Sociology 701.02
Assessment Research Methods
Evaluation Principles and Application
Winter 2018

Instructors:

	Siegrid Deutschlander, Ph.D.	Sandra Johansen, Ph.D.
e-mail:	deutschs@ucalgary.ca	sandra.johansen@ucalgary.ca
Office #:	SS 903	SS 903
Office Phone:	N/A	N/A
Office Hours:	TBD	TBD

Class Time:

Tuesdays 6-8:45 pm (SS921)

Course Description

This course discusses key topics and issues in program evaluation. Over the last 15 years, there has been an increasing demand for evaluating public initiatives and programs. By doing evaluations, stakeholders (i.e., implementation groups, participants, funders, and the public) determine the effectiveness of the program. A program evaluation helps determine the merit or worth of a program and whether it should be revised, scaled-up, continued, or canceled. Evaluation also ensures accountability of program expenditures to funders when these rely on public money. Furthermore, evaluation generates knowledge that influences thinking about evaluation itself and evaluation methodology.

Course Objectives

The goal of this course is to provide students with the knowledge and skills to critically review and conduct evaluations of public and organizational programs. Designing an evaluation will give students hands-on experience in understanding the practice of evaluation. Key topics to be addressed include evaluation types and models, logic model design, evaluation competencies, measurement issues, ethics, and knowledge translation.

Course Text and Readings

Required textbook:

Alkin, M. C., and Vo, A. T. (2017). *Evaluation Essentials, Second Edition: From A to Z*. Guilford Press: New York.

Additional required readings are provided each week; Refer to the weekly class schedule for assigned readings.

Student Assessment:

Each student will be assessed based on the four activities listed below. Each of these activities will be discussed in greater detail during the first lecture.

1. **Class participation (13%)**

Students are expected to attend each class. Students will receive the full 13% by attending all the class sessions.

2. **Thought questions (18%)**

On weeks when readings are assigned (starting the second week of classes) students are expected to submit two thought questions to the instructors via email by 11:59 pm Monday prior to that week's class. These thought questions are based on that week's readings but should go beyond the material presented in the readings. The questions can discuss how the material relates to other materials you know, can criticize the readings, can inquire about assumptions made in the readings, or point to further questions about the readings.

3. **Class discussion (9%)**

Each student will lead class discussion once during the semester. Students will sign up for leading a discussion during Session 1 on Jan 9th, 2018. The student leading the discussion each week is expected to provide a brief summary of 1 reading that week and be able to engage their colleagues in the discussion.

4. **A Program Evaluation Plan (60%)**

The main deliverable for this course is a program evaluation plan that each student will develop. This evaluation plan will be based on either a real program the student is familiar with, a program from the literature or the community, or a hypothetical program.

a) Session 7: Each student will present a **description of the program** they plan on evaluating and the purpose of the evaluation (10%)

b) Session 11: Each student will present the **logic model** of the program they plan on evaluating (10%)

c) April 17th: Students will submit a **program evaluation plan** (20-25 pages; 40%). This plan will include the following sections (further detail to be provided in class):
   a) A description of the program to be evaluated (including implications and need)
   b) The purpose of the evaluation that will be conducted
   c) Description and rational of the framework to be used to guide the evaluation activities
   d) Logic model and description
   e) Evaluation objectives and questions
   f) Methods
   g) Data matrix
   h) Milestones and timeline
   i) How the evaluation will be used
   j) References
   k) Appendices with sample data instruments (e.g., surveys, interview/focus group guides)

Grade Reappraisal

Within two weeks of the date the assignment is returned, students seeking reappraisal of assignments must submit a written response to the instructors explaining the basis for reconsideration of their mark. The instructors will reconsider the grade assigned and will then book a time with the student to discuss their work and rationale. It should be noted that a re-assessed grade may be raised, lowered, or remain the same.

Technology Use

Please note that the use of laptops, tablets, cell phones or other electronic devices is **NOT** permitted during lectures. Students who require the use of electronic devices for academic accommodation purposes are exempt from this policy, but must provide documentation from Student Accessibility Services to the instructor. Please be sure to mute your cell phone and refrain from using it during class.

Email

We can be reached by email for administrative inquiries (e.g., to set up an appointment). Please put the course number and section in the subject line, and include a proper salutation, your full name, student ID, and a proper closing in the body of your email. Any questions that can be answered by consulting the course outline will not be answered. Please do not use e-mail as a replacement for an in-person conversation during office hours. This may include discussing course content and readings, concerns about grades, or any other personal issues. All emails violating customary email conventions will be ignored.

Handing in Papers, Assignments

1. The Sociology Department main office does not deal with any course-related matters. Please speak directly to your instructor.
2. **Protection of Privacy:** The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIPP) legislation does not allow students to retrieve any course material from public places. Any completed assignments will be handed back to students during class or office hours. If students are unable to pick up their assignments from the instructor, they will provide the instructor with a stamped, self-addressed envelope for mailing back the assignment.
3. Final grades are not posted by the Sociology Department but are available online only.

Ethics Research

Students are advised that any research with human subjects – including any interviewing (even with friends and family), opinion polling, or unobtrusive observation – must have the approval of the Faculty Ethics Committee. In completing course requirements, students must not undertake any human subjects' research without discussing their plans with the instructor, to determine if ethics approval is required.

Academic Misconduct

Please refer to the website listed below for information on University of Calgary policies on Plagiarism/Cheating/Other Academic Misconduct:
http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/k-5.html

Deferrals

When possible, please provide advance notice if you are unable to complete/turn-in assignments on time. All requests for deferral of a course component due to health reasons must be accompanied by written documentation as outlined in the University Calendar and should be obtained while the student has the health issue rather than after recovery. Deferrals will be allowed in the following circumstances: illness, domestic affliction or religious conviction. Travel arrangements, misreading the syllabus, and scheduling conflicts with other classes or employment are not valid reasons for requesting a deferral. Deferrals will not be granted if it is determined that just cause is not shown by the student.

If students cannot attend the class that they are scheduled to present, they will need to arrange to switch their presentation day with another student and advise the instructors of the change.

Deferred Term Work Form: Deferral of term work past the end of a term also requires a form to be filled out. It is available at:
https://www.ucalgary.ca/registrar/files/registrar/deferred_termwork15_0.pdf

Once an extension date has been agreed between instructor and student, the form should be taken to the Faculty of Arts Program Information Centre (SS 110) for approval by an Associate Dean (Students).

Student Representation

The 2017-18 Students' Union VP Academic is Tina Miller (suvpaca@ucalgary.ca). For more information, and to contact other elected officials with the Student's Union, please visit this link: https://www.su.ucalgary.ca/about/who-we-are/elected-officials/. You may also wish to contact the Student Ombudsperson for help with a variety of University-related matters: http://www.ucalgary.ca/ombuds/contact

Emergency Evacuations

In the case of fire or other emergency evacuation of this classroom, please proceed to the assembly point at Professional Faculties - Food Court. Please check these assembly point locations for all of your classes at: http://www.ucalgary.ca/emergencyplan/assemblypoints

Safewalk

The University of Calgary provides a "safe walk" service to any location on Campus, including the LRT, parking lots, bus zones, and campus housing. For Campus Security/Safewalk call 220-5333. Campus Security can also be contacted from any of the "Help" phones located around Campus.

Academic Accommodation

The student accommodation policy can be found at: ucalgary.ca/access/accommodations/policy.

Students needing an Accommodation because of a Disability or medical condition should communicate this need to Student Accessibility Services in accordance with the Procedure for Accommodations for Students with Disabilities ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/student-accommodation-policy.

Students needing an Accommodation based on a Protected Ground other than Disability, should communicate this need, preferably in writing, to the course instructor.

Winter 2018: Topics, Readings and Assignments

Session / Date	Topic	Readings/Assignments	Instructor
1 - Jan 9	Introductions & Course Overview What is program evaluation?	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Sections A & B Poth G, Lamarche MK, Yapp A et al. 2014. Toward a definition of Evaluation within the Canadian Context: Who knew this would be so difficult? *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation,* 29: 87-103. Rogers P. 2014. Ways of framing the difference between research and evaluation. Available at:http://www.betterevaluation.org/blog/framing_the_difference_between_research_and_evaluation	Sandra & Siegrid
2 - Jan 16	Program Planning Theory of Change and Logic Models	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Sections E, F, G, H & I Altschuld JW & Watkins R. 2014. A primer on needs assessment: More than 40 years of research and practice. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 144: 5–18. Porteous NL, Sheldrick BJ & Stewart PJ. 2012. The logic Model: A blueprint for describing programs. Available at: http://med-fom-familymed-research.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2012/03/logic_model_e.pdf	Sandra
3 - Jan 23	Core Competencies in Evaluation	CES Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice: https://evaluationcanada.ca/txt/2_competencies_cdn_evaluation_practice.pdf Stevahn L, King J, Ghere G & Minnema J. 2005. Establishing essential competencies for program evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26: 43-59. Becker KL & Renger R. 2017. Suggested guidelines for writing reflective case narratives: Structure and indicators. *American Journal of Evaluation,* 38: 138-150.	Siegrid
4 – Jan 30	Developing an Evaluation plan Environmental scans	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Section J Davy D. 2016. Anti-human trafficking interventions: How do we know they are working? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 37: 486-504.	Sandra

		Friedman VJ, Rothman J & Withers B. 2006. The power of why: Engaging the goal paradox in program evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation,* 27: 201-218. Wilburn A, Vanderpool RC & Knight JR. 2016. Environmental scanning as a public health tool: Kentucky's Human Papillomavirus Vaccination Project. *Preventing Chronic Disease, 13*.	
5 - Feb 6	Types of evaluation: • Formative • Summative Models of Evaluation • RE-AIM • Economic	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Sections O & P Saunders RP, Evans MH & Joshi P. 2005. Developing a process-evaluation plan for assessing health promotion program implementation: A how-to guide. *Health Promotion Practice, 6*: 134-147. Honeycutt AA, Khavjou OA, Bradley C, Neuwahl S, Hoerger TJ, Bellard D, Cash AJ 2016. Intervention costs from communities putting prevention to work. Preventing Chronic Disease Vol13 (E98): 1-9. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2016/15_0368.htm Gaglio B, Shoup JA & Glasgow RE. 2013. The RE-AIM Framework: A systematic review of use over time. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*: e38-e46.	Siegrid
6 - Feb 13	Discussion of Case Examples	PARISC (ACPLF) TBD	Sandra & Siegrid
No classes – Feb 20	Reading Week	No class	
7 - Feb 27	Students: Program description and evaluation purpose presentations		Sandra & Siegrid
8 – Mar 6	Models to guide evaluation efforts: • Utilization-focused evaluation	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Sections E, F & X	Siegrid

	• Developmental	Flowers AB. 2010. Blazing an evaluation pathway: Lessons learned from applying utilization-focused evaluation to a conservation education program. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *33*: 165-171. Meyer RM & Meyer MC. 2000. Utilization-focused evaluation: evaluating the effectiveness of a hospital nursing orientation program. *Journal for Nurses in Professional Development, 16*: 202-208.	
9 - Mar 13	How will the data be collected, in what form, and from whom?	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Sections K, L & M Henson H. 2016. Data quality evaluation for program evaluators. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 31*: 99-108.	Sandra
10 - Mar 20	Monitoring and Evaluation Evaluability assessment	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Section N Leviton LC, Khan LK, Rog D, Dawkins N, Cotton D. 2010. Evaluability Assessment to Improve Public Helath policies, programs, and practices. Annual Review of Public Health 31: 213-33.	Siegrid
11 - Mar 27	Students: Logic Model presentations		Sandra & Siegrid
12 - Apr 3	Ethics Real world evaluation constraints Health Impact Assessment	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Section Q, W Cole BL, & Fielding JE. 2007. Health Impact Assessment: A tool to help policy makers understand health beyond health care. *Annual Review of Public Health, 28*: 393-412. Pattyn V, & Brans M. 2013. Outsource vs. in-house? An identification of organizational conditions influencing the choice for internal or external evaluators. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 28: 43—63.	Sandra
13 - Apr 10	Reporting evaluation findings Integrated Knowledge Translation (iKT)	Alkin & Vo. 2017. Sections T, U, V & Z (Sections R & S are recommended but not mandatory)	Sandra & Siegrid

| | | Bourgeois I & Nare C. 2015. The "Usability" of evaluation reports: A Precursor to evaluation use in government organizations. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluations, 11*: 60-67.

Straus SE, Tetroe J, & Graham I. 2009. Defining knowledge translation. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 181: 165–168. | |
| April 17 | Final Evaluation Plans due | | |