

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL ECOLOGY
SOWK 673 Program Planning and Evaluation
Spring Quarter 2007

Section:	Instructors:	Contact Info:	Units:	Lecture:	Room:
1	Dr. Ignatius Yacoub	909-558-7148 iyacoub@llu.edu Griggs Hall 114	3	Tuesday, 3:00-5:50 p.m.	GH 107

TEXTBOOK

Kettnor, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L.(1999). *Designing and managing programs: An effectiveness-based approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS FROM THE FOLLOWING BOOKS

Ashley, M. (1999). *Promoting health in multicultural populations: A handbook for practitioners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Duran, B.M. & Duran, E.F. (1999). *Promoting health in multicultural populations: A handbook for practitioners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Powell, J. (1995). *Pathways to leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

COURSE CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION

As one of the core courses in the Policy/Administration concentration, ***Program Planning and Evaluation (SOWK 673)*** introduces students to the range of issues, knowledge, and skills required in the design, planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs. Building on the knowledge obtained in other concentration courses, alternative philosophical and theoretical perspectives of program planning and evaluation as public processes for solving social problems and for reaching social goals are explored. The concept of public interest, as the underlying justification for planning, is examined from a multi disciplinary view utilizing the foundations of political science, economics, and sociology for comparing social work values and practice perspectives. Various models of program planning and evaluation are critiqued 1) for their capacity to present the cyclical continuum of the planning process, and 2) for their capacity to identify inequities in the availability and accessibility of health and mental health services. Integration of the course concepts takes place through the development of a comprehensive program proposal that makes use of students' practicum sites or other identified community organizations and initiatives.

COURSE GOAL

To introduce students to the range of issues, knowledge, and skills required in the design, planning, implementation, and evaluation of equitable social programs.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

- To examine alternative theories that guide the planning process;
- To examine the concept of public interest and its varied manifestations and political underpinnings;
- To examine the values underlying public planning in relation to social work values;
- To examine the interdigenuous nature of social policies, program planning and evaluation designs;

- To examine the effects of organizational context on the planning and evaluation process; and
- To examine the principles, methods, and tools of evaluation research as an integrated part of the program planning process.

STUDENT EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

- Students will demonstrate through analysis of a state or county program plan the ability to identify and explain different theoretical perspectives that can guide the planning process;
- Students will demonstrate through the analysis of a state or county program plan an understanding of the nature of public interests and the role these play in the planning process;
- Students will demonstrate through completion of a planning project the application of social work values toward the design of equitable services;
- Students will demonstrate through completion of a planning project the interrelationship between social policies, program planning and evaluation design;
- Students will be able to identify organizational constraints affecting the program planning implementation and the evaluation process; and
- Students will demonstrate through the completion of a planning project the appropriate application of evaluation research methods to measure program effectiveness.

COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE LEARNING EXPERIENCES

The instructional methods used in this course rely primarily on lectures and discussions in which students are asked to integrate examples from the field practicum experiences. Some guest lectures have been invited to present to students the realities, challenges, and results of program planning and evaluation in public and private settings.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

Required Readings: Course readings designated as required provide the major content for lectures, class discussions, and assignments. Required readings are located in either the course textbooks or the course supplement.

Recommended Readings: Recommended readings refer to the text and journal materials used to enhance course lectures, discussions, and student research. Examination and quiz questions are not taken from recommended readings.

Attendance Policy: Students are expected to attend all sessions of all classes. Failure to do so will negatively impact the student's grade and may place the student in jeopardy of course failure. This policy exists because the social work program is one of professional preparation. In addition to acquiring theoretical knowledge, students are expected to acquire professional values, to integrate knowledge from a range of courses, to develop professional skills and be socialized into the profession. The faculty of the Department of Social Work and Social Ecology are convinced that this cannot be accomplished through independent study alone. Thus, attendance is required unless legitimate and special reasons exist for absences or tardiness. Any such absences or tardiness should be discussed directly with the course instructor.

Classes begins on the hour unless otherwise arranged. Students are required to be in the classroom and seated by that time. Instructors have the right to refuse entry or reentry to any students who are tardy or who take frequent and/or extended breaks from class. Early departures from classes are also not acceptable. Tardiness, frequent and/or extended breaks, and early departures are all recorded as absences. All absences are factored into the course grade and may be substantial enough to effect the final course grade; including assignment of an unsatisfactory or failing

grade. Absences due to personal emergencies, jury duty, or work responsibilities will be excused only if appropriate documentation is provided. Students should give special attention to arranging for child care and making voluntary personal appointments at times that do not conflict with their responsibilities regarding class attendance.

Faculty members may choose to incorporate a + or - 1% tolerance range in the grading system. This option will be used to reflect attendance (missed classes, late arrivals and early departures) and passive participation.

Test Taking Policy: It is the policy of the department that all students are expected to take examinations at the scheduled time. The only acceptable excuse/s for not taking an examination on time is major illness (documented by the student health service or student's physician) or serious personal emergency. The consequences of missing an examination under these circumstances are determined by the Academic Standards Committee. If a student arrives late for an examination, s/he may be denied admission to the examination site. If a student arrives late for an examination and is allowed to take the examination, s/he will not be given extra time but is required to finish the examination at the pre-scheduled completion time.

Participation: Participation is made up of many factors including being present, prepared, and willing to add meaningful ideas during class discussions. Each student is expected to have read and reflected upon the assigned readings, and be prepared to participate to apply these in class discussions. The teacher has the option of adding 1% to students who provide meaningful participation in class discussions.

Critique of Planning Model: Students are to select one of the program plans provided by the instructor and provide a critique of that plan. The critique should be organized according to the following questions:

1. Which of the planning models discussed in class (see list on week three of course schedule) appear to be guiding the content and structure of the plan? Please justify.
2. What model would you propose as the most effective one to promote the viable implementation of the services described in the plan? Why?
3. Which of the types of public interest do you see operating in this plan? Why?

Program Proposal Outline: Describe a social problem and the factors contributing to the problem. (This part of the assignment is devoted to describing the characteristics of the general population, the at-risk population, the target population, and the client population.) Next, provide a brief assessment of existing services available to your target population. Based upon your description of the problem and analysis of existing services provide a program goal and a set of measurable objectives that would augment (improve upon the services already offered).

The following program outline should be used:

- I. Description of the Problem (A-D should be 2-3 pages total)
 - A. General Population (characteristics; size estimates)
 - B. At-Risk Population (characteristics; size estimates)
 - C. Target Population (characteristics: size estimates)
 - D. Client Population (characteristics: size estimates)
 - E. Assessment of Existing Services to Target and Client Population--- (types of services and number of clients) (1-2 pages total)
- II. Design of the Program (A and B should be 1-2 pages total)
 - A. Describe planning model to be used
 - B. Program Goal and Objectives
 1. realistic (technological; fiscal; ethical)
 2. lack of jargon
 3. action-oriented verbs (when possible)

4. possible
 5. measurable
 6. sets single standard
 7. sets time parameter
- C. Evaluation Paradigm (1-2 pages)
1. describe system of evaluation

GRADING

The Course requirements add up to 100%. The Breakdown is as follows:

Participation	20%
Assessment of Planning Model	30%
Program Proposal	50%
TOTALS	100%

A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F
93-100	90-92	87-89	83-86	80-82	77-79	73-76	70-72	67-69	63-66	60-62	<60
4.0	3.7	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.3	2.0	1.7	1.3	1.0	<i>0.0 Assigned value for calculation of grade point averages.</i>	

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE

All students receive copies of the MSW Program Student Handbook and the Loma Linda University Student Handbook upon admission to the University and program. Students are held responsible for becoming familiar with the policies contained in these documents. Specifically, students need to know and understand the academic policies that guide their classroom and practicum experiences. These include but are not limited to policies for assignment standards, late assignments, attendance, identification of codes for course assignments, and academic dishonesty. Students should address any questions they may have regarding these policies to the Department

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) POLICY

If you are an individual with a certifiable disability and need to make a request for reasonable accommodation to fully participate in this class, please visit the Dean's Office of your school. To view the Disability Accommodation Policy please go to: <http://www.llu.edu/llu/handbook/6e.htm>

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

[Sample; pending approval of a university-wide policy] Acts of dishonesty including theft, plagiarism, giving or obtaining information in examinations or other academic exercises, or knowingly giving false information are unacceptable. Substantiated violations are to be brought before the dean for disciplinary action. Such action may include, but is not limited to, academic probation or dismissal from the program. To view the Standards of Academic Conduct Policy please visit: <http://www.llu.edu/llu/handbook/6r.htm>

Loma Linda University
All Undergraduate & Graduate Programs
Requirements for the Appropriate Use of PHI
Addendum to Syllabus, Prospectus Guidelines or other Program Material

Applicability:	All Students (LLU Students in all schools/programs & Non-LLU Students)
Purpose:	To provide guidance and establish clear expectations for students regarding the appropriate access to and use of protected health information (PHI) during course studies and related program activities.
Scope:	PHI or Protected Health Information. Under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), patient health information is protected. Patient health information is considered protected if any of the identifiers listed under “List of Patient Identifiers” below is attached to health data.

Requirements & Expectations

PHI may be accessed and used under the direction of the instructor for learning and education within the student’s formal field of study. In a course where PHI is needed to enhance and promote learning, students are allowed to access or use PHI in a manner consistent with expectations of the course and within the limits of information that would otherwise be accessed or used in the role of a licensed professional within the student’s formal field of study.

While in the possession of PHI belonging to LLU or its affiliates, students must assume legal responsibility and provide necessary security means to ensure data integrity and patient confidentiality. PHI stored on electronic portable devices e.g., laptops, PDA’s must be password protected and encrypted. PHI must be encrypted when transferred via the Internet.

If PHI is not required to meet course objectives, accessing PHI via any means (including but not limited to access to hardcopy patient charts, computers, downloading of data to electronic devices (portable or otherwise) via USB ports, flash drives, and transferring data to LLU or non-LLU email accounts e.g., Yahoo, AOL, or other means), is strictly prohibited.

Students must adhere to all outlined guidance for the proper access to and use of PHI. Non-adherence to the requirements or established expectations regarding the access to, use or disclosure of PHI is subject to disciplinary action.

1. Access to PHI

Access to PHI must be within approved methods/channels (e.g., Health Information Management (HIM) Department) established by the hospital or entity holding the PHI. Students granted system access are only allowed access to PHI when necessary to fulfill required course objectives (e.g., rotations, patient care and treatment). Students must not use system access for any other purpose.

2. Minimum Necessary

Minimum necessary applies to any access to PHI. Minimum necessary means that students must only obtain the information necessary to complete the required course objective. The required course objective will be defined class by class by instructors and listed in the class syllabus.

3. De-Identification

Any PHI that is obtained to meet a required course objective must not leave the hospital or the entity holding the PHI. Only de-identified data can be removed from the facility. Students must obtain permission from the hospital or entity holding the data to access PHI for de-identification purposes. See the “List of Patient Identifiers” section below for the fields that must be removed in order to de-identify data. Copies of PHI can only be made with written approval by the entity holding the data. The written approval must include acknowledgement by the authorizing

individual of the specific purpose of use of copies. Copies of PHI must be de-identified prior to leaving the hospital or entity.

4. Case Studies involving Patients

If a unique case is described that may identify an individual to the general public simply by describing the disease or the unique treatment received, authorization from the patient is required prior to disclosing the information as part of a published article, meeting abstract, or any other form of public presentation.

IRB-approved recruitment practices should be followed in order to contact a patient or patients to acquire their authorization for disclosure of information for a case report. For example, if the case is being researched or presented by someone other than the treating physician, then the initial contact should be made by, or at least in collaboration with, the clinical department that treated the patient and with whom the patient is familiar. For further guidance on recruitment practices, see section VIII of the LLU Researcher's Guide to HIPAA, which can be found at <http://research.llu.edu>.

5. Research

Research protocol/studies must be reviewed/approved through the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Visit the Office of Sponsored Research (OSR's) website (<http://research.llu.edu>) for special requirements associated with conducting research.

6. Other Publications

Students must not use PHI in any publication without a valid written authorization and approval from the following: Dean of School, Legal Counsel and Compliance.

7. Photographs

Photographs must not be taken of patients or any proprietary information (e.g., equipment, facilities) without obtaining appropriate consents and/or authorizations. If photographs are required for coursework, students must obtain documentation from the instructor that photographs are needed and must follow entity specific policy for taking photographs. For patient photographs, written authorization to use or disclose the photograph must be obtained from the patient in addition to obtaining written consent to take the patient's photograph. All consent/authorization forms used must be approved forms currently in use by the hospital or facility in which the photograph is taken. Note: The term "photograph" means any motion picture or still photography in any format, as well as video/digital tape, disc, or any other mechanical or electronic means of recording and reproducing images, including cell phones.

8. Disclosure

PHI accessed/learned/obtained from LLU or its affiliated entities must not be shared in any way with family members, friends, fellow students, other trainees or any other individual. Family/friends that come to visit may not visit in areas where PHI is easily accessible. Note: For patient care and training purposes, PHI can be shared with those that have a need to know in order to meet patient care and training objectives.

9. Disposal and Destruction of PHI

Immediately upon completion of its intended use, PHI that will not be placed in the patient medical record must be shredded. Destruction of PHI on media such as, but not limited to, CD or diskette must be handled in accordance with entity specific policy to ensure proper destruction.

10. Incident Reporting

Students must report incidents of potential privacy or security breaches immediately to their instructor or Program Director. Potential privacy or security breaches include but are not limited to events or incidents that may result in compromised patient data, loss/theft of patient chart(s) or electronic devices which store patient data, and possible harm to a patient due to use/disclosure of PHI in a manner contrary to stated guidance for the proper access to and use of PHI.

List of Patient Identifiers to be Removed for De-Identification

To de-identify data, the following fields for the patient and of the patient's family or employer must be removed:

<i>List of Patient Identifiers</i>	
Names	Health plan beneficiary numbers
Addresses (geographic subdivisions smaller than a state)	Account numbers
Zip codes	Certificate/License Numbers
All elements of dates (except year) (e.g. birth/death; admission/discharge)	Vehicle identifiers/Serial numbers (e.g., driver's license numbers)
All ages over 89 and all elements of dates (including year)	Device identifiers
Telephone Numbers	Web Universal Resource Locators (URLs)
Fax Numbers	Internet Protocol (IP) address numbers
Email addresses	Biometric identifiers, including voice and finger prints
Social security numbers	Full face photographic images and any comparable images
Medical record numbers	Any other unique identifying number, characteristic, or code (e.g., birthmarks, tattoos, identifying anomalies)

**SOWK 673 Program Planning & Evaluation
COURSE SCHEDULE**

WEEK ONE-March 27, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. Introduction to the Course -Dr. Buckles
 - A. The relationship of social welfare planning to other social work methods
 - B. The role of social welfare planners
 - C. Education for social welfare planning
 - D. Organization of the course

- II. The Nature of Public Interests -Dr. Buckles
 - A. Interdisciplinary perspectives (political science, economics, and sociology)
 - B. Toward an integrated theory of public interests
 - C. Social policy and public interests

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*REQUIRED*):

Kettnor, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L.(1999). *Designing and managing programs: An effectiveness-based approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chapter 01 Contemporary issues in social service program, pp. 3-17.

Chapter 02 Understanding social problems, pp. 21-32.

Ashley, M. (1999). Health promotion planning in African American communities. In *Promoting health in multicultural populations: A handbook for practitioners* (pp. 223-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

O'Connell, A.A., Bol, L., & Langley, S.C. (1997). Evaluation issues and strategies or community-based organizations developing women's HIV prevention programs. In *Evaluation and the Health Professions*, 20 (4), 428-454.

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*RECOMMENDED*):

O'Connor, G. & Mc Cord, L. (1990-91). Networking among social service providers: An expanded and transformed practice. *The Journal of Applied Social Sciences*, 15 (1), 7-29.

Johnson, A. (1994). Linking professionalism and community organization: A scholar/advocate approach. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (2), 65-86.

WEEK TWO-April 3, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. The Nature of Planning -Dr. Yacoub
 - D. The characteristics of planning
 - E. The nature of rationality
 - F. Types of rationality
 - G. Planning and policy making

- II. The Organizational Context of Planning--Bureaucracy Versus Citizen Participation -Dr.

- Yacoub
- H. The independent planning commission
- I. The administrative model
- J. Participatory models

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*REQUIRED*):

- Barzelay, M. (1997). Breaking through bureaucracy. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 491-504). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.
- Corvo, K.N. (1997). Community-based youth violence prevention: A framework for planners and funders. *Youth and Society*, 28 (3), 291-316.
- Downs, A. (1997). The life cycle of bureaus. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 262-274). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

A handout on Public Interest Categories will be provided in class.

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*RECOMMENDED*):

- Daley, J.M., & Wong, P. (1994). Community development with emerging ethnic communities. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (1), 9-24.
- Lipsky, M. (1997). Street-level bureaucracy: The critical role of street-level bureaucrats. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 401-407). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.
- Merton, R.K. (1997). Bureaucratic structure and personality. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 100-108). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.
- Robinson, B. & Hanna, M. (1994). Lesson for academics from grassroots community organizing: A case study: The industrial areas foundation. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (4), 63-94.
- Schopler, J. (1994). Interorganizational groups in human services: Environmental and interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (3), 7-28.
- Weber, M. (1997). Bureaucracy. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 37-43). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

WEEK THREE-April 10, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. Alternative Models of the Planning Process
 - A. Developmental planning - Dr. Yacoub
 - B. Incremental Model of Planning
 - C. Mixed-Scanning - Dr. Yacoub
 - D. Disjointed Incrementalism - Dr. Buckles
 - E. Transactive Approach -Dr. Buckles
 - F. The economic model of choice - Dr. Buckles
 - G. The ethical model of choice - Dr. Buckles
- II. Toward an Integrated Theory of Planning - Dr. Buckles
 - A. Problems, solutions, and strategies

B. Common errors in applying theory to practice

Due at the beginning of class, week five: **Critique of Program Plan**

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*REQUIRED*):

Kettner, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L. (1999). Designing and managing programs: An effectiveness-based approach (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Chapter 03 Needs assessment: Theoretical considerations, pp. 33-48.

Bartholomew, L.K., Parcel, G.S., & Kok, G. (1998). Intervention mapping: A process for developing theory- and evidence-based health education programs. In *Health Education and Behavior*, 25 (5), 545-563.

Handouts on Program Plans will be provided in class.

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*RECOMMENDED*):

Cruikshank, J. (1994). The consequences of our actions: A value issue in community development. *Community Development Journal*, 29 (1), 75-89.

Johnson, A. & Rollins, A. (1994). Integrated program development. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (3), 29-48.

Mancoske, R. & Hunzeker, J. (1994). Advocating for community services coordination: An empowerment perspective for planning AIDS services. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (3), 49-58.

Wernet, S. (1994). A case study of adaptation in a nonprofit human service organization. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (3), 93-111.
Available on reserve at Del Webb Library.

WEEK FOUR- April 17, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. An Overview of the Planning Process -Dr. Yacoub
 - A. Choosing a Model
 - B. Interrelationships among stages
- II. Assessment of Needs -Dr. Buckles
 - A. The nature of needs assessment
 - B. Sources of data
 - C. Techniques of assessment
 - D. Social Indicators
 - E. Target Population Definitions
 - F. Population-at-Risk/Population Definitions
 - G. Prevalence/Incidence Rates
- III. Identifying Goals through Assessment -Dr. Yacoub
 - A. Nature of goals
 - B. Sources of Goals
 - C. Techniques for determining goals
 - D. Multiple goals
- IV. Specification of Objectives -Dr. Yacoub
 - A. Nature of objectives

B. Alternatives to measurement by objectives

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*REQUIRED*):

Kettner, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L. (1999). *Designing and managing programs: An effectiveness-based approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chapter 04 Needs assessment: Approaches to measurement, pp. 49-70.

Chapter 06 Setting goals and objectives, pp. 89-109.

Hofer, R., Hofer, R., & Tobias, R. (1994). Geographic information systems and human services. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (3), 113-127.

Handouts on Writing Program Goals and Objectives will be provided in class.

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*RECOMMENDED*):

Chambers, D.E. (1992). Needs studies. In *Evaluating social programs* (pp. 68-99). Old Tappan, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

WEEK FIVE-April 24, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. Design of Alternative Actions -Dr. Buckles
 - A. The nature of alternatives
 - B. Steps in the process
 - C. Techniques for generating alternatives

- II. Estimating Consequences of Alternative Actions -Dr. Buckles
 - A. Efficiency measures
 - B. Equity
 - C. Political feasibility
 - D. Presentation of estimates

- III. Selection of a Course of Action -Dr. Buckles
 - A. Who participates in decision making
 - B. Steps in the selecting process

DUE TODAY AT THE BEGINNING OF CLASS: *Critique of Program Plan*

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*REQUIRED*):

Kettner, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L. (1999). *Designing and managing programs: An effectiveness-based approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chapter 05 Selecting the appropriate intervention strategy, pp. 73-88.

Key, V.O., Jr. (1997). The lack of a budgetary theory. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 109-112). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

Lewis, V.B. (1997). Toward a theory of budgeting. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 178-190). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

Powell, J. (1995). Assembling your team. In *Pathways to leadership* (pp.87-107). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Powell, J. (1995). Using evaluation to confirm mission success. In *Pathways to leadership* (pp. 147-166). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

WEEK SIX-May 1, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. Implementation -Dr. Yacoub
 - A. Specifying an operational procedure
 - B. Specifying an accountability procedure
 - C. Critical nature of leadership in implementation
 - D. Empowering professional teams

- II. Budgeting
 - A. Budget cycle
 - B. The politics of budgeting
 - C. Strategies for proposing new programs

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (REQUIRED):

Students will be given an outline for developing a program proposal at the end of this class period.

Kettner, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L. (1999). *Designing and managing programs: An effectiveness-based approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chapter 07 Designing effective programs, pp. 111-138.

Chapter 08 Building a management information system, pp. 139-169.

Schick, A. (1997). The road to PPB: The stages of budget reform. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 220-234). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

Wiloughby, W.F. (1997). The movement for budgetary reform in the states. In *J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), Classics of public administration* (pp. 33-36). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (RECOMMENDED):

Armstrong, M., Huz, S., & Evans, M. (1992). What works for whom: The design and evaluation of children's mental health services. *Research on Children*, 28 (1), 44-52.

Cohen, M. (1994). Overcoming obstacles to forming empowerment groups: A consumer advisory board for homeless clients. *Social Work*, 39 (6), 742-749.

WEEK SEVEN-May 8, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. The Interdependent Purpose of Program Evaluation: Constructing Avenues of Continuous renewal -Dr. Buckles, Dr. Yacoub
 - A. Continuous renewal and accountability
 - B. Theoretical underpinnings of the evaluation process

- II. Making Evaluation Choices -Dr. Buckles

- A. Political and ethical issues in program evaluation
- B. Addressing population diversity issues
- C. Structural choices in program evaluation--incorporating evaluation into program design

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*REQUIRED*):

Kettner, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L. (1999). *Designing and managing programs: An effectiveness-based approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chapter 09 Line-item, functional, and program budgeting systems, pp. 173-203.

Chapter 10 Budgeting for control, management, and planning, pp. 205-214.

Lynch, K.B., Geller, S.R., Hunt, D.R., Galano, J., & Dubas, J.S. (1998). Successful program development using implementation evaluation. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community*, 17 (2), 51-64.

Milstein, R.L. & Wetterhall, S. (1999). Framework for program evaluation in public health. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 48 (RR-11), 1-40.

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*RECOMMENDED*):

Chambers, D.E. (1992). Types of social policy and social program evaluation. In *Evaluating social programs* (pp. 8-16). Old Tappan, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Chambers, D.E. (1992). Describing the policy or program theory base for evaluation purposes. In *Evaluating social programs* (pp. 107-118). Old Tappan, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Orlandi, M. (1992). The challenge of evaluating community-based prevention program: A cross-cultural perspective. In *Cultural competence for evaluators* (pp. 1-22). Rockville: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services.

WEEK EIGHT-May 15, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. Differential Frameworks for Program Evaluation -Dr. Yacoub
 - A. Program auditing
 - B. Program monitoring
 - C. Differentiating the role of the consultant from the evaluation process
- II. Identifying and Utilizing Success Indicators - Dr. Buckles
 - A. Measuring program inputs
 - B. Measurement of outcomes
- III. Measurement Strategies in Program Evaluation - Dr. Buckles
 - A. Choosing evaluation methods and tools
 - B. Reliability versus validity
 - C. Using multiple measures
- IV. A Brief Look at Cost Benefit and Cost Effectiveness Analysis
 - A. Basic concepts
 - B. Methodology

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (*REQUIRED*):

Kettnor, P., Moroney, R., & Martin, L. (1999). *Designing and managing programs: An effectiveness-based approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Chapter 11 Performance measurement, pp. 215-238.

Grant, P.R. (1997). The relocation of nursing home residents: An illustration of the advantages gained by planning a new program and designing an implementation evaluation together. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 20 (4), 507-516.

Haynes, N.M., Emmons, C.L., & Woodruff, D.W. (1998). School development program effects: Linking implementation to outcomes. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 3 (1), 71-85.

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (RECOMMENDED):

Chambers, D.E. (1992). The assessment of social program evaluability. In *Evaluating social programs* (pp. 119-146). Old Tappan, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

WEEK NINE-May 22, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. Experiential Program Development -Guest Lecturers: County Mental Health Older Adults System of Care-Prop 10 Collaborative
- II. Pulling it All Together -Wraparound projects
- III. Handout: Program Evaluation Standards

READINGS/ASSIGNMENTS (REQUIRED):

Yoe, J.T., Santarcangelo, S., Atkins, M., & Burchard, J.D. (1996). Wraparound care in Vermont: Program development, implementation, and evaluation of a statewide system of individualized services. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 5 (1), 23-37.

WEEK TEN-May 29, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

Students work on program proposals under the supervision of instructors.

WEEK ELEVEN-June 5, 2007

LECTURE TOPICS:

- I. Course Evaluation
- II. Program Proposal Presentations by Students

SOWK 673 Program Planning and Evaluation
REFERENCE LIST AND SUGGESTED READINGS

- Adamson, M. (1993). The ACORN housing agenda. *Shelterforce*, 15 (2-68), 8-11.
- Adler, G. (1994). Community action and maximum feasible participation: An opportunity lost but not forgotten for expanding democracy at home. *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy*, 8 (2), 547-571.
- Baizerman, M. & Compton, D. (1992). From respondent and informant to consultant and participant: The evolution of a state agency policy and evaluation. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 53 (Spring), 383.
- Bergman, A., et al. (1993). High-risk indicators for family involvement in social work in health care: A review of the literature. *Social Work*, 38 (3), 281.
- Chen, H., et al. (1994). A panel on theory driven evaluation and evaluation theories. *Evaluation Practice*, 15 (1), 73-93
- Collin, R.W., Beatley, T., & Harris, W. (1995). Environmental racism, A challenge to community development. *Journal of Black Studies*, 25 (3), 354-376.
- Cuaresma, J.C. (1993). Reforms in local planning. *Phillipine Journal of Public Administration*, 37 (1), 1-21.
- Dryden, J. (1992). Quantifying technological advance: S&T indicators at the OECD-Challenges for the 1990s. *Science and Public Policy*, 19 (5), 281-290.
- Elks, M. & Kirkhart, K. (1993). Evaluating effectiveness from the practitioner perspective. *Social Work*, 38 (5), 554.
- Gilchrist, A. (1992). The revolution of everyday life revisited: Towards an anti-discriminatory praxis for community development work. *Social Action*, 1 (1), 22-28.
- Gill, A.M. (1991). An evaluation of socially responsive planning in a new resource town. *Social Indicators Research*, 24 (2), 177-204.
- Graham, S. (1994). Using information & communications technology for community development. *Community Development Journal*, 29 (1), 90-94.
- Greenblatt, B. (1980). Utilization of social science theory in federal preschool policy. *Quarterly Journal of Ideology*, 3 (4), 26.
- Gutierrez, L.M. & Lewis, E.A. (1994). Community organizing with women of color: A feminist approach. *Journal of Community Practice*, 1 (2), 23-44.
- Harding, P. (1991). Qualitative indicators and the project framework. *Community Development Journal*, 26 (4), 294-305.
- Hargrove, G.P. (1993). Neighborhood center perspectives on community service learning. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 26 (2), 35-40.
- Harvey, A. R. (1994). A black community development model: The universal negro improvement association and African communities league 1917-1940. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 21 (1), 113-124.
- Healey, P. & Shaw, T. (1993). Planners, plans and sustainable development. *Regional Studies*, 27 (8), 769-776.
- Holman, C., Donovan, R.J., & Corti, B. (1993). Evaluating projects funded by the western Australian health promotion foundation: a systematic approach. *Health Promotion International*, 8 (3), 199-208.
- Julian, D.A., & Lyons, T.S. (1992). A strategic planning model for human services: Problem solving at the local level. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 15(3), 247.
- Kaye, L.W. & Albert, R. (1990). The technology of social planning and program development: An advocacy training model for professional social workers. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 4 (1), 101-112.