

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Open Educational Resources

Lehman College

2021

EDL805 Program Design and Evaluation Syllabus

Harriet Fayne

CUNY Lehman College, harriet.fayne@lehman.cuny.edu

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/le_oers/52

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Lehman College, City University of New York
Department of Counseling, Leadership, Literacy, and Special Education

EDL 805: Program Development and Evaluation
(4 Semester Hours)
Online- Spring 2021

The School of Education prepares competent, ethical, and reflective professionals for service in diverse communities.

Instructor: Harriet Fayne, Ph.D.

E-mail: harriet.fayne@lehman.cuny.edu

Dropbox: harriet.fayne32@login.cuny.edu

Phone: 646-303-6091

Mail Box Location: Carman Hall-B20

Zoom Office Hours: Thursdays, 7:00 p.m. –9:00 p.m. or by appointment

NOTE: I will use some Thursday office hours for guest speakers and synchronous plenary sessions.

Plenary session dates are on the course calendar. Additional sessions will be announced on Blackboard.

Course Description:

Emphasis on research designs (theoretical and applied); needs assessment; data collection and analyses techniques; program development and review; grant proposals/funding; research reports; and continuous improvement through feedback loops. (Fieldwork hours required.)

Text:

There is no required textbook that needs to be purchased for this course. Links to Open Education and Zero Cost readings and multimedia resources can be found in the syllabus (course calendar) and on the Blackboard course site.

Lehman Urban Transformative Education (LUTE) Conceptual Framework:

The LUTE represents the School of Education's vision for educators and leaders who are or will be responsible for stimulating and supporting the development of knowledge, skills, practices, and dispositions that enrich individuals and, in turn, communities where they live and work. Our vision is rooted in and extends from the missions of both The City University of New York and Lehman College. We seek to facilitate individuals' access to postsecondary education and occupational opportunities. We also seek to increase personal and social competencies for every PreK-18 student. In all of our work, we strive to close achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps. The LUTE focuses on four themes: 1) Empower Our Community of Educators and Learners; 2) Educate and Advocate for Social Action and Equity; 3) Realize Potential; and 4) Affirm Our Diverse Ethnic and Cultural Contexts. The entire LUTE conceptual framework is available at <http://www.lehman.cuny.edu/academics/education/introduction.php>

Course Objectives:

- 1) Demonstrate professionalism and core skills for deeper learning skills (content mastery, effective communication, critical thinking/problem solving, collaboration, self-directed learning, academic mindset)
- 2) Demonstrate the ability to conduct a needs assessment that serves as the basis of program development and/or request for external funding
- 3) Design an evaluation plan that can serve as a framework for a process or outcomes program evaluation.
- 4) Acquire grantsmanship skills: preparing a grant proposal in response to funder guidelines
- 5) Improve technical reading, writing, and oral communication skills

Course Requirements:

- Please keep in mind that this is a fully online, asynchronous course. As such, you must fully engage with the material, with me, and with one another on one major group project, in order to be successful.
- You are expected to log into Blackboard frequently to access course materials. In addition, we will make use of collaboration software so that you can work together on the major group project (grant proposal).
- While the class is asynchronous, it is not self-paced. Therefore, all assignments must be typed and uploaded on the Blackboard course site **by the specified deadlines** (see course calendar and Bb site for specific dates/time).
- APA format must be used for all in-text citations and reference lists.
- You must have access to your Lehman e-mail account and must be able to access the Blackboard system.
- A course schedule can be found in this syllabus. The schedule is subject to revision if weather conditions or other extraordinary circumstances make it impossible to adhere to it.

Instructional Methods Used in This Course:

- Video Lectures
- Cooperative Learning (Group Project)
- Technology Integration (e.g., Blackboard, YouTube, Web Sites, Dropbox, Zoom, Padlet, Google Docs/Forms, Microsoft 365 Office Suite)
- Guest Speakers
- Experiential Learning (Field Work)

Course Expectations, Key Assessments, Grading Criteria

1. Professionalism (5 points)

- Leaders need to be able to manage their time and meet deadlines. You are expected to fully participate in online activities. Be aware of deadlines for online submissions.
- Leaders also have to be effective team members. You will be working in a group to develop a grant proposal. Everyone will have opinions/ideas to share; therefore, active participation is extremely important. Each member of the group possesses unique talents, experiences and beliefs. Variety ultimately leads to diverse and interesting discussions, which increases the likelihood of a high-quality product.
- You will write a brief reflection on your performance across the semester in order to earn the 5 points.

2. Ethical Considerations: CITI Certification (5 points)

- Complete online CITI module: Responsible Conduct of Research-Basic
- Upload the certificate of completion to Bb.

3. Check-In Assignments (10 points)

- Complete 10 Check-In Templates, each worth 1 point if completed by due date, Answers will be based on the week's module completed prior to the due date.
- Dates for the check-ins can be found in the syllabus or on Bb site (under Week tabs).
- You will receive 1 point for each check-in that answers the prompt(s) and is turned in by the deadline.

4. Needs Assessment (20 points)

- You will design and execute a needs assessment for a non-profit organization (K-12 school or district, higher education institution, hospital/health care facility, community-based organization, faith-based institution). Your objective is to figure out what types of new approaches or programming are worthy of consideration in order to improve or expand services. Your report will consist of three sections (Pre-Assessment, Assessment, Post-Assessment) and should be 5-8 pages in length.
- You will conduct a pre-assessment by coming up with tentative answers to the following questions: What are unmet needs of the population served? Who is affected? What is currently being done to narrow the gap between what should be and what is? You may revisit work that you did in your research seminar during fall semester. You may already have thought about these questions. Start keeping track of your field hours.
- You will move on to Phase Two (qualitative methods of data gathering): interviewing, conducting systematic observation, and/or content analysis of official communications/web site. Your notes (with date stamps) will document your findings. Phase One and Phase Two should account for the 10 hours of fieldwork required in this course.
- For Phase Three (post-assessment), you will review your findings and identify one problem of practice that is of critical importance to the organization. You then identify who should be invited to participate in a stakeholder's group to brainstorm possible solutions and to develop an implementation plan.
- You **cannot pass** this course without 10 hours of field work. Your Field Work Documentation Form with the Field Work Addendum will serve as documentation.

5. Program Evaluation Proposal (30 points)

- You will select a project, program, or a unit in your workplace or in a non-profit setting where you volunteer your time (can be faith-based institution or community agency). You are developing an evaluation proposal for consideration by decision makers within the organization. You will create an evaluation plan that will help the organization to gauge program effectiveness.
- You are not expected to conduct the evaluation; therefore, you will not be required to collect the data that you are describing in the methodology section. You should base your proposal on the assumption that the formal evaluation should take no longer than one calendar year to complete (including dissemination activities).
- Your evaluation proposal will be no longer than 10 pages and should include the following five sections:
 - Background of Organization (History, Mission, Number of Programs, Operating Budget)
 - Program Description (Goals/Objectives, Population Served, Staffing, Major Activities)
 - Goals for the Evaluation (Questions to be addressed)
 - Methodology
 - Dissemination of Findings

6. Grant Proposal- Group Project (30 points)

- You will be assigned to a group of 6-7 colleagues.
- Together, you will write a grant proposal for one of the organizations represented in your group. You will use a Blackboard Group Discussion Forum (or an alternative interactive technology) to exchange ideas, share drafts, and come up with a coherent and compelling proposal.
- Everyone in the group will take major responsibility for at least two sections of the proposal but will contribute to other sections based on experience and expertise.
- Each proposal will consist of eight sections
 - Executive Summary
 - Introduction
 - Needs Statement
 - Goals
 - Project Design
 - Evaluation Design
 - Organizational Capacity: Project Management and Sustainability
 - Budget

Rubrics:

Needs Assessment

	Exemplary	Proficient	Below Expectations	Unacceptable
Pre-Assessment 25%	Answers (supported by data gathering during the pre-assessment phase) are provided to the following questions: What are unmet needs of the population served? What is currently being done to narrow the gap between what should be and what is?	Answers provided to following questions: What are unmet needs of the population served? What is currently being done to narrow the gap between what should be and what is?	Missing or vague answers to one of the following questions: What are unmet needs of the population served? What is currently being done to narrow the gap between what should be and what is?	Missing or vague answers to both of the following questions: What are unmet needs of the population served? What is currently being done to narrow the gap between what should be and what is?
Assessment 50%	Rigorous data collection and analysis; data gathering techniques are acceptable and clearly aligned to objectives; detailed field notes provided	Adequate data collection and analysis; data gathering techniques are acceptable; field notes provided	Vague and unclear data collection and analysis; insufficient detail on data gathering techniques; field notes lack specificity	Missing description of data collection and/or analysis; missing field notes
Post-Assessment 25%	Action plan based on a clearly defined problem with implementation strategy that references key stakeholders and provides feasible, measurable next steps	Action plan based on a clearly defined problem with implementation strategy that provides feasible next steps	Action plan based on an ill-defined problem; action plan is vague	No action plan

Program Evaluation Proposal

	Exemplary	Proficient	Below Expectations	Unacceptable
Background of Organization 5%	Clear, succinct organizational background	Mostly clear succinct organizational background	Organizational background not succinct; too many extraneous details	Missing organizational background
Program Description 5%	Comprehensive and detailed program description and explanation of staffing	Adequate program description and explanation of staffing	Vague program description and unclear explanation of staffing	No program/staffing descriptions
Goals for Evaluation Plan 25%	Goals are strongly aligned with program's overall mission/vision and are measurable	Goals are mostly aligned with program's overall mission/vision and are measurable	Not clear how goals are aligned with program's overall mission/vision and are too general	Missing goals completely, or they are not connected to evaluation plan
Methodology 50%	Rigorous and detailed data collection and analysis plans for evaluation; instruments are appropriate	Adequate and mostly detailed data collection and analysis plans for evaluation; instruments mainly are appropriate	Vague and unclear data collection and analysis plans for evaluation; poorly thought-out and constructed instruments	Missing data collection and analysis plans for evaluation
Dissemination of Findings 10%	Comprehensive, inclusive dissemination plan that includes feedback loops and continuous improvement strategies	Adequate dissemination plan that includes some continuous improvement strategies	Poorly designed, surface dissemination plan; lacks feedback loops and continuous improvement strategies	No dissemination plan
Technical Aspects 5%	Grammatically and stylistically superior; correct citation format and appropriate references	No more than 5 spelling or grammatical errors; minor errors in citation format; appropriate references	More than 5 spelling or grammatical errors; major errors in citation format; some inappropriate references	Spelling or grammatical errors throughout document; missing citations

Grant Proposal

	Exemplary	Proficient	Below Expectations	Unacceptable
Abstract - Executive Summary 10%	Clear, succinct summary of proposed project that includes important details (e.g., grant applicant, why funding is needed, amount requested, etc.)	Mostly clear summary of proposed project that includes most of important details (e.g., grant applicant, why funding is needed, amount requested, etc.)	Summary of proposed project is missing many important details (e.g., grant applicant, why funding is needed, amount requested, etc.); not succinct; too many extraneous details	Missing summary or missing most important details of summary
Needs Statement 15%	Strong and compelling need established through detailed explanation of problem; supported with comprehensive evidence (data, statistics, research)	Need established; supported with adequate evidence (data, statistics, research)	Unclear problem or need; vague and/or surface evidence provided as support	No problem and./or need evident; fails to provide any evidence as support
Goals/Objectives 10%	Goals/objectives are extremely well written; they are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely	Goals/objectives are mainly well written; they mostly are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely	Goals/objectives are poorly written; most of them are vague, unclear and not measurable.	Goals/objectives are not specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely.
Project Design 25%	Detailed, appropriate, project design; feasible timeline	Adequate project design, but elements need additional details; mostly feasible timeline	Questionable and vague project design and timeline	No project design and timeline

Evaluation Plan 15%	Outstanding, specific and highly detailed evaluation plan; evaluation methods directly measure all goals/objectives	Strong, mostly specific and mostly detailed evaluation plan; evaluation methods directly measure most goals/objectives	Vague and poorly detailed evaluation plan; evaluation methods are limited in their measurement of goals/objectives	No evaluation plan
Budget - Budget Narrative 10%	Comprehensive budget includes detailed descriptions of all costs/expenses (including in-kind)	Adequate budget includes mostly detailed descriptions of all costs/expenses (including in-kind)	Vague budget includes incomplete descriptions of all costs/expenses (including in-kind)	Budget lacks details of costs.
Organizational Capacity and Plans to Institutionalize Project 10%	Strong and compelling explanation that demonstrates that organization has the capabilities (e.g., staff, skills, knowledge, partners) to implement the proposed project successfully and to institutionalize it after funding ends	Adequate explanation that mostly demonstrates that organization has the capabilities (e.g., staff, skills, knowledge, partners) to implement the proposed project successfully and to institutionalize it after funding ends	Vague and disconnected explanation; does not fully demonstrate that organization has the capabilities (e.g., staff, skills, knowledge, partners) to implement the proposed project successfully and to institutionalize it after funding ends	Lacks explanation; does not demonstrate that organization has the capabilities (e.g., staff, skills, knowledge, partners) to implement the proposed project successfully and to institutionalize it after funding ends
Technical Aspects 5%	Grammatically and stylistically superior; sentences & paragraphs are well developed; no spelling and/or grammatical errors	Grammatically and stylistically sound; sentence/paragraph development is present but not perfected; no more than 5 spelling and/or grammatical errors	Grammatically and stylistically poor; information is understandable, but ideas are not organized or developed; more than 5 spelling and/or grammatical errors	Grammatically and stylistically inadequate; information is not conveyed in a way that can be understood; ideas are not organized or developed; more than 5 spelling and/or grammatical errors

Professionalism Grade

Exemplary	Reflection corroborated by instructor records provides evidence of active engagement in group work and documents timely submission of all assignments
Proficient	Reflection corroborated by instructor records provides evidence of engagement in group work and documents no more than one missed deadline
Does Not Meet Expectations	Reflection corroborated by instructor records provides evidence of limited engagement in group work and documents two or more missed deadlines
Unacceptable	Reflection corroborated by instructor records fails to provide evidence of engagement in group work or documentation of timely submission of assignments

<u>Course Assessment:</u>	<u>Points</u>
Needs Assessment	20
Program Evaluation Plan	30
Grant Proposal	30
Check-In Assignments	10
CITI Assignment (certificate)	5
Professionalism: Reflection	5

Grading Scale:

Letter Grade	Points
A	95-100
A-	90-94.9
B+	87-89.9
B	84-86.9
B-	80-83.9
C+	77-79.9
C	74-76.9

General Information

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy

Academic Dishonesty, which includes plagiarism, is prohibited in The City University of New York and is punishable by penalties, including failing grades, suspension, and expulsion, as provided herein. A full statement and information may be found in Lehman College's student handbook at the following link: <http://www.lehman.cuny.edu/student-affairs/documents/student-handbook-02.pdf>.

Accommodating Disabilities

Lehman College is committed to providing access to all programs and curricula to all students. Students with disabilities who may need classroom accommodations are encouraged to register with the Office of Student Disability Services. For more information, please contact the Office of Student Disability Services, 718.960.8441.

The Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) *The Academic Center for Excellence (ACE)*

The Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) is a tutoring center on campus. The ACE provides appointment based and drop-in tutoring in the humanities, social sciences, and writing, as well as general writing and academic skills workshops. To obtain more information about the ACE, please visit their website at <http://www.lehman.edu/issp>, or please call 718.960.8175.

Purdue University's online APA-specific resources

Purdue University's writing lab has a plethora of online APA-specific resources that may be beneficial (<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>). In addition, a sample paper formatted according to APA standards with explanatory comments can also be found via the below links.

IT Helpdesk

Computer Center Helpdesk: 718-960-1111(telephone); help.desk@lehman.cuny.edu (email)

Answers to frequently asked questions: <http://lehman.edu/itr/helpdesk-faqs.php>

Lehman College Food Bank

Any student who has difficulty affording groceries or accessing sufficient food every day, and believes this may affect their academic performance, is urged to utilize the Herbert H. Lehman

Food Bank. The Food Bank is located in The Student Life Building, room 120. Students should make an appointment online to pick up food at <https://lehmanfoodbank.setmore.com/>

Course Schedule

All assignments must be submitted by 11:59 p.m. on the due date.

Week	Topic/ Activity	Readings, Videos, Web Sites	Assignments Due
Week 1	Course Introduction	<p>Syllabus</p> <p>What is program evaluation?</p> <p>Read the health services perspective as articulated by the Center for Disease Control, the education sector perspective as articulated by the US Department of Education, or the social work perspective as articulated in a social work research methods textbook.</p> <p><i>What is an evaluation culture?</i> Read blog entry and share your perspective with the class on Padlet. In your post, give your name and which sector (health, education, social services) you represent.</p>	<p>Sunday, 2/7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check-in #1 (Padlet Post) <p>https://padlet.com/nikifayne/gom6uen8k1jmb8q1</p>
Week 2	Ethical Considerations	CUNY CITI Course	<p>Sunday 2/14,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CITI Module Completed and Certificate Uploaded
Week 3	Needs Assessment (1)	<p>Preliminary Work</p> <p>Where can you begin?</p> <p>Research Methods in Psychology Text, Chapter 32 Observational Research</p>	<p>Sunday, 2/21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check-in #2
Week 4	Needs Assessment (2)	<p>Using qualitative methods for data gathering:</p> <p>Interviews (YouTube Video-Yale U. School of Public Health)</p> <p>Focus Groups (Podcast, Grantsmanship Center)</p> <p>Surveys (Graduate Social Work Methods Text Chapter)</p>	<p>Sunday, 2/28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check-in #3
Week 5	Needs Assessment (3)	<p>Post-Needs Assessment: Developing an Action Plan</p> <p>Resource: Community Tool Kit</p> <p>Chapter 8 “Developing an Action Plan”</p>	<p>Sunday, 3/7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs Assessment Report Due MSOL Field Work Documentation Form Due
Week 6	Assessing Program Theory and Design	<p>Program Theory YouTube Video</p> <p>James Madison University Assessment and Research Studies, Program Theory</p> <p>Logic Models</p> <p>Logic Model You Tube Video</p>	<p>Sunday, 3/14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check-in #4

		Smart Goals YouTube Video Amanda Perez (Lehman College MSOL Program Faculty), SMART Goals	
Week 7	Assessing Program Processes (Formative Evaluation)	Process Evaluation Step 7: Process Evaluation (Rand Corporation Web Site)	Sunday, 3/21 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check-in #5
Week 8	Spring Break		
Week 9	Assessing Program Outcomes (Summative Evaluation)	Mixed Methods Approaches Towards the use of mixed methods inquiry as best practice in health outcomes research (journal article) Hard and Soft Data (podcast, Grantsmanship Center)	Sunday, 4/4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check-in #6
Week 10	Impact Evaluation: Comparison Group Designs	Research Methods in Social Work Text Chapter Non-Experimental, Quasi-Experimental, Experimental Group Designs	Sunday, 4/11 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check-in #7

Week 11	Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness Analyses	Measuring Economic Impact More Education Studies Look at Cost Effectiveness Sara Sparks, <i>Education Week</i> Plenary Session (Optional) Evaluation Proposal Critical Friend Review Join us for a synchronous session via Zoom on Thursday, 4/15 at 7:00 p.m. Share your work with your peers and invited experts	Sunday, 4/18 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation Proposal Due Any request for extensions should be submitted with a progress report as an email attachment (Extension Request in Subject Line). Include an anticipated submission date..
Week 12	Grants (1)	Introduction and Problem (Needs) Statement How to Get a Grant? Grantsmanship Center Webinar (scroll down and click on the icon with this title) Grant Writing Needs Statement: Part One Dondra Ward, Sidnae Global Research Grant Writing Needs Statement: Part Two Dondra Ward, Sidnae Global Research	Sunday, 4/25 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check-in #8
Week 13	Grants (2)	Outcomes: What do you hope to achieve? Activities: What do you plan to do? Review Logic Models and SMART Goals (also, see materials listed under Week 6) Evaluation: How will you track activities and measure results?	Sunday, 5/2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check-in #9

Week 14	Grants (3)	Governance/Sustainability Review at least two sample grant proposals that you can find on Bb under Week 14 tab. Focus on governance (management plan), and sustainability components. Since these grant proposals do not adhere to one template, you will need to look for these components even if they do not have specific category labels.	Sunday, 5/9
Week 15	Grants (4)	Budget <i>Budget</i> webinar available on Bb under Week 15 tab Plenary Session (Optional) Grant Proposals Join us for a synchronous session via Zoom on Thursday, 5/13 at 7:00 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check-In #10 Friday, 5/14 (Note Change of Day from typical Check-Ins)
Week 16	Closure		Sunday, 5/23 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each member of group uploads their own copy of the grant proposal on Bb (Grant Proposal Hub Tab) and provides a one paragraph explanation of their unique contribution to the group effort • Professionalism Reflection Uploaded (Professionalism Tab)

Open Education Texts

DeCarlo, M. Cummings, C., Agnelli, K. Graduate research methods in social work: A project-based approach. Unless otherwise noted, this textbook and all of the associated resources (workbook, slideshows, activities, etc.) are © 2020 by these authors and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>).

Price, P.C., Jhangiani, R.S., Chiang, I., Leighton, D.C., & Cuttler, C. [Research Methods in Psychology](#) (cloned version) Pressbooks under a [CC BY-NC-SA \(Attribution NonCommercial ShareAlike\)](#) license. (It may differ from the original.)

Web Resources

American Evaluation Association
<https://www.eval.org/>

Center for Disease Control (CDC): Program Performance and Evaluation Office
<https://www.cdc.gov/eval/index.htm>

Center for Nonprofit Excellence
<https://www.centerfornonprofitexcellence.org/resources/evaluation>

Foundation Center
<http://foundationcenter.org/>

Grantmanship Center
www.tgci.com

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation
<http://www.jcsee.org/program-evaluation-standards-statements>

Rand Corporation: Tools
<https://www.rand.org/pubs/tools.html>

University of Kansas: Community Tool Kit
<https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents>

University of Wisconsin- Extension: Program Development and Evaluation
<https://fyi.uwex.edu/programdevelopment/planning-programs/>

U.S. Department of Education: Standards, Assessments, and Accountability
<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html>

Additional Resources and Supplemental Readings

Books

Barrett, N. (2016). *Program evaluation: A step by step guide*. Springfield, IL: Sunnycrest Press.

Heppner, P. P. & Heppner, M. J. (2004). *Writing and publishing your thesis, dissertation & research: A guide for students in the helping professions*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Kiritz, N.J. (2017). *Grantsmanship: Program planning & proposal writing* (2nd Ed. updated and expanded by Barbara Floersch). Los Angeles, CA: Grantsmanship Center.

Newcomer, K.E., Hatry, H.P., Wholey, J.S., Eds. (2015). *Handbook of practical program evaluation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Pyrczak, F. & Bruce, R. (2007). *Writing research reports*. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Royse, D., Thyer, B.A., & Padgett, D.K. (2016). *Program evaluation; An introduction to an evidence-based approach* (6th ed). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2019). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Articles and Book Chapters

Astramovich, R.L. (2016). Program evaluation interest and skills of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 20* (1), 54-6

Baker, A. J. (2007). Client feedback in child welfare programs: Current trends and future directions. *Children and Youth Services Review, 29* (9), 1189-1200.

Cadogan, K., Waldrop, J., Maslow, G. & Chung, R.J. (2018). S.M.A.R.T. transitions: A program evaluation. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care, 32* (4), 81-90.

Dino, G., Horn, K., Abdulkadri, Abdullahi, Kalsekar, Iftekhar, & Branstetter, S. (2008). Cost-effectiveness analysis of the Not On Tobacco program for adolescent smoking cessation. *Prevention Science, 9* (1), 38-46.

Donaldson, S., Gooler, L. E & Scriven, M. (2002). Strategies for managing evaluation anxiety: Toward a psychology of program evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation, 23* (3), 261-273.

Farrington, D. P. (2003). A short history of randomized experiments in criminology: A meager feast. *Evaluation Review, 27* (3), 218-227.

Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2004). Exemplars as case studies: Reflections on the links between theory, practice, and context. *American Journal of Evaluation, 25* (4), 541-559.

Henry, K. L., Smith, E. A. & Hopkins, A. M. (2002). The effect of active parental consent on the ability to generalize the results of an alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention trial to rural adolescents. *Evaluation Review*, 26 (6), 645-655.

Puddy, R. W., Boles, R. E., Dreyer, M. L., Maikranz, J., Roberts, M. C., Vernberg, E. M. (2008). Demonstrating support for the formative and summative assessment paradigm in a school-based intensive mental health program. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 17 (2), 253-263.

Riddell, M.A., Dunbar, J.A., Absetz, P., Wolfe, R., Li, H., Brand, M. Aziz, Z., & Oldenburg, B. (2016). Cardiovascular risk outcome and program evaluation of a cluster randomized controlled trial of a community-based, lay peer led program for people with diabetes. *BMC Public Health*, 16(1).

