

**CORE 676**  
**Consultation and Evaluation of Human Services and Systems**

**Course Instructor:** **Dr. Anne Hughson**  
Telephone: 403 220-6273  
Email: [hughson@ucalgary.ca](mailto:hughson@ucalgary.ca)

**Course Dates:** September 12 - 18, 2011 (Block Week)  
January 9 - 11, 2012  
April 10 - 11, 2012

**Location:** Web-based course

**Course Description**

Qualitative and quantitative evaluation research informs the design and implementation of a collaborative evaluation of a rehabilitation program, policy or system.

**Prerequisite**

NA

**Required Resources**

Shaw, I., Greene, J. & Mark, M. (2006). The SAGE handbook of evaluation. SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA

**Suggested Textbook**

*On-line Articles:*

Abma, T. A. Responsive evaluation in health promotion: its value for ambiguous contexts. Health Promotion International Advance Access, June 21, 2005.

Abma, T. A., Stake, R.E. (2001). *Stake's Responsive Evaluation: Core Ideas and Evolution*. New Directions for Evaluation, no. 92, Winter 2001.

Andrews, A.B., Motes, P.S., Floyd, A.G., Flerx, V.C., & Fede, AL-D. (2005). Building evaluation capacity in community-based organizations: Reflections of an empowerment evaluation team. Journal of Community Practice. 13(4) 85- 104.

Andrews, D.A., Robinson, D., & Balla, M. (1986). Risk principle of case classification and the prevention of residential placements: An outcome evaluation of the share the parenting program. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 54(2), 203-207.

Austin, M.J., Weisner, S., Schrandt, E., Glezos-Bell, S., & Murtaza, N. (2006). Exploring the transfer of learning from an executive development program for human services managers. Administration in Social Work. 30(2), 71-90.

Biklen, Douglas P. (1983). *Community Organizing: Theory and Practice*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bonner, L. (2003). Using theory-based evaluation to build evidence-based health and social care policy and practice. Critical Public Health. 13(1) p 77.

Buchanan, D.R. (1992). An Uneasy Alliance: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods, *Health Educators Quarterly*, 19(1), pp. 117-135.

Chen, H. (1990). *Theory Driven Evaluations*. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications. American Journal of Evaluation, Feb. 1994, vol. 15, pp. 79-82.



- Chesterton, P. (2003). Balancing ethical principles in evaluation: a case study. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 18(1) p 49.
- Conley, R.W. (1973). *The Economics of Mental Retardation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins.
- Dehar, M. Casswell, S. & Juignan, P. (1993). Formative Process Evaluation of the Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Programmes. *Evaluation Review*, 17(2), pp. 204-220.
- Deschin, C.S. (1963). Research Interviewing in Sensitive Subject Areas: Some Further Applications and Suggestions. *Social Work*, 8, 3-9.
- Egan, J., Chenoweth, L., & McAuliffe, D. (2006). Email-facilitated qualitative interviews with traumatic brain injury survivors: A new and accessible method. *Brain Injury*, 20(12), 1283-1294.
- Fetterman, D.M., Kaftarian, S.J. & Wandersman, A. (1996). *Empowerment Evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment & accountability*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications. (Academic Onefile) ejournal.
- Fetterman, D. (1994). Empowerment evaluation. *Evaluation Practice*, (15), 1-16.
- Fitzpatrick JL, Sanders JR, Worthen BR. (2010) *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines* (4th Edition). New York. Longman Publishers.
- Flynn, Robert and Boschen, Kathryn (1984). Program Evaluation in Canadian Rehabilitation Services, in N.J. Marlett, R. Gall, and A. Wight-Felske (eds.). *Dialogue on Disability: A Canadian Perspective*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Greene, J. (1997). *Participatory evaluation*. In L. Mabry (volume ed.) *Evaluation and the Postmodern Dilemma*. In R. Stake (series ed.) *Advances in Program Evaluation*, 3, 41-59. London: JAI Press.
- Greene, J.C., Caracelli, V.J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255-274.
- Hampshire, K., Hills, E., & Iqbal, N. (2005). Power relations in participatory research and community development: a case study from Northern England. *Human Organization*, 64 (4), p 340.
- House, E. & Howe, K. R. (2000). Deliberative democratic evaluation. In K. Ryan & L. DeStefano (eds) *New Directions for Evaluation*, (85), 3-12.
- Howard, D.C., J & Howard, P.A. (2000). Towards sustainability of human services: assessing community self-determination and self-reliance. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 15(1) p 25.
- Krumer-Nevo, M., & Barak, A. (2006). Service users' perspectives on the benefits system in Israel: A participatory action research. *Social Policy & Administration*, 40(7), 774-790.
- Leonard, R., Onyx, J., & Hayward-Brown, H. (2005). Quality gifts: Issues in understanding quality volunteering in human services. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 40(3) 411-425.
- Leviton, L. C. (2003). Evaluation use: advances, challenges and applications. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(4), 525-535.
- Lyons, A.C., Cude, B., Lawrence, F.C., & Gutter, M. (2005). Conducting research online: Challenges facing researchers in family and consumer sciences. *Family And Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(4), 341-356.
- Miller, R.L., & Campbell, R. (2006). Taking stock of empowerment evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(3) 295-319.
- Neuman, K.M. (2003). Developing a comprehensive outcomes management program: a ten step process. *Administration In Social Work*, 27(1) 5-23.
- Perkins, D.D., Bess, K.D., Cooper, D.G., Jones, D.L., Armstead, T., & Speer, P.W. (2007). Community organizational learning: Case studies illustrating a three-dimensional model of levels and orders of change. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(3), 303-328.
- Rose, M., & Christie, C.A. (2003). The language of evaluation theory: insights gained from an empirical study of evaluation theory and practice. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 18(2) p 33.
- Ryan, K. Dialogue as a Democratizing Evaluation Method. (2001). *Sage Journals*. *Evaluation*, Vo. 7, No. 2, 188-203.
- Schalock, R.L., & Bonham, G.S. (2003). Measuring outcomes and managing for results. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 26(3) 229-235.
- Schoes, C.J. (2000). Empowerment evaluation applied: Experiences, analysis, and recommendations from a case study. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21(1) p 53.
- Schwandt, T.A. (2000b). Meta-analysis and everyday life: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21, 213-219.
- Scriven, M. (1999). The nature of evaluation part ii: Training. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 6(12). Retrieved September 12, 2005 from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=6&n=12>



- Shaw, Ian. F. (1984). Consumer evaluations of the personal social services. *British Journal of Social Work*, 14(3), pp. 277-284.
- Smith, R.L., Bailey, M., Hydo, S.K., Lepp, M., Mews, S., Timm, S., & Zorn, C. (2004). All the voices in the room. *Nursing Education Perspectives*. 25(3), 278-283.
- Spath, R., & Pine, B.A. (2004). Using the case study approach for improved programme evaluations. *Child & Family Social Work*. 9(1) 57-63.
- Sullins, C.D. (2003). Adapting the empowerment evaluation model: A mental health drop-in center case example. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 24(3) p 387.
- Taylor, D. (2005). Governing through evidence: Participation and power in policy evaluation. *Journal of Social Policy*. 34(4) 601-618.
- Wiggins, G.S. (2004). The analysis of focus groups in published research articles. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*. 19(2), 143
- Stecher, A., McLeroy, K.R., Goodman, R.M., Bird, S.T. & McCormick, L. (1992). Toward Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: An Introduction. *Health Education Quarterly*, 19(1), pp. 1-8.

**Books:**

- Atkin, M. (ed.) (2004). *Evaluation Roots: Tracing theorists; views and influences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barnes, C.A. (1992). *Critical Thinking: Educational Imperative*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publication.
- Bogaert, M.V.D., Ghagat, S. and Fam, N.B. (1985). —Participatory Evaluation of an Adult Education Programme|| in Walter Fernandes and Rajesh Tandon (eds.). *Participatory Research and Evaluation – Experiments in Research as a Process of Liberation*. pp. 172-182. New Dehli: Indian Social Institute.
- Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bolman, Lee G. and Deal, Terrence E. *Reframing Organizations* (3rd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (2006) ISBN # 0787964271
- Brown, R.I. (ed.) (1986). *Management and Administration of Rehabilitation Programmes*. Mississauga: Phonic Ear.
- Brown, R.I. and Hughson, E.A. (1993). *Behavioural and Social Rehabilitation and Training: A perspective* (2nd ed.). North York Ontario: Captus Press.
- Brown, R.I., Bayer, M.B. and MacFarlane, C. (1989). *Rehabilitation programmes: Performance and quality of life with adults with developmental handicaps*. Toronto: Lugus Productions Ltd.
- Balcazar, F.E., Taylor, R.R, Kielhofner, G.W., Tamley, K., Benziger, T., Carlin, N., & Johnson, S. (2004). *Participatory action research: General principles and a study with a chronic health condition*. In L. Jason, (Ed) *Participatory community research: Theories and methods in action*. Chpt 1 Washington, DC: American Psychological Association
- Chen, H. (1990). *Theory-Driven Evaluation*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Chen, H-T (2005). *Practical Program Evaluation: Assessing an improving planning, implementation, and effectiveness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cook, T.D. & Reichardt, C.S. (1979). *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cooke, W. & Kothari, U. (2001). *Participation: The new Tyranny?* London: Zed.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2004). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, third edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Donaldson, S., & Scriven, M. (2003). *Evaluating Social Programs and Problems: Visions for the new millennium*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fetterman, D. (2005). A Window into the heart and soul of empowerment evaluation. In D. Getterman & A. Wandersman (eds) *Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. & Morris, L.L. (1987). *How to Analyze Data*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Flyvberg, B. (2001). *Making Social Science Matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again* (S. Sampson, trans.) Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuhrer, M.S. (1987). *Rehabilitation Outcomes: Analysis and Measurement*. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1981). *Reason in the Age of Science* (F. G. Lawrence, trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Guba, E. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog, In E. Guba (ed.), *The Paradigm Dialog*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Hall, G. E. & Hord, S.M. (2001). *Implementing Change*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Henerson, M.E., Morris, L.L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (1987). *How to Measure Attitudes*. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications.



- Herbert, M., & Harper-Dorton, K.V. (2002). Practice processes and outcomes—Evaluation: An integral component of practice processes and outcomes—Why evaluate practice? In M. Herbert, & K.V. Harper-Dorton (3rd ED). *Working with children, adolescents, and their families*. Chpt 14. Chicago, IL: Lyceum books.
- Herman, J.L., Morris, L.L. & Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (1987). *Evaluator's Handbook*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Holstein, J.A. & Gubrium, J.F. (2003). Active interviewing. In J.F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (eds) *Postmodern Interviewing* (pp 67-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Isenberg, D.H., Loomis, C., Humphreys, & K., Maton, K.I. (2004). Self-help research: Issues of power sharing. In L. Jason, Ed). *Participatory community research: Theories and methods in action*. Chpt 7 Washington, DC: American Psychological Association
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews*. Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.
- King, J.A., Morris, L.L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (1987). *How to Assess Program Implementation*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Productions.
- Lincoln, Yvonna, S. and Guba, Egon G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, California: SAGE Publishing Inc.
- Maio, G. R., & Olson, J. M. (eds) (2000). *Why We Evaluate: Functions of attitude*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mark, M. M., Henry, G. T., & Julnes, G. (2000). *Evaluation: An integrated framework for understanding, guiding, and improving public and nonprofit policies and programs*. San Francisco. CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mertens, Donna M. (1998). *Research Methods in Education and Psychology*. SAGE Publications, Inc
- Mitchell, J. (1990). Policy Evaluation for Policy Communities: Confronting the Problem. *Evaluation Practice*, 11(2), pp. 109-114.
- Morgan, D.L. (1988). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Morris, L. L., Fitz-Gibbon, C.T., & Freeman, M.E. (1987). *How to Communicate Evaluation Findings*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Morris, L.L., Fitz-Gibbon, C., & Lindheim, E. (1987). *How to Measure Performance and Use Tests*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Northouse, Peter G. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. (2006). ISBN141294161X
- Oliver, M. (1990). *The Politics of Disablement*. London: MacMillan Education Ltd.
- Patton, M.Q. (1987). *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd ed.) London: SAGE Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-Focused Evaluation: The new century text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rioux, M. & Crawford, C. (1994). An occasional paper from L'Institut Roehrer & Roehrer Institute. *The Canadian Disability Resource Program: Offsetting Costs of Disability and Assuring Access to Disability Related Supports* Toronto: Roehrer Institute.
- Rioux, M. & Bach, M. (1994). *Disability is Not Measles*. Toronto: Roehrer Institute.
- Rogers, P. (2004). Appreciating appreciative inquiry. In H. Preskill & A.T. Coghlan (eds). *Using Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*. No. 100. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rogers, P.J., Hacs, T.A., Petrosino A., Huebner T.A., (2000) *Program Theory in Evaluation Challenges and Opportunities: New Directions for Evaluation*, No. 87
- Rossi, P.H., & Freeman, H.E. (1985). *Evaluation, a systematic Approach*, third edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation Thesaurus*, fourth edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwandt, T.A. (2002). *Evaluation Practice Reconsidered*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Sechrest, L. & Scott, A. (eds) (1993). *Understanding Causes and Generalizing About Them. New Directions for Evaluation*, No. 57. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., & Leviton, L.C. (1991). *Foundations of Program Evaluation: Theories of practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., & Campbell D.T. (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Generalized Casual Inference*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data*, 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stecher, B.M. & Davis, W.A. (1987). *How to Focus an Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Taylor, D., & Balloch, S. (2005) (Eds). *The politics of evaluation: Participation and policy implementation*. Bristol: Great Britain: Policy Press.



UNIVERSITY OF  
CALGARY

SC  
fall/winter  
2011

Department of Community Health Sciences  
Faculty of Medicine

Academic Year 2011-2012  
Fall and Winter SESSION

- Unrau, Y.A. (2001). Using client exit interviews to illuminate outcomes in program logic models: a case example. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 24(4), 353-361.
- Worthen BR, Sanders JR & Fitzpatrick JL. *Program Evaluation: alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. NY:Longman (2003) ISBN0321077067.
- Yarbrough, D. B., Shulha, L. M., Hopson, R. K., and Caruthers, F. A. (2011). *The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and methods*, 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Stage.

<http://www.jcsee.org/program-evaluation-standards/program-evaluation-standards-statements>

Further readings will be supplied during the term



SC  
fall/winter  
2011

**Course Goals**

The course goals are to:

- Evaluate programs by determining appropriate evaluation methodologies.
- Examine philosophy, goals and effects on outcome research.
- Implement a data collection system.
- Identify management and organizational implications.
- Outline a cost analysis and cost benefit plan.

**Learner Objectives**

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

- Conceptual base and linkage between interdisciplinary and inter-agency needs assessment.
- Service design.
- Program development.
- Service delivery systems.
- Program models.
- Data collection.
- Cost analysis and cost benefit.
- Risk management models.
- Social action research.
- Evaluation methodologies

**Academic Integrity**

The Department of Community Health Sciences expects **intellectual honesty** from its students. Course participants should be aware of University policies relating to Principles of Conduct, Plagiarism and Academic Integrity. These are found in the printed Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar, or online under Faculty Regulations in the Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar, or at [www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/how/How\\_LB.htm](http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/how/How_LB.htm).

**Cut Points For Grades**

This course adheres to the grading system outlined in the University of Calgary, Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar. Percentage/letter-grade conversions are standard for courses in the Department of Community Health Sciences.

Grade	Course %	Grade Point Value*	Graduate Description*
A+	97-100	4.0	Outstanding
A	90-96.5	4.0	Excellent
A-	85-89.5	3.7	Very good performance
B+	77-84.5	3.3	Good performance
B	72-76.5	3.0	Satisfactory performance
B-	68-71.5	2.7	Minimum pass for students in the Faculty of Grad Studies
C+	63-67.5	2.3	All grades below B- are indicative of failure at the graduate level and cannot be counted toward Faculty of Graduate Studies course requirements.
C	60-62.5	2.0	



### **Late Assignments:**

- Assignments are due on the specified date by 9 AM. Students who hand in assignments late will be penalized 5% per day for handing in late. Assignments that are handed in 14 calendar days or more after the due date will be refused and the students assigned a score of zero for the assignment.
- Students may hand in assignments late without penalty under the following circumstances:
  - The student has discussed the timelines with course instructor in advance of the due date and the course instructor has granted an extension
  - There is a valid health or family emergency such as is discussed under the University regulations for deferral of final examinations. Students may be required to provide the Course Coordinator with such documentation related to illness and/or emergency as is discussed and required in the University regulations pertaining to deferral of final examinations. This information can be found in the University Calendar.

### **Evaluation Plan**

#### **1. Seminar presentation - 50%**

Breakdown:

- a) Seminar oral presentation 25% - Due Date: January 9-11, 2012
- b) Seminar paper 25% - Due Date: January 11, 2012

#### **2. Practicum Report - 50%**

Breakdown:

- a) Oral Presentation 10% - Due Date: Apr. 10-12, 2012
- b) Final report 40% - Due Date: Apr. 30, 2012



## **Appendix 1**

### Student Guidelines: Negotiation for Practicum Evaluation Project

You may wish to include a brief resume of your background(s) by way of introduction and explanation of this as a graduate course at UofC (CRDS Program) including my contact information as course instructor.

Introduction and Purpose: including a brief description of the program/service as background to explaining the purpose and scope of the proposed evaluation process.

#### **Evaluation Process:**

- Evaluation Design: this might include the identification of stakeholders. Development of methodology and evaluation questions, review of documents as well as description of any instruments you might use or design.
- Data Gathering: includes how you will gather data, from whom, as well as indication of review and analysis of literature on best principles and practices relevant to the evaluation purpose and questions.
- Analysis and Report of Evaluation Findings: include an indication of timelines for providing draft report for circulation to ensure accuracy of information, and intention to provide final report after incorporating feedback at the end of April
- Deliverables and projected timelines: include the timelines for phases of the project (i.e. data collection phase, analysis of findings, write up, etc) as well as anticipated oral presentations and delivery of final report.



SC  
fall/winter  
2011

**Appendix 2**  
**Seminar Topics**

**Instructions:**

Students will prepare and present a seminar paper on one of the following topics. Some topics are large enough to lend themselves to collaborating with another student. This seminar presentation will provide an opportunity for colleagues to learn from each other about specific aspects and issues of evaluation research and consultation. A written outline and overview of materials will be required for the seminar presentation and should be circulated in advance to allow other students to prepare for discussions. This should include copies of any graphical material and include a comprehensive list of current references. Students are invited to discuss the preparation for this seminar in advance with the instructor. At the time of their one hour presentation, students are expected to teach the material to their peers and should make notes on feedback, comments and advice from fellow students and incorporate those into the final seminar paper submission.

**Marking criteria: SEMINAR PAPER (total worth 25%, each criterion worth 5%)**

1. Analysis/synthesis of main constructs
2. Coherent discussion of theory and practice
3. Relevant and current review of literature
4. Organized and clearly written
5. Critical appraisal of current practices/issues.

**Seminar topics presentation schedule**

Student (s)	Date	Topic
		Compare and contrast the major principles that guide the evaluator to conceptualize a request for program evaluation – needs assessment, summative, formative, emphasis on process and outcomes, etc. – how to get the question
		An examination of major approaches to program evaluation in human services, which lens to use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experimental design</li> <li>• Empowerment evaluation</li> <li>• Inclusive evaluation</li> <li>• Goal-free evaluation</li> <li>• Utilization – oriented evaluation</li> </ul>
		How to gather information for purposes of evaluation – discuss the methods of sampling, naturalistic inquiry, qualitative (interview, observation, etc) and quantitative (test measures, surveys, file data, etc) methods with an emphasis on the issues leading to differing results
		How to communicate Evaluation findings – discuss the implications for funders, stakeholders, decision-makers, etc.
		Ethical responsibilities and duties in conducting program evaluation and consultation in human services



SC  
fall/winter  
2011

		An exploration of evaluation issues in the context of social policy, human resource development and current resource allocation that effect the implementation of community based programs.
		Discuss the role of program evaluation in making a difference in the lives of people with disabilities – how will we know a quality program if we see one and what would it take to safeguard the positive features.
		Analyzing findings, lessons learned and the role of Meta evaluations in the life of program evaluators – what are the standards for the professional evaluators?
		Other topics to be negotiated

**Marking Criteria: SEMINAR PRESENTATIONS (each component is worth 5% = total 25%)**

1. Use adult teaching methods to convey material
2. Identifies/discusses underlying theory
3. Links theory to application (for example, practicum project)
4. Organizes presentation and presents clearly within required timeframe
5. Invites class discussion/feedback and responds appropriately to questions/debates

**MDCH 624 Final Evaluation Report Guidelines**

**Marking Criteria: FINAL EVALUATION REPORT (each component is worth 10% = total 50%)**

1. Clearly written evaluation question
2. Coherent presentation of theoretical issues, service delivery model and program details
3. Relevant and current review of literature related to programmatic issues
4. Organized presentation of methodology, data collection processes, results and analysis of findings
5. Clearly written recommendations and rationale for implementation

**Components of a typical evaluation report**

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Acknowledgements
- III. Introduction and Historical Background  
Include: description that elaborates on stated program philosophy, goals and objectives
- IV. Aims and Objectives of Evaluation  
also include identification of stakeholders
- V. Procedure and Method  
include literature with justification of your method,  
sub-headings of tools you have used,  
description of program,  
in many reports this will come after the introduction

VI. Results  
try to follow sections under Procedure and Method (e.g. Specific tests or tools)

- VII. Discussion  
Raise main issues – what works/what does not  
Provide your justification for conclusions  
Refer to other literature

Give recommendations attached to specific parts of discussion  
Include sources of error  
Indicate where to go from here  
Ethical Issues/Professional Issues

**VI. Recommendations**

Can give in point form following sequence of discussion  
Often better to prioritize under headings (e.g. General Recommendations, Philosophy, Goals, Program recommendations, Record Keeping)  
Individual Client Recommendations (may handle separately)

**VII. Appendices**

Operating Budget  
Introductory Letters  
Timetable  
Philosophy and Goals  
Job Description  
Emergency Procedures  
Daily/Weekly Records (of the Center)  
Flow Chart  
Contractual agreements with agency and funding sources

**VIII. Resource Lists**

List of useful material – literature, media matter with addresses or source

Some additional considerations for writing an evaluation report

- Is all or part of the report confidential?
- Present and discuss draft of your report with person(s) requesting evaluation
- What sort of statements would you be willing to change or leave out?
- Ethical considerations – anonymity and confidentiality
- Implementation issues related to recommendations
- Questions regarding follow-up
- Who will get copies of the report?

## Course Timetable

### **Course Description:**

The course is directed towards the design, development and evaluation of community based human services for children and adults. A lecture and practicum course for the student who has a sound knowledge of disability issues, organizational and management experience and “best practices” in the field of community rehabilitation.

Each student will be required to design and implement an evaluation plan for an existing program or facility.

### FALL TERM

1. The Nature of Inquiry
  - a. How do we get at the Truth
  - b. Some paradigms
  - c. Assumptions about the paradigms
  - d. Some areas of self-knowledge
2. Evaluation Context
  - a. Values and Assumptions about human services
  - b. Beliefs – world views
  - c. Skills and standards
  - d. Personal style
3. Framework for evaluation
  - a. Definitions
  - b. Purposes
  - c. Evaluators roles
  - d. Models
  - e. Emphasis
4. Needs Assessment for Evaluation
  - a. Program areas of most interest
  - b. Outcomes
  - c. Implementation/process
  - d. Purpose of Inquiry
  - e. Needs assessment
  - f. Formative evaluation
  - g. Summative evaluation
5. The Primary Problems that Focus the Lenses of Evaluation
  - a. Lack of Knowledge in Situation
  - b. Lack of Capacity and self-determination
  - c. Lack of Inclusion
  - d. Lack of Independent perspective
  - e. Lack of Use of Evaluation Results
6. Major Evaluation Approaches that Offer Different Solutions
  - a. Experimental Designs – elucidate casual connections
  - b. Empowerment Evaluation – process engagement
  - c. Inclusion Evaluation – target excluded, underserved populations, least advantage
  - d. Goal-Free Evaluation – independent evaluation rendering independent judgement
  - e. Utilization-oriented Evaluation – intended use by intended users
7. Evaluation Process
  - a. Different Problems, Different Solutions, Different Results
  - b. Lessons Learned from Matching Approach to Situation
  - c. Evaluation Focus



UNIVERSITY OF  
CALGARY

SC  
Fall/Winter  
2011

Department of Community Health Sciences  
Faculty of Medicine

Academic Year 2011-2012  
Fall and Winter SESSION

### Winter Term

1. Consultation to evaluation projects – sharing the lessons learned  
Discussion of Evaluation Reports – preparation of written and oral reports for sponsors of the projects.

### Academic Accommodation

Students with a disability, who require academic accommodation, need to register with the Disability Resource Centre <http://www.ucalgary.ca/drc/> MC 295, telephone 220-8237. Academic accommodation letters need to be provided to course instructors no later than fourteen (14) days after the first day of class. **It is a student's responsibility to register with the Disability Resource Centre and to request academic accommodation, if required.**