

Indiana University  
School of Social Work

**S622 Social Work Research II: Macro Practice (3 credits)**

Mondays, 9:00 am - 11:40 am

Instructor:	Bill Barton	Semester Year: Fall 2000
Office:	ES 4142	Section No.: R509
Phone:	317/274-6711 (w); 317/475-9914 (h)	Room: ES 2103
FAX:	317/274-8630	
e-mail:	<a href="mailto:wbarton@iupui.edu">wbarton@iupui.edu</a>	
Office hours:	M 12-2 pm or by appt.	

**I. Course Rationale and Description**

This course is concerned with the place of research in the context of human service organizations and is designed to build upon the student's introduction to program evaluation methods acquired in S520. The primary emphasis is upon program evaluation in its multiple forms, including the analysis of: need for services, the process of service delivery, and the effects and efficiency of services. The course will provide students with an understanding of and application competency in both the technical skills necessary for program evaluation (design, quantitative and qualitative analysis procedures, written and oral reporting) and the process skills necessary for implementing evaluation in the political, organizational and social contexts in which program evaluation occurs. The course is primarily designed for those students who envision themselves working at any time in management, policy making, or research roles.

**II. Course Objectives**

In this course, students are expected to demonstrate achievement of the following objectives:

1. Understand the purposes of program evaluation in the context of human service organizations,
2. Understand the significance of evaluation as part of a larger system within an organization,
3. Understand the types of evaluation activities appropriate for various stages in the development and implementation of programs, including planning and needs assessment, start-up and process evaluation, monitoring of ongoing program operation and outcome evaluation.
4. Understand the relationship between program evaluation and basic research.

5. Understand the social, organizational and political contexts within which evaluation occurs.
6. Understand the standards of evaluation research -- utility, feasibility, propriety and accuracy, including the necessity of balance among the standards, and an emphasis on ethical considerations in evaluation research, including issues of data confidentiality, informed consent, and diversity.
7. Evaluate critically evaluation research studies.
8. Develop plans for the evaluation process in a human service setting, including identification of stakeholders, task planning and budgeting for evaluations.
9. Define and focus evaluation questions related to one or more of the following: needs assessment, program implementation or program impact.
10. Select appropriate research designs to address evaluation questions, balancing concerns for the standards of utility, feasibility, propriety and accuracy of the research.
11. Evaluate the appropriateness of primary and secondary data sources for one or more of the following: assessing needs, monitoring activities and measuring impact.
12. Design, use and assess the quality (reliability, validity, utility) of measurement instruments.
13. Collect and process quantitative and/or qualitative data.
14. Describe and analyze data through tabular, graphic and statistical procedures.
15. Prepare written and oral reports based upon the analysis of obtained data.

### III. Content Outline and Readings

**Note: (\*) = required readings; (r) = highly recommended readings**

#### **Required Texts:**

Royse, D., Thyer, B. A., Padgett, D., & Logan, T. K. (2001). Program evaluation: An introduction, 3rd ed. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Hatry, H., van Houten, T., Plantz, M. C., & Taylor, M. (1996). Measuring program outcomes: A practical approach. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America. *Available in class from instructor for \$5.*

SPSS for Windows, Version 10 (available for \$5 from the IUPUI Bookstore).

#### **Recommended Text:**

Weinbach, R. & Grinnell, R. (2001). Statistics for social workers, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

## Weekly Schedule

1. 8/28 *Topic(s)*: Introduction to course, review syllabus  
*Handouts*: syllabus, notes, initial questionnaire  
*Activities*: ice breaker; initial questionnaire

**NOTE: Labor Day, Monday 9/4 – No Class!**

2. 9/11 *Topic(s)*: Review initial questionnaire results; What is macro research; standards; theory of action  
*Handouts*: APA style, Measuring Program Outcomes books (bring \$ or checkbook)  
*Activity*: Nominal Group Technique

### Readings

(\*)Notes, sections I – II

(\*)Royse et al., Program Evaluation, ch. 1

(r)Seidl, F. W. (1995). Program evaluation. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, 19th ed., NASW, pp. 1927-1932.

House, E. R. (1980). Evaluating with validity. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. chs. 2,3,6,11,20.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. chs. 1-3, 10.

3. 9/18 *Topic(s)*: Ethics, politics, process issues  
**\*Turn in: PROJECT PAPER DRAFT INSTALLMENT (a) (Required)\***  
*Handout*: IRB forms  
*Activity*: Role play exercise

### Readings

(\*)Notes, sections III, X

(\*)Royse et al., Program Evaluation, ch. 2, 13

(r)Gillespie, D. (1995). Ethical issues in research. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, 19th ed., NASW, pp. 884-893.

Barton, W. H. (1998). Culturally competent research protocols. In R. R. Greene & M. Watkins (Eds.), Serving diverse constituencies: Applying the ecological perspective (pp. 285-303). Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, ch. 14.

Mathison, S. (1991a). Role conflicts for internal evaluators. Evaluation and Program Planning, 14, 173-179.

4. 9/25 *Topic(s):* Outcomes Evaluation  
*Handout:* Worksheets  
*Activity:* Logic Model Shuffle

Readings

- (\*)Notes, sections VI – VII  
 (\*)Hatry et al., Measuring Program Outcomes, Steps 1 – 4 (pp. 1-104)  
 (\*)Royse et al., Program Evaluation, ch. 9  
 Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally.  
 Rossi, P. H., & Freeman H. E. (1993). Evaluation: A systematic approach, 5th ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, ch. 5-8.

5. 10/2 *Topic(s):* Needs Assessments, Monitoring  
*Handout:* NH Proposal  
*Activity:* Needs assessment exercise

Readings

- (\*)Notes, sections IV – V  
 (\*)Royse et al., Program Evaluation, ch. 3  
 (r)Witkin, B. R., & Altschuld, J. W. (1995). Planning and conducting needs assessments: A practical guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.  
 Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1993). Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets. Chicago: ACTA Publications.  
 Krueger, R. A. (1994). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research, 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.  
 Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, ch. 9.  
 Posavac, E. J., & Carey R. G. (1992). Program evaluation: Methods and case studies, 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, ch. 6.

6. 10/9 *Topic(s):* Critically consuming research; literature review  
*Handout:* Critique criteria  
*Activity:* Critique an article

Readings

- (\*)Royse et al., Program Evaluation, ch. 15 (checklist, pp. 390-391).  
 (r)Royse, D. (1999). Research methods in social work, 3rd ed. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, ch. 13.  
 Stern, P. C., & Kalof, L. (1996). Evaluating social science research, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

7. **10/16** *Topic(s):* Qualitative Methods in Evaluation; Formative & Process Evaluation  
*Turn in: PROJECT PAPER DRAFT INSTALLMENT (b) (Optional)*  
*Activity:* Focus group exercise

Readings

- (\*)Royle et al., Program Evaluation, chs. 4-5  
 (r)Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.  
 Patton M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods, 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Part II.  
 Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, chs. 4-6.

8. **10/23** *Topic(s):* Measurement  
*Handout:* Statistics & Measurement chapter  
*Activity:* Design an instrument

Readings

- (\*)Notes, section VIII  
 (\*)Royle et al., Program Evaluation, chs. 11-12  
 (r)Kosecoff, J., & Fink, A. (1982). Evaluation basics: A practitioner's manual. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. ch. 5.  
 Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric theory, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill. (*classic text in measurement*)  
 Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., Sechrest, L., & Grove, J. B. (1981). Nonreactive measures in the social sciences, 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. (*revised edition of classic "Unobtrusive Measures"*)

9. **10/30** *Location: ES 2116 Computer Lab*  
*Topic(s):* Intro to SPSS; Data Analysis (1): Data entry  
*Turn in: PROJECT PAPER DRAFT INSTALLMENT (c) (Optional)*  
*Activity:* Set up a data file and enter data in SPSS

Readings & Preparation

- (\*)Statistics & Measurement chapter (handed out 10/23)  
 (\*)Royle et al., Program Evaluation, ch. 14  
 (\*)Install SPSS on your computer OR go to a computer lab and explore the program. Bring a floppy disk with you.  
 (r)Weinbach, R. & Grinnell, R. (2001). Statistics for social workers, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, chs. 1-2.

10. 11/6 **Location: ES 2116 Computer Lab**

*Topic(s):* Data Analysis (2): Descriptive statistics

*Handout:* Presentation sign-up sheet

*Activity:* Practice with SPSS data

Readings

(r)Weinbach, R. & Grinnell, R. (2001). Statistics for social workers, 5<sup>th</sup> ed.  
Boston: Allyn & Bacon, chs. 3-6.

Blalock, H. M. (1979). Social statistics, revised second edition. New York:  
McGraw-Hill. (*an oldie, but a goody -- basic statistics text*)

Patton M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods, 2nd ed.  
Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Part III.

Siegel, S. (1956). Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York:  
McGraw-Hill. (*like Blalock above, an ancient but valuable resource*)

11. 11/13 **Location: ES 2116 Computer Lab**

*Topic(s):* Data Analysis (3): Correlations, t-test, one-way ANOVA, regression

**\*Turn in: DATA ANALYSIS EXERCISE (Required)\***

*Handout:* Presentation checklist

*Activity:* Practice with SPSS data

Readings

(r)Weinbach, R. & Grinnell, R. (2001). Statistics for social workers, 5<sup>th</sup> ed.  
Boston: Allyn & Bacon, chs. 7-11.

12. 11/20 *Topic(s):* Writing Reports & Disseminating Findings

*Turn in: PROJECT PAPER DRAFT INSTALLMENT (d) (Optional)*

Readings

(\*)Notes, section IX

(\*)Royse et al., Program Evaluation, ch. 15

Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text, 3rd  
ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, ch. 13.

## 13. 11/27 Presentations

## 14. 12/4 Presentations

**\*Turn in: FINAL PROJECT PAPER (Required)\***

## 15. 12/11 Presentations, wrap up, course/instructor evaluations

#### IV. Course Format and Assignments

The main objectives of this course involve providing you with beginning skills as an evaluation researcher, building upon the introduction and overview you had in S520 or some comparable course. In order to conduct evaluation research you must know how to identify appropriate research questions, develop designs suitable for addressing the research questions, collect the necessary information (data), accurately analyze this information, and effectively present your findings in written and oral forms, *all the while being sensitive to the political and interpersonal contexts in which the evaluation takes place.*

The best way to learn is by doing, so the major course requirement is for you to initiate (or participate in) one of the following: **1:** an evaluation project; or **2:** the development of an evaluation proposal. Details regarding this and other course assignments appear later in this syllabus. You will work on this project throughout the term, turning in portions of it for feedback and revision according to the schedule shown below. You will make a brief oral presentation of your major project near the end of the semester.

The major portion of your grade will be based on the major project paper and presentation. In addition, grades will be derived from a brief quiz, an SPSS exercise, and your attendance and participation, as detailed later in this syllabus.

There is room in the schedule for some flexibility regarding what material is emphasized in class through lectures or other mechanisms. I welcome your suggestions and questions to help guide this process. Nevertheless, you are expected to complete the assigned readings in a timely fashion.

While there will be some lectures and discussion involving the entire class, you will spend much of the class time in small groups, discussing and reacting to course material and engaging in exercises and role plays that will enhance your evaluation skills.

##### A. MAJOR PROJECT:

Choose **either** an actual **PROJECT** (see Section 1 on p. 8 below), which you can design, carry out, analyze, and write up during the semester -- **OR** -- a **PROJECT PROPOSAL** (see Section 2 on p. 9 below), including budget and workplan, for a study that could be done in the future. **NOTE:** the outlines for these two options differ somewhat.

## 1. EVALUATION RESEARCH or NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROJECT

Needs assessments, process evaluations of ongoing programs, planning projects for new programs, outcome evaluations of programs (perhaps including cost-effectiveness) or program components, and policy analyses are all possible types of projects. Ideally, your project can be conducted in your field placement or other real agency setting, and can be completed by the end of the term. Your written report (20 pages max.) should include the following sections:

- i. Executive Summary -- summarize the goals, methods, results and implications. (*1 page -- although this appears first, you will obviously write it last*)
- ii. Introduction:
  - (a) Overview -- what is this study about (*1/2 page*)
  - (b) Context -- who wants the study done; why is it important (*1/2 - 1 page*)
  - (c) Literature review -- what other related information is available from prior studies in the agency and/or the literature? (*1 - 3 pages*)
- iii. Research questions. (*1/2 - 1 page*)
- iv. Methodology:
  - (a) Design. (*1/2 - 1 page*)
  - (b) Data sources and collection methods. (*1/2 - 1 page*)
  - (c) Measures. (*1 - 2 pages*)
- v. Results. (*4 pages*)
- vi. Discussion -- implications. (*4 pages*)
- vii. Bibliography (*1 page or more as needed*)
- viii. Appendices (*as needed, e.g., instruments, etc.*)
- ix. Process Supplement (**very important**) -- qualitative description of the **process** of conducting this study. Describe the organizational context of the study; dynamics (e.g., who did and did not cooperate with the research; who felt threatened and why); what changes, if any, you had to make in the study design or methods as you went along; what were the reactions to the study's findings and why, etc. Reflect on your experience, what you have learned from it, how it relates to the other course materials, and how you might do things differently in the future. (*3 - 5 pages*)

Section page lengths are only suggestions, not rigid limits, except that the Executive Summary may not exceed one page and the total document may not exceed 20 pages (not counting the bibliography and appendices). The Executive Summary and the bibliography may be single-spaced; the rest must be double-spaced.

**Note:** If the study is a longer-term project that cannot be completed in one term, discuss with the instructor ways of narrowing the focus of your report to the part(s) of the process in which you will be able to participate during the term.



## 2. EVALUATION RESEARCH or NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROPOSAL

If you are not in a field placement, agency work setting, or for some other reason cannot become involved in an actual evaluation project, you may choose to develop a **proposal**. The written product will be the proposal to a (real or hypothetical) funding source to conduct an evaluation study of any of the types listed previously. The written proposal (20 pages max.) should include the following sections:

- i. Executive Summary. *(1 page -- although this appears first, you will obviously write it last)*
- ii. Introduction -- the context of your proposed study, who might want it done and why it might be useful. *(1 - 2 pages)*
- iii. Literature review -- What relevant information, substantive and/or methodological, is already known from prior research that can help you plan your proposed study? *(2 - 4 pages)*
- iv. Research questions. *(1/2 page)*
- v. Methods: Design; Data sources; Data collection plans; Measures; Data analysis plans. *(2 - 3 pages)*
- vi. Work plan: task timelines. *(1/2 - 1 page)*
- vii. Proposed staffing and qualifications of the researchers. *(1/2 - 1 page)*
- viii. Itemized Budget and Budget Narrative. *(1 page)*
- ix. Bibliography. *(1 page)*
- x. Appendices *(e.g., resumes of key evaluation project staff, draft instruments, etc. -- as many pages as needed)*
- xi. Process Supplement (**very important**) -- from your experience and class materials, what obstacles to the conduct of the proposed study do you anticipate? How might you deal with these obstacles? Beyond what you wrote in the body of the proposal, what are some other possible outcomes of the proposed study? Who would "win" and who would "lose" under various hypothetical outcomes? How can the evaluators maximize the utility of the potential findings under various outcome scenarios? This is the place to reflect upon your experience in developing this proposal. What have you learned from it? *(3 - 5 pages)*

Section page lengths are suggestions, not rigid limits, except that the Executive Summary may not exceed one page and the total paper may not exceed 20 pages (not counting the resumes and appendices). The Executive Summary, references and resumes may be single-spaced; the rest double-spaced.

### 3. SCHEDULE FOR SUBMISSION OF DRAFT PORTIONS OF YOUR PAPER: (\*=**required**; otherwise optional)

If you are writing a **PROJECT REPORT**:

- (a) \*Week 3: Description of program to be evaluated or area of need to be assessed; discussion of potential stakeholders and their interests; preliminary indication of why your project would be worth doing (*section ii-a and ii-b above, 2 - 4 pages*).
- (b) Week 7: Brief literature review relevant to your project, including list of references in APA style (*section ii-c above, 2 - 4 pages*).
- (c) Week 9: Evaluation research plan: focal evaluation question(s); what information would be collected from what sources; proposed data collection methods; data collection instruments, etc. (*sections iii and iv above, 3 - 6 pages*).
- (d) Week 12: Data analysis, interpretations, conclusions, recommendations, etc. (*Sections v and vi above, 3 - 6 pages*).
- (e) \*Week 14: **Final version of entire project paper**. Include an executive summary (section i), revisions of earlier sections, final list of references (section vii), any other supporting documentation (section viii) and the process supplement (section ix).

If you are writing a **PROPOSAL**:

- (a) \*Week 3: Description of program to be evaluated or area of need to be assessed; discussion of potential stakeholders and their interests; preliminary indication of why your project would be worth doing (*section ii above, 1 - 2 pages*).
- (b) Week 7: Brief literature review relevant to your project, including list of references in APA style (*section iii above, 2 - 4 pages*).
- (c) Week 9: Evaluation research plan: focal evaluation question(s); what information would be collected from what sources; proposed data collection methods; data collection instruments, etc.; (*sections iv and v above, 3 - 6 pages*).
- (d) Week 12: Workplan and Budget (*Sections vi through viii above, 2 - 4 pages*).
- (e) \*Week 14: **Final version of entire project paper**. Include an executive summary (section i), revisions of earlier sections, final list of references (section ix), any other supporting documentation (section x) and the process supplement (section xi above).

### 4. SHADOW GRADES

You will receive a "shadow" grade along with substantive feedback on each portion of the project paper that you submit. Shadow grades do not count; they just give you an idea of how you're doing so far. The grade given to your **final revised paper** is the only one that will count. In other words, you can improve your grade by paying attention to the feedback and revising your work accordingly.

*Note: If you work in groups for either (1) or (2) above, your group reports will adhere to the page and time limits shown. These reports will constitute 80% of the major project grade for each individual. For the other 20%, group members will individually submit a brief (3-5 page) narrative describing their perceptions of the process of the group in producing the reports.*

## **B. ORAL REPORT**

During the last two or three weeks of the course, you will make an oral report based upon your major project paper. The oral report should be **no longer than 15 minutes**. For those doing an actual project, you should think of the class as an audience of stakeholders to whom you will present a summary of the written report, excluding the process supplement. For those doing proposals, the oral report will simulate the presentation of that proposal to a group making the funding decision.

## **C. QUIZ**

There will be one brief quiz, consisting of multiple choice and/or short answer items, covering basic evaluation concepts presented early in the semester, based on required readings and any other material presented in class.

## **D. SPSS EXERCISE**

We will spend several weeks working with SPSS to enter and analyze data. There will be one take-home assignment requiring you to perform and interpret some basic SPSS data analysis operations.

## **E. ATTENDANCE & PARTICIPATION**

Consistent, on-time attendance is an important aspect of this course, and a professional courtesy to both the instructor and your fellow students. There will also be many in-class activities designed to enhance and reinforce your learning. Accordingly, a portion of your grade will be based on your attendance and active participation during the semester.

## V. Course Policies, Evaluation & Grading

Students are expected to conduct themselves in a professional manner. Professionalism includes respect for other students and the instructor. This is operationalized to include preparation for class, regular attendance, appropriate participation, active listening, and providing colleagues with appropriate feedback when requested. All cell phones and beepers are expected to be turned off or put on vibrate during class. If you are expecting a call of an emergency nature and must leave your phone turned on you are expected to sit by the door and leave quickly when your phone is ringing. Course papers should be produced on a wordprocessor (or typed), double spaced, with one-inch margins on all sides, carefully edited and proofed, using no smaller than a 12 point font, and conforming to APA style. Please remember to include your mailbox number on the cover page of your papers.

Grades will be determined as follows:

- |     |                                  |     |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----|
| (a) | Major project -- written report: | 50% |
| (b) | Oral report of major project:    | 10% |
| (c) | Quiz:                            | 15% |
| (d) | SPSS exercise:                   | 10% |
| (e) | Attendance & Participation:      | 15% |

### Evaluation of Course

Consistent with School and University policy, at the end of the semester, students will have an opportunity to complete anonymous evaluations of the course and instructor. You are also invited to submit anonymous feedback at any time, or contact me personally during office hours or after class with suggestions and comments.

## VI. Bibliography

- Ashery, R. S., Carlson, R. G., Falck, R. S., & Siegal, H. A. (1995). Injection drug users, crack-cocaine users, and human services utilization: An exploratory study. *Social Work*, *40*, 75-82.
- Barton, W. H. (1998). Culturally competent research protocols. In R. R. Greene & M. Watkins (Eds.), *Serving diverse constituencies: Applying the ecological perspective* (pp. 285-303). Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Berlin, S. B., & Marsh, J. C. (1993). *Informing practice decisions*. NY: Macmillan.
- Blalock, H. M. (1979). *Social statistics*, rev. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brueggemann, W. G. (1996). *The practiced of macro social work*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall. (see ch. 6: Becoming a macro social work researcher).
- Chambers, D. E., Wedel, K. R., & Rodwell, M. K. (1992). *Evaluating social programs*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. *HV41 .C43 1992 Philanthropic Studies Library*
- Chavkin, N. F. (1993). *The use of research in social work practice: A case example from school social work*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Chelimsky, E., & Shadish, W. R. (Eds.) (1997). *Evaluation for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chen, H. (1993). Emerging perspectives in program evaluation. *Journal of Social Service Research*, *17*, 1-17.
- Cohen, A. Y., & Kibel, B. M. (1993, September). The basics of open-systems evaluation: A resource paper. Bethesda, MD: Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cooper, H. M. (1989). *Integrating research review: A guide for literature reviews*, 2nd ed. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cooper, H., & Hedges, L. V. (Eds.) (1994). *The handbook of research synthesis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Durning, D. (1993). Participatory policy analysis in a social service agency: A case study. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 12, 297-322.
- Fetterman, D. M., Kaftarian, S. J., & Wandersman, A. (Eds.) (1996). Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fink, A. (1993). Evaluation fundamentals: Guiding health programs, research, and policy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fink, A. (1995). Evaluation for education and psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fink, A. (1998). Conducting research literature reviews: From paper to the internet. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Foddy, W. (1993). Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: Theory and practice in social research. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Forss, K., Cracknell, B., & Samset, K. (1994). Can evaluation help an organization to learn? Evaluation Review, 18, 574-591.
- Gabor, P. A., & Grinnell, R. M., Jr. (1994). Evaluation and quality improvement in the human services. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glaser, Daniel (1988). Evaluation research and decision guidance. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. AZ191 .G82 1989
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1992). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hatry, H., van Houten, T., Plantz, M. C., & Taylor, M. (1996). Measuring program outcomes: A practical approach. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America.
- Henry, G. T., Julnes, G., & Mark, M. M. (Eds.). (1998). Realist evaluation: An emerging theory in support of practice. New Directions for Evaluation, no. 78. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- House, Ernest R. (1980). Evaluating with validity. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jansson, B. S. (1990). Social welfare policy: From theory to practice. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- Johnson, D. E. et al. (1987). Needs assessment: Theory and methods. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Kosecoff, J., & Fink A. (1982). Evaluation basics: A practitioner's manual. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. *AZ191 .K67 1982*
- Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1993). Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets. Chicago: ACTA Publications.
- Krueger, R. A. (1994). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research, 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. *H62 .K754 1994*
- Marquart, J. M., & Konrad, E. L. (Eds.) (1996). Evaluating initiatives to integrate human services. New directions for evaluation, 69. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mathison, S. (1991a). Role conflicts for internal evaluators. Evaluation and Program Planning, 14, 173-179.
- Mathison, S. (1991b). What do we know about internal evaluation? Evaluation and Program Planning, 14, 159-165.
- Mohr, L. B. (1995). Impact analysis for program evaluation, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moore, C. M. (1994). Group techniques for idea building, 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nas, T. F. (1996). Cost-benefit analysis: Theory and application. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Community AIDS Partnership (1993). Evaluating HIV/AIDS prevention programs in community-based organizations. Washington, DC: [author].
- Newman, D. L., & Brown, R. D. (1995). Applied ethics for program evaluation. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *H62 .N587 1996 Philanthropic Studies Library*
- Nunnaly, J. (1978). Psychometric theory, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Patton M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods, 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Posavac, E. J., & Carey R. G. (1992). Program evaluation: Methods and case studies, 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. *H62.5.U5 P62 1992*
- Riecken, H. W., & Boruch R. F. (1974). Social experimentation: A method for planning and evaluating social intervention. New York: Academic Press.
- Rossi, P. H., & Freeman H. E. (1993). Evaluation: A systematic approach, 5th ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. *H62 .R666 1993 Philanthropic Studies Library*
- Rutman, L. (Ed.) (1984). Evaluation research methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Royse, D., Thyer, B. A., Padgett, D., & Logan, T. K. (2001). Program evaluation: An introduction, 3rd ed. Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Royse, D. (1999). Research methods in social work, 3rd ed. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Sederer, L. I., & Dickey, B. (Eds.). (1996). Outcomes assessment in clinical practice. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- Seidl, F. W. (1995). Program evaluation. In Encyclopedia of social work, 19th ed. (pp. 1927-1932). Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers.
- Shadish, W. R., Jr., Cook, T. D., & Leviton, L. C. (1991). Foundations of program evaluation: Theories of practice. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Siegel, S. (1956). Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Soriano, F. I. (1995). Conducting needs assessments: A multidisciplinary approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. *HV91 .S6267 1995*
- Stake, R. E. (1986). Quieting reform: Social science and social action in an urban youth program. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study research: Perspectives on practice. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stern, P. C., & Kalof, L. (1996). Evaluating social science research, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. (1982). Asking questions: A practical guide to questionnaire design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, B. J. (1993). Assessing needs and planning care in Social Work. Brookfield, VT: Arena.



- Tripodi, T. (1987). Program evaluation. In Encyclopedia of social work, 18th ed., NASW, pp. 366-379.
- Usher, C. L. (1995). Improving evaluability through self-evaluation. Evaluation Practice, 16 (1), 55-64.
- Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., Sechrest, L., & Grove J. B. (1981). Nonreactive measures in the social sciences, 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Weinbach, R. W., & Grinnell, R. M., Jr. (2001). Statistics for social workers, 5th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Weiss, C. H. (1972). Evaluation research: Methods for assessing program effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Weiss, C. H. (1984). Increasing the likelihood of influencing decisions, in L. Rutman (Ed.), Evaluation research methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. ch. 6, pp. 159-190.
- Weiss, R. S. (1995). Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies. New York: The Free Press.
- Wheeler, J. S., Abrahamson, M. A., & Bellavita C. (1986). Performance and credibility: Developing excellence in public and nonprofit organizations. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (Eds.) (1994). Handbook of practical program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Witkin, B. R., & Altschuld, J. W. (1995). Planning and conducting needs assessments: A practical guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. *HD30.28 .W595 1995*
- Yates, B. T. (1996). Analyzing costs, procedures, processes, and outcomes in human services. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. *HV11 .Y37 1996*