1

NOTE: Over the term, we will adjourn each class at 11:45; group facilitators will use these final 15 minutes of class to plan for their in-class discussions of readings; and the instructor will use these final 15 minutes of class to hold brief conferences with students and/or arrange for an office conference with a student.

Session 2: September 23

Topic: Planning and Conceptualizing Evaluations: I

Readings posted on CTools:

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014). *Practical strategies for culturally competent evaluation*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Letiecq, B.L., & Bailey, S.J. (2004). Evaluating from the outside. Conducting cross-cultural evaluation research on an American Indian Reservation. *Evaluation Review*, 28(4), 342-357.
- Myers-Walls, J. (2000). An odd couple with promise: Researchers and practitioners in evaluation settings. *Family Relations*, 49, 341-47.

Textbook Readings:

Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 1, Introduction, Pp. 1-37.
Chapter 5, Mission statements, goals, and objectives. Pp. 138-143.

Resource for Logic Model Development:

- W.K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Development Guide. Chapters 1 and 2. Pp. 1-26.

Small Group Activity

- Small group discussions facilitated by students using questions based on weekly readings (45 minutes)
- Students will begin developing a logic model for planning and conceptualizing their evaluation proposal (60 minutes)

Student facilitators submit independent assignment #1 on this date.

Session 3: September 30

Topic: Planning and Conceptualizing Evaluations: II

Readings posted on CTools:

- Gaglio, B., Shoup, J.A., & Glasgow, R.E. (2013). The RE-AIM Framework: A systematic review of use over time. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(6), E38-E46.

- Glasgow, R.E., Vogt, T.M., & Boles, S.M. (1999). Evaluating the public health impact of health promotion interventions: The RE-AIM Framework. *American Journal of Public Health, 89*(9), 1322-1327.
- Guinta, N., & Thomas, M.L. (2015). Integrating assessment and evaluation into partnership initiatives: Lessons from the community partnerships for older adults. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 34*(5), 609-632.

Required Readings:

- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 4, Qualitative and mixed methods in evaluation. Pp. 93-117.

Small Group Activity

- Small group discussions facilitated by students using questions based on weekly readings (45 minutes)

Guest Presenter: Betsy Williams, MA

Writing Skills / Study Skills Coordinator
School of Social Work

Presentation topics will include writing scientific proposals; objective/passive/active language; writing literature reviews; and plagiarism. (30 minutes; 11:15-11:45 A.M.)

<p>Student facilitators submit independent assignment #1 on this date.</p>

Session 4: October 7

Topic: Needs Assessment

Readings posted on CTools:

- Orel, N.A. (2004). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual elders: Expressed needs and concerns across focus groups. (2004). *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 43*(2/3), 57-77.
- Werner, S. (2012). Needs assessment of individuals with serious mental illness: Can it help in promoting recovery? *Community Mental Health Journal, (48)*, 568-573.
- West, A.E., Williams, E., Suzukovich, E., Strangeman, K., & Novins, D. A mental health needs assessment of urban American Indian youth and families. *American J Community Psychology, 49*, 441-453.

Textbook Readings:

- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 3. Needs assessment. Pp. 65-87.

Small Group Activity

- Small group discussions facilitated by students using their questions on weekly readings (40 minutes)

- In small groups, students will plan and conceptualize a needs assessment (60 minutes).

Student facilitators submit independent assignment #1 on this date.

Session 5: October 14

Topic: Measurement Tools and Data Collection in Evaluation

Guest Presenter: Massy Mutumba, PhD

Research Fellow in Health Behavior and Biological Sciences
School of Nursing
University of Michigan

HIV and AIDS remain a major public health challenge in Africa and mental health is also emerging as a major cause of morbidity and mortality in Africa. Dr. Mutumba's presentation will focus on the intersection of HIV and mental health among adolescents in Uganda. In particular, it addresses the lack of locally validated measures of mental health in Uganda, and the paucity of data to inform the evaluation of evidence-based programming for adolescents living with HIV. [9:15-10:15 for presentation; 10:15-10:30 for Q&A]

Textbook Readings:

- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 11. Measurement tools and strategies. Pp. 301-327. Skim Chapter 12. Selecting the Best Evaluation Measure for your Project. Pp. 332-347.

Small Group Activities

- Students will perform a critique of two measurement tools used by two different health providers to evaluate client services: (1) The Critical Care Client Satisfaction Survey and (2) the Clinician Survey. They will suggest ways for improving the reliability and content validity of the items in each survey.

All students submit their logic model assignment, Assignment #2, on this date.

Session 6: October 21st

Topic: Sampling in Evaluation

www.youtube.com: Sampling Methods, Stratified Sampling, Systematic Sampling

Readings posted on CTools:

- Arean, P. et al. (2003). Recruitment and retention of older minorities in

- mental health services research. In *The science of Inclusion. Recruiting and retaining racial and ethnic elders in health research*. L. Curry & J. Jackson (Eds), pp. 17-25. Washington, DC: The Gerontological Society of America.
- Chadiha, L.A., Washington, O.G.M., Lichtenberg, P.A., Green, C., Daniels, K., & Jackson, J.S. (2011). Building a registry of research volunteers among older urban African Americans: Recruitment processes and outcomes from a community-based research partnership. *The Gerontologist*, 51(S1), S106-S115.

Textbook Readings:

- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 8. Sampling. Pp. 212-225.

Small Group Activity:

- Small group exercise using a Focus Group approach to develop strategies for finding and retaining hard-to-reach populations in service programs (60 minutes)

Student facilitators submit independent assignment #1 on this date.

Session 7: October 28

Topic: Formative and Process Evaluations

Readings posted on CTools:

- Baranowski, T., & Stables, G. (2000). Process evaluations of the 5-a-Day projects. *Health Education & Behavior*, 27(2), 157-166.
- Higgins, D.L., et al. (1996). Using formative research to lay the foundation for community level HIV prevention efforts: An example from the AIDS Community Demonstration Projects. *Public Health Reports*, 111, 28-35.
- Williams, J. H., Belle, G. A., Houston, C., Haire-Joshu, D., & Auslander, W. F. (2001). Process evaluation methods of a peer-delivered health promotion program for African American women. *Health Promotion Practice*, 2(2), 135-142.

Textbook Readings:

- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 5. Formative and process evaluation. Pp. 122-151.

Small Group Activity

- Small group discussions facilitated by students using their questions on weekly readings (40 minutes)
- In small groups, students will plan and conceptualize a process evaluation (60 minutes).

Student facilitators submit independent assignment #1 on this date.

Session 8: November 4

Topic: Program Monitoring in Evaluation

1st Half of Class: YouTube Video: Gramya: Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) in UDWDP

The film shares the Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) activity conducted on six categories viz. level of awareness about the project, participation, inclusiveness and equity, transparency, creation of assets and financial management in Uttarakhand Decentralized Watershed Development Project (UDWDP). The UDWDP is a World Bank funded watershed project - popularly known as Gramya- which is under implementation. The objective of the project is to improve the productive potential of natural resources and increase incomes of rural inhabitants in degraded watersheds of the state through socially inclusive, institutionally and environmentally sustainable approaches. [NOTE: What makes the last statement an objective statement rather than a goal statement?]

2nd Half of Class - Guest Presenter via Blue Jeans (10:45-11:45 A.M.0

Caroline Gelman, LCSW, Ph.D.

Director, MSW Program

Associate Professor

Silberman School of Social Work

Hunter College, City University of New York

Topic: Using examples from her own work, Professor Gelman will address issues of cultural competence in research and evaluation. She will discuss why looking at cultural and other diversity issues is so important in the social work field, and how not addressing these issues has contributed to health disparities among some groups in the U.S.

Readings posted on CTools:

- Weaver, H.N. (1997). The challenges of research in Native American communities: Incorporating principles of cultural competence. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 23(2), 1-15.

Textbook Readings:

- Review Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 5. Process evaluation: Program monitoring. Pp. 136-137.

Small Group Activity: Reflections on Gramya: Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation in the UD Watershed Development Project.

All students submit Part 1, Assignment #3, of their evaluation proposal on this date.

Session 9: November 11

Topic: Statistics and Quantitative Data Analyses in Evaluations

Elise Hernandez, MSW, Doctoral Student in Psychology and Social Work, with experience in teaching statistics, will teach this lab class. Students will have an opportunity to conduct hands-on statistical analyses and learn how to interpret statistical findings in the context of evaluating a program, service and/or intervention. Students will be able to receive feedback about selecting the appropriate statistical technique for addressing their question(s), goal(s), and objective(s) in their evaluation proposal.

NOTE: No readings for this session.

Session 10: November 18

Topic: Conceptualizing/Specifying Outcome Evaluations

Readings posted on CTools:

- Dworsky, A. (2013). The economic well-being of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth transitioning out of foster care. *OPRE Report #2012-41*, Washington DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Mathematica Policy Research Issue Brief.
- Ssewamala, F.M., Han, C-K., Neilands, T.B., Ismayilova, L., & Sperber, E. (2010). Effect of economic assets on sexual risk-taking intentions among orphaned adolescents in Uganda. *American Journal of Public Health, 100*(3), 483-488.
- Zacharia, S., Taylor, E.L., Hofford, CW., Brittain, D.R., & Branscum, P.W. (2015). The effect of an 8-week Tai Chi exercise program on physical functional performance in middle-aged women. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 34*(5), 573-589.

Textbook Readings:

- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 9. Group research designs. Pp. 227-276.

Small Group Activity

- Small group discussions facilitated by students using their questions on weekly readings (30 minutes)
- In small groups, students will complete exercises that aim to increase understanding threats to internal validity in evaluations using a group design approach.

Student facilitators submit independent assignment #1.

Session 10: November 25

Topic: Cost Effectiveness, Cost Analysis and Impact in Evaluations

Readings posted on CTools:

- Bosman, J. (July 28, 2009). “City Aids Homeless with One-Way Tickets Home.” Follow this link or copy it into your browser:
http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/29/nyregion/29oneway.html?_r=0
- Heckman, J. J. (September 14, 2013). Lifelines for poor children. *The New York Times. Opinionator.*
- Zaveri, H., & Burwick, A., Maher, E. (March, 2014). The potential for cost savings from home visiting due to reductions in child maltreatment. *Mathematica Policy Research Issue Brief.* Chicago: IL

Textbook Readings:

- Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. Chapter 10. Cost-effectiveness and cost analysis designs. Pp. 283-298.

Small Group Activity

- Small group discussions facilitated by students using their questions on weekly readings (40 minutes)

Student facilitators submit independent assignment #1 on this date.

The instructor will allow 30 minutes of class time for discussing the final assignments including the poster presentation and the proposal, submission of parts 1 and 2.

**YIPPEE! NO MORE READING ASSIGNMENTS!!
HAVE A SAFE AND RELAXING HOLIDAY BREAK!**

Session 12: December 2nd

1st Half of class: Rob Pettigrew, Senior Academic Technologist, an expert of poster development from the Academic Technology Group of the University Library, will instruct students in designing professional posters. He will disseminate information about poster printing sites on UM campus.

2nd Half of class: Students will use this session to finalize and print their posters at designated campus sites.

Session 13: December 9

Students will present their posters, Assignment #4, which is due via CTools on this date. The instructor will divide the class into two groups of approximately equal numbers of presenters; one group of students will present their posters during the first half of class and a second group of students will present their posters during the second half of class. The instructor will provide pizza and drinks for this session.

A Reminder: Assignment #5 due on December 14.

The final submission date for both Part 2 and Part 1 (with or without revisions) of your evaluation proposal is due by 11:55 p.m. on December 14 via CTools, the Assignment Feature. Please note that late submissions must be submitted via the Drop Box, and they are subject to a late penalty (up to 5 points deducted) when the student has not received the instructor's approval for a late submission.

Guidelines for Writing Your Evaluation Proposal: Assignments #3 and #5

This assignment aims to provide students with methods and analytical skills as well as professional proposal writing skills in planning and designing social work evaluations. Students are requested to use headings when writing both parts of this assignment.

Part 1: Assignment #3 (20 points. Maximum number of double spaced pages = 10; submission date for this assignment is November 4th by 11:55 p.m. via Drop Box or Assignment Feature on CTools)

1. In a brief introductory paragraph, (1) identify and describe the problem or need that your evaluation aims to address; (2) state the purpose or aim of the evaluation; and (3) justify why it is important to address the problem or need using the specific type of evaluation you are planning. (1/2 to a full page)
2. Conduct a selective and write a critical review (4-5 pages) of the empirical literature on the problem or need including prior empirical literature on the program, intervention or service that you will plan. End this review with a brief conclusion in which you establish a clear link between the literature review and the evaluation you are planning. **NOTE:** Your empirical literature (a minimum of 10 references) for this review may include peer review journal articles, government reports, foundation reports, policy research reports/briefs, and/or white papers.
3. Formulate the research question(s) you plan to address in the evaluation. **NOTE:** The question(s) should relate to the problem or need and link directly to the purpose or aim(s) of the evaluation.
4. Identify the target population—the group or groups affected by the problem or need and/or who will benefit from the program, intervention or service.
5. [IF YOU ARE PLANNING A PROGRAM, INTERVENTION OR SERVICE] Briefly describe the program, intervention or service that you expect to change, prevent or treat in the target population. [NOTE: IF YOU ARE PLANNING A NEEDS ASSESSMENT OR A FORMATIVE EVALUATION IN A CONTEXT WITHOUT A PROGRAM, ITEM 5 MAY NOT APPLY.]
6. List measureable goals and objectives for the program, intervention, service, needs assessment, or formative evaluation. Goals and objectives should link directly to the purpose or aim of the evaluation and the evaluation question(s).
7. Identify any specific strategies for achieving the goals and objectives.
8. Using the logic model from Assignment #2 as a conceptual framework for your evaluation proposal, briefly explain in the text how your program, intervention or service will achieve its goals and objectives. This explanation in the text should include:
 - The theory of change/assumptions underlying the program, intervention, service, needs assessment, or formative evaluation.
 - Inputs or resources.
 - Activities (i.e., tasks, actions, and events undertaken to change, prevent or treat the problem or need)

- Outputs (i.e., tangible products resulting from activities)
- Outcomes (i.e., positive consequences of the program, intervention, service, needs assessment or formative evaluation); these may be defined as short-term, intermediate, and long term).

NOTE: Attach your logic model at the end of Part 1 or insert it in the body of Part 1.

9. Identify all potential stakeholders (i.e., persons involved in and/or affected by the evaluation); explain their role in the evaluation process.

NOTE: You are allowed 10 double-spaced pages for Part 1, excluding your references. Remember that 4-5 of these 10 pages will be your literature review consisting of a critique and reflections on the empirical literature. You will end this review with a brief conclusion in which you establish a clear link between the literature review and the evaluation you are planning. Some funding agencies provide feedback to proposal submitters, which submitters use to revise and resubmit proposals. In order to help students hone their proposal writing skills, the instructor will provide students with extensive feedback that they can use to revise Part 1 of their proposal for resubmission with Part 2.

Part 2: Assignment #5 (40 points. Maximum number of double spaced pages is 8-10. Students will submit Part 2 along with Part 1, including appendices, by 11:55 p.m., on December 14th via CTools). Students may earn between one and five points for the revisions they made in Part 1.

Research design (Estimated number of double spaced pages is 2-3)

1. Specify the research design you will use to address the evaluation question(s), goals and objectives for the program, intervention or service, and the logic model's outcomes you specified in Part 1. For instance, will you use a survey research design, pre, quasi or true experimental design, pre- or posttest design or some other type of design?
2. (If you plan to use a pre-, quasi- or true experimental design) Draw a diagram of the design.
3. (If you use a quasi- or true experimental design) Explain how you will form any groups for the specific design you will use.
4. Address any strengths and limitations of your design, including potential threats to internal validity, such as selection, maturation or dropout.

Sample, recruitment and retention of participants (Estimated number of double spaced pages is 2-3)

5. Specify the type of sample will you use and provide a rationale for using it.
6. What inclusionary criteria will you use for selecting participants? Provide a rationale for excluding participants.
7. How will you recruit, contact, and retain participants?
8. How will you address problems of low participation and attrition?
9. Briefly explain how you will protect the rights of participants, such as ethical issues of informed consent, voluntary participation, protection of sensitive data, etc.

Data collection and measures (Estimated number of double spaced pages is 1-2)

10. Where and how will you get data for your evaluation?
11. Will it be new data or secondary data?
12. Will it be quantitative, qualitative or both?
13. Define and operationalize the measures you plan to use. If you plan to use standardized measures, please document their reliability and validity.

NOTE: If you decide to construct your own measure(s), you are required to provide examples of items in the measure(s) and describe how you will address their reliability and validity.

Analysis plan (Estimated number of double spaced pages is 1)

14. Describe the appropriate statistical techniques for analyzing data on sample characteristics and evaluation outcome measures.
15. Identify the level of measurement for all measures.

NOTE: Summarize your analysis plan in a table that describes all measures, specifies their level of measurement and specifies the appropriate statistical techniques for analyzing data based on the level of each measure. Link the information in your analysis plan to the question(s), goals, and objectives you formulated in Part 1 as well as to your logic model's outcomes.

Brief conclusion with next steps or recommendations (Estimated number of double spaced pages is less than one)

Your conclusion should integrate relevant literature from the review in Part 1 and include any expected implications for practice/policy/research.

Appendices

You are required to submit the following three appendices:

1. References (minimum of 10) from Part 1 and any new ones.
2. Abstract (maximum of 250 words using this format: Purpose, Design and Methods, Expected Results, and Implications for Practice and Policy).
3. Informed Consent Statement. Use the guidelines in your textbook to write a one-page informed consent statement.

NOTE: Students are expected to write the text, citations and references for their evaluation proposal using the 5th Edition of the American Psychological (APA) style. They are required to use headings from the guidelines of the proposal for their proposal's text. A student's noncompliance to this requirement will result in deduction of points.

SW683: General Grading Rubric for the Evaluation Proposal, Parts 1 and 2

1. Thoroughness: You addressed Items for this assignment [1.0 deduction for each unaddressed item].
2. You provided a list of references [1.0 deduction for missing reference list]
3. Your reference list complied with APA format [1.0 deduction for noncompliance with APA format.]
4. You provided documentation as required and included page numbers when quoting materials [1.0 deduction if both are unaddressed or .5 deductions if either is unaddressed].
5. You submitted your proposal on or by the due date [1.0 deduction up to 5.0 deductions for late submission].
6. Poor quality of writing (e.g., grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, mostly passive voice, organization such as no headings, paragraphs that cover more than a half page) [1.0 – 5.0 deduction depending on the writing quality]
7. Other concerns: [Points may vary depending on the gravity of the concern].