

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Open Educational Resources

Lehman College

2022

EDL 805 Syllabus Spring 2022

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/57

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 (Sections S 81, S82)
(4 Semester Hours)
Synchronous Online- Spring 2022

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

Mailbox Location Carman Hall B-20

Office Location: Carman Hall-B-01H

Class Meetings: Section 81 Mondays, 6-8 p.m. ([Zoom](#))

Section 82 Mondays, 8:10-10:10 p.m. ([Zoom](#))

Office Hours: Mondays, 4-6 p.m. and by appointment ([Zoom](#))

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) or 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 course. As such, you must sign on for all synchronous Zoom sessions in order to fully engage with the material, with me, and with one another.
- You are expected to log into Blackboard frequently to access course materials that constitute the asynchronous component of this course.
- While the class is online, 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 7 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 both asynchronously and synchronously (during Zoom sessions).
- 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:

- Lectures
- Discussions (Asynchronous and Synchronous)
- 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.
- 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 how you demonstrated professionalism 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. Formative Assessment

- Complete 10 Check-Ins (Discussion Forum Posts), each worth 1 point.

4. Needs Assessment (20 points)

- You will design and execute a needs assessment for a non-profit organization (P-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 (documenting the Phase One and Phase Two hours) 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.
- 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 one or more 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 (Rubric Aligned with Scoring Guide)

	Exemplary	Proficient	Below Expectations	Unacceptable
Abstract - Executive Summary 3 points	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 4.5 points	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 3 points	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 7.5 points	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 4.5 points	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 3 points	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 3 points	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 1.5 points	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:

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 “Before the Class Session” preparation should be completed prior to the class session. All “After the Class Session” activities should be completed before the next week’s class session (specific due dates for assignments that are to be uploaded onto Blackboard are noted).

Week	Before the Class Session	Synchronous Class Session	After the Class Session
Week 1 Course Intro.	What is program evaluation? 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 .	<i>What is an evaluation culture?</i> Read blog entry and share your perspective with the class on the Discussion Forum Check-In #1, 1/31 In your post, give your name and which sector (health, education, social services) you represent. You can refer to information that you gathered from your “Before the Class Session” reading selection.	Annotate your syllabus using Hypothesis.
Week 2	Ethical Considerations CUNY CITI Course	Applying ethics to evaluation case scenarios	Sunday, 2/13 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CITI Module Completed and Certificate Uploaded
Week 3	Needs Assessment (1) Where can you begin? Research Methods in Psychology Text, Chapter 32 Observational Research-Sections on Naturalistic, Participant, and Structured Observation	Pre-Assessment Phase Preliminary Work: Document Review, Web Searches, Observation Check-in #2, 2/14 Your school, hospital, social agency, or faith-based organization wants to address food insecurity that has been a by-product of the COVID-19 pandemic. How would you go about gathering data for Phase One of a Needs Assessment? Where do you start?	Plan to spend five clock hours conducting pre-assessment activities. Here is a suggestion for how to allocate the five hours: 1 hr. planning 3 hrs. data collection 1 hr. data analysis (write up results)
Week 4	Week 4 folder on Bb includes: -PP slide deck -LibGuide -Executive Summary, Needs Assessment	NO CLASS on 2/21 President’s Day	Continue pre-assessment activities Allocate time to prepare interview guide, focus group questions, and/or questionnaire items (see Week 5 for source material)

<p>Week 5</p>	<p>Needs Assessment (2) Interviews (YouTube Video- Yale U. School of Public Health) Focus Groups (Podcast, Grantsmanship Center) Surveys (Graduate Social Work Methods Text Chapter)</p>	<p>Assessment Phase Using qualitative methods for data gathering: Check-in #3, 2/28 Which data gathering technique or combination of techniques will you use in your Needs Assessment (interviews, focus groups, surveys)? Explain your choice, referencing the resources provided in this module. Identify one “pothole” or problem that you will need to avoid and indicate how you plan to do so.</p>	<p>Plan to spend five clock hours conducting assessment activities. The way that you allocate time will depend on the type of method you select (interview, focus group, questionnaire).</p>
<p>Week 6</p>	<p>Needs Assessment (3) Resource: Community Tool Kit Chapter 8 “Developing an Action Plan”</p>	<p>Post-Needs Assessment: Developing an Action Plan Check-In #4, 3/7 Phase three of the needs assessment is a short action plan. What need surfaced during the first two phases? Who needs to be at the table to talk about next steps? What is a realistic timeline? What resources do you anticipate needing to get this project underway?</p>	<p>Sunday, 3/13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs Assessment Report Due • MSOL Field Work Documentation Due
<p>Week 7</p>	<p>James Madison University Assessment and Research Studies, Program Theory Amanda Perez (Lehman College MSOL Program Faculty), SMART Goals Logic Model You Tube Video</p>	<p>Program Theory, Logic Models, SMART Goals Check-In #5, 3/14 Based on the logic model prepared by a community based organization to reduce the number of foster care referrals (shared in class), answer the following question: Are the program goals and objectives in alignment with SMART criteria? Explain your answer in one paragraph referring to SMART criteria.</p>	

Week 8	Assessing Program Processes Step 7: Process Evaluation (Rand Corporation Web Site)	Process Evaluation Check-In #6, 3/21 Pose a question or questions about your organization that could be addressed in a formal process evaluation. What can you count? What kind of qualitative data would you need to collect? Guest Speaker(s) ?	
Week 9	Assessing Program Outcomes (Summative Evaluation) Towards the use of mixed methods inquiry as best practice in health outcomes research (journal article) Hard and Soft Data (podcast, Grantsmanship Center)	Mixed Methods Approaches Check-In #7, 3/28 “In my evaluation proposal, I plan to include the following technique to gauge client/patient/student satisfaction: ---” Indicate how you will measure satisfaction and provide a rationale for why this is a reliable (trustworthy) and valid (meaningful) approach.	
Week 10	Impact Evaluation: Comparison Group Designs Chapter Non-Experimental, Quasi-Experimental, Experimental Group Designs	Research Methods Check-In #8, 4/4 Explain why experimental group designs are considered the “gold standard” in evaluation research and why it is not a common practice to use these types of designs.	

Week 11	Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness Analyses More Education Studies Look at Cost Effectiveness Sara Sparks, <i>Education Week</i>	Measuring Economic Impact Check-In #9, 4/11 In this check-in, complete these sentence starters: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• My team met on (Date/Time) _____• We decided to use _____ as a way of communicating with one another.• We plan to share drafts with one another using _____• We agreed that we would write a grant proposal for (Name of Organization) _____• The team member who will be the point of contact with the organization is _____	Grant Group Meetings (Group members determine day, time, and meeting format)
---------	--	---	---

Week 12		Spring Break (4/15-22) NO CLASS on Monday, 4/18	Sunday, 4/24 Evaluation Proposal Due
Week 13	<p>Grants (1)</p> <p>How to Get a Grant? Grantsmanship Center Webinar (scroll down and click on the icon with this title)</p> <p>Grant Writing Needs Statement: Part One Dondra Ward, Sidnae Global Research</p> <p>Grant Writing Needs Statement: Part Two Dondra Ward, Sidnae Global Research</p>	<p>Introduction and Problem (Needs) Statement</p> <p>Grant Panel 4/25</p>	Grant Group Meetings (Group members determine day, time, and meeting format)
Week 14	<p>Grants (2)</p> <p>Review Logic Models and SMART Goals (also, see materials listed under Week 6)</p>	<p>Outcomes: What do you hope to achieve?</p> <p>Activities: What do you plan to do?</p> <p>Evaluation: How will you track activities and measure results?</p> <p>Check-In #10, 5/2 Post a brief progress report. How are you coming with your section? What assistance do you need from your group? From your instructor? Outline next steps.</p>	Grant Group Meetings (Group members determine day, time, and meeting format)
Week 15	<p>Grants (3)</p> <p>Bb: Sample Grant Proposals and USDOE monograph on sustainability</p>	Governance/Sustainability	Grant Group Meetings (Group members determine day, time, and meeting format)
Week 16	<p>Grants (4)</p> <p>Bb: <i>Budget</i> webinar</p>	Budget	Grant Group Meetings (Group members determine day, time, and meeting format)
<p>Closure</p> <p>Exam Period: No Class</p> <p>Monday, 5/23</p> <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).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).