



SOWK 460w (1): Social/Programs Evaluation (3 credits)

Spring 2026, Heritage at CBC

Instructor	Dr. Jacob Campbell, Ph.D., LICSW		
Office Hours	Toppenish Campus Office: Simpkins Hall, Office 2124 Drop-in: Tuesdays 2-3 PM	Tri-Cities Regional Site Office: 2 nd Floor Office 4209 Drop-in: Wednesdays 2-3 PM	
	Weekly office hours are available for drop-in via Zoom or in-person. Other times available by arrangement. Schedule available at https://vsp.ink/now .		
Phone	(509) 392-1056	Email	campbell_j@heritage.edu
Dates	Mondays from 5:30 PM to 8:15 PM in RM SWL-212		

Land Acknowledgement

Heritage University occupies its home on the traditional lands of the Yakama People. These ancestral homelands are the Yakama, Palouse, Pisquouse, Wenatshapam, Klikatat, Klinquit, Kow-was-say-ee, Li-ay-was, Skin-pah, Wish-ham, Shyiks, Ochechotes, Kah-milt-pa, and Se-ap-cat, who today are represented by the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation (Treaty of 1855) and, whose relationship with this land continues to this day. Heritage University, grounded in the vision of the two Yakama women founders, respects Indigenous peoples as traditional guardians of the lands and the enduring relationship that exists between Indigenous peoples and their traditional territories. We offer gratitude for the land itself, for those who have stewarded it for generations, and for the opportunity to study, learn, work, and be in community on this land. We acknowledge that our university's history, like many others, is fundamentally tied to the first colonial developments in the Yakima Valley. Finally, we respectfully acknowledge and honor past, present, and future Indigenous students who will journey through this home called Heritage University.

This course is based at the Heritage at CBC campus. This campus is located in Pasco and is on the ancestral homelands of the Cayuse, Umatilla, Walla Walla, Yakama, and Palouse peoples. I also desire to honor and acknowledge them as well.

Course Description

Basic evaluation methodologies for social programs; analysis of public and private social programs' effectiveness; policy design, implementation, and evaluation. Basic practice evaluation skills. This course is offered in the spring semester with the prerequisite of students being of senior standing.

Course Purpose

This course introduces students to strategies used to conduct program and policy evaluation. Students learn methodologies for evaluating and analyzing public and private program effectiveness.

Students apply their knowledge and skills to evaluate a program in the university community or their practicum placement.

Relationship to Other Sequences and Other Courses

Social work students take the SOWK 460w Social Program Evaluation course in the final semester of their senior year. It is considered a “w” class because it is writing-focused. It follows and builds on the SOWK 459 Social Science Research Methods course. Students take this course concurrently with SOWK 491 Field Practicum II to help facilitate the learning and application to program evaluation.

Competencies, Performance Indicators, Assessment Methods

In adult education, providing the context of the content you are teaching helps the learner understand the expectations on them. The social work program has identified goals and objectives that students are expected to achieve, and the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE, 2022) has identified competencies and practice behaviors that are integral to social work education. We assess these through key assignments throughout the BSW program curriculum and in students’ practicum settings. They are identified as follows:

Social Work Program Goals and Objectives

Heritage University School of Social Work has the following goals:

1. The Social Work Program provides quality educational preparation for beginning generalist social work practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.
2. The Social Work Program focuses on the specific needs of the multicultural, diverse populations in the rural and urban regions of the Northwest.
3. The Social Work Program prepares students academically to pursue graduate-level education.

Assignment Assessment Methods, Practice Behaviors, and Competencies

In the *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards* (EPAS), the CSWE (2022) defines competence as “the ability to integrate and apply social work knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes to practice situations in a culturally responsive, purposeful, intentional, and professional manner to promote human and community well-being” (p. 7). Competence is “informed by knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes that include the social worker’s critical thinking, affective reactions, and exercise of judgment in regard to unique practice situations” (p. 7).

The nine competencies identified in the 2022 EPAS are:

1. Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior
2. Advance Human Rights and Social, Racial, Economic, and Environmental Justice
3. Engage Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI) in Practice
4. Engage in Practice-Informed Research and Research-Informed Practice
5. Engage in Policy Practice
6. Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

The social work program has developed the curriculum with competencies as outcomes. Most required courses identify a specific competency for students to demonstrate and be assessed by faculty through a key assignment. The content of the course also introduces and develops related competencies and behaviors. Students who complete this course will have demonstrated the competencies listed in the table below.

What will I do in this class? (Class Learning Assignment)	What knowledge/skills will I gain? (Practice Behaviors)	How does this work apply? (CSWE 2022 Competency)
Executive Summary of the Program Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. select and use culturally responsive methods for evaluation of outcomes; andb. critically analyze outcomes and apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.	Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Texts, Materials, and Technology

Text(s)

Royse, D. (2022). *Program evaluation: A practical guide for social work and the helping professions*. Cognella Academic Publishing.

Supplements

Technology

Access to a laptop (PC, MacBook, etc.) or a desktop, and reliable internet access, will be needed. Laptops can be checked out from the library (Unfortunately, iPads, tablets, and Chromebooks are not laptops. See the staff in the Donald K. North Library to check out a laptop). Our Learning Management System (LMS), MyHeritage, will be used to communicate ideas/instructions and upload assignments. Your faculty member will help you.

Supplemental Texts

The content of this course includes the textbook, which is supplemented by many other texts. The professor will provide links or downloadable PDFs of all these articles on the course page at MyHeritage. The required content for this course is outlined in the course schedule, and complete reference list entries are listed in the reference section of this syllabus. One supplemental text a student might wish to purchase is the American Psychological Association (APA, 2020) style guide. This is not required, and the publishers offer a valuable, comprehensive website with the necessary information to meet the style expectations. However, if students prefer a physical book as a reference for styling their writing, they might benefit from purchasing one.

Assignments and Grading

Grade Scale:

The grade scale table lists the assigned letter grade, its corresponding percentages, and its GPA.

Letter Grade	Percentage	GPA
A	93 to 100	4.0
A-	90 to 92.99	3.7
B+	87 to 89.99	3.3
B	83 to 86.99	3.0
B-	80 to 82.99	2.7
C+	77 to 79.99	2.3
C	73 to 76.99	2.0
C-	70 to 72.99	1.7
D+	67 to 69.99	1.3
D	63 to 66.99	1.0
D-	60 to 62.99	0.7
F	0 to 59.99	0.0

I grade students on four different significant assignments for SOWK 460w. Class participation is included each week, and either takes place in person or via discussion forums in asynchronous weeks. Weeks with reading from the textbook also have an associated quiz. Students complete research ethics/compliance training to prepare them for the investigation they will be conducting. The program evaluation is the most significant assignment for this class. This assignment has been divided into parts to help students progress through the evaluation process. Furthermore, students can earn extra credit by reviewing a published program evaluation and a report on implementing the student's program evaluation.

This table delineates the assignments, their point values, and the percentage of the overall class grade.

Assignment	Points	Percentage
A-01: Class Engagement and Attendance	100	10%
A-02: Chapter Reading Quizzes	50	5%
A-03: CITI Research Ethics and Compliance Training	50	5%
A-04: Group Program Evaluation Project		
A-04a: Individual Weekly Journal Entries	200	20%
A-04b: Group Work Plan for the Program Evaluation	100	10%
A-04c: Agency Logic Model	100	10%
A-04d: Executive Summary for the Program Evaluation	200	20%
A-04e: Program Evaluation Group Presentation	200	20%
TOTAL	1000	100%
A-05a [Extra Credit]: Review of a Published Program Evaluation	50	5%
A-05b [Extra Credit]: Descriptive Review of Groups Program Evaluation	100	10%

Course Assignments Descriptions

I have described each assignment with meta-information on implementation, the purpose, the specific tasks students are expected to complete, and the criteria used to assess it.

Assignment 01: Class Engagement and Attendance

Meta: *Points* 100 pts (10% of final grade) In-class 6 pts each session (e.g., 60 pts) and asynchronous weeks 8 pts (e.g., 40 pts); *Deadline* Class engagement is based on attendance and work completed each week; *Completion* via attendance taken by instructor and documentation during class. Asynchronous weeks are assessed through the Assignments on MyHeritage

- Purpose:** This class environment is designed to provide students with the skills necessary for program evaluation and to be able to collaborate with their group for the program evaluation project. During asynchronous work weeks, the forums and other assignments allow students to demonstrate their ongoing learning.
- Task:** Students should come to class having completed the assigned readings and be ready to participate in an informed yet informal discussion. This class sometimes provides in-class time to work on their program evaluation, and students should come prepared with productive activities they can do. The instructor assigns grades for in-class participation based on attendance and participation in discussions and activities. I deduct points for unexcused tardiness, absences, or non-participation. Students will have forums or activities to complete during asynchronous weeks.
- Success:** Students will be present, on time, or have contacted the instructor for the class session. Students will fully engage in class activities and discussions. Students will complete forums according to the guidelines for asynchronous weeks.

Assignment 02: Chapter Reading Quizzes

- Meta:** *Points* 50 pts (5% of final grade); *Deadline* due before class each week when readings from the Royse (2022) text are assigned. When the week is asynchronous, this is due by the end of the week (e.g., the following Monday at 8 AM); *Completion* via MyHeritage Assignments.
- Purpose:** Reading the textbook for this course is highly important for students to gain a fuller understanding of the content. Lectures will sometimes draw from topics discussed in the textbook, but they are not exhaustive. It is due before the in-class session, as activities and discussions will often build on concepts discussed in the textbook.
- Task:** Students will complete an online quiz on the reading using the MyHeritage course page. During the semester, the instructor selects 50 questions from the required reading, each worth 1 point. Questions are true/false, multiple-choice, and short answer.
- Success:** Students correctly answer the questions in the quiz. Students are encouraged to discuss questions they got wrong in class to facilitate growth. Students receive feedback about the completed quiz and can see what they missed after the assignment deadline.

Assignment 03: CITI Research Ethics and Compliance Training

- Meta:** *Points* 50 pts (5% of final grade); *Deadline* Monday 02/09/26 at 8 AM; *Completion* via MyHeritage Assignments as an uploaded paper.
- Purpose:** Students learn and demonstrate knowledge of essential human subjects' research topics for social-behavioral-educational researchers.

Task: Heritage University’s Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative’s (CITI) Research Ethics and Compliance Training program introduces issues such as informed consent, human subjects’ protection, privacy, and confidentiality for students involved in research involving no more than “minimal risk.” To complete the CITI training, go to <http://www.citiprogram.org/> and follow these instructions:

1. Click on “Register” in the upper right-hand corner.
2. Enter “Heritage” as your organization’s affiliation.
3. Fill out the remaining information through Step 6:
 - a. Username, password, security question
 - b. No CME/CEU credits
 - c. Answering the professional certification study guide question and course survey is optional
 - d. Institutional email, department, role in research: student researcher-undergraduate
4. When you get to Step 7 of the registration process, do the following:
 - a. For Question 1 on “Human Subjects Research,” select “Social & Behavioral Educational (SBE) course: Choose the option “to satisfy CITI training requirements for Investigators and staff involved primarily in research with human subjects.”
 - b. For Question 2, select “Not at this time.”
 - c. Do not select anything for Question 3.
 - d. For Question 4, select “No.”
 - e. For Question 5, select “No.”
5. When your registration is complete, Social & Behavioral Educational (SBE) will be in the courses “ready to begin” section.
6. Click “Start Now.” Complete all 12 modules required courses to achieve certification. You do not need to complete any of the supplemental modules.
7. Find your certificate documentation completion for this course by navigating to the records section of the website. Download or take a screenshot showing that you completed the course and upload it to MyHeritage.

Students can find additional support and information on Heritage University’s Institution Review Board (<https://heritage.edu/student-resources/irb-institutional-review-board/>)

Success: Students will complete the CITI Social & Behavioral Educational (SBE) course. They will upload a copy of their certificate (or a screenshot showing completion/grade assigned) to MyHeritage assignments. Grades for this assignment will be completed by mid-term grades due by the faculty on Wednesday, 03/25/26 at 5:00 PM.

Assignment 04: Group Program Evaluation Project

The majority of the coursework for this class is related to the students' group program evaluation project. The assignment has been broken up into smaller parts. The culmination of this assignment is a final executive summary-style paper and a presentation discussing the results of the completed program evaluation. Students work as a learning team to complete this assignment in groups of three to five. These teams will work together to create the executive summary and deliver the final presentation. Students will also jointly develop the group logic model and group work plan. Each group member will also be responsible for posting in their weekly journal.

Assignment 04a: Individual Weekly Journal Entries

Meta: *Points* 200 pts total or 20 pts each journal (20% total or 2% individually of final grade); *Deadline* Sundays at 08:00 AM on designated weeks; *Completion* private forum in MyHeritage.

Purpose: The weekly journal entries are designed to encourage students to keep their program evaluation on track for timely completion, help ensure that work is fairly distributed, and reflect on the program evaluation's process and progress.

Task: Starting week five, students will complete journal entries each week until the end of the semester. No journal entries are assigned during spring break. Using MyHeritage forums (set to private), students are to write journal entries of 250-500 words that reflect on how their work is unfolding. The professor reviews and grades all the forums, but if there is timely information to share or direct support needed, please reach out through other channels. Consider the following questions as you write your reflections. Students can respond to any of the given prompts, and they are not expected to write about them all each week:

- How did you contribute to your group's work this week? Do you feel your group is on track to complete a high-quality program evaluation by the established deadlines? If not, what needs to change so you can be successful?
- What steps have you taken to ensure that your work follows ethical guidelines while reflecting culturally competent practice? Is there more that needs to be done? If so, what?
- What barriers did you face to completing the work? How did you (or will you) get around the obstacles? Barriers can be related to the work or personal issues that emerge for you.

Success: Students will complete a journal entry each week as required. The content will address at least one question and meet the required word count. Entries can be written informally, but please review them for grammar and spelling.

Assignment 04b: Group Work Plan for the Program Evaluation

Meta: *Points* 100 pts (10% of student's final grade); *Deadline* Monday 02/16/26 at 8 AM; *Competition* via a forum post on MyHeritage.

- Purpose:** The group work plan is a form that students complete to document their action steps and assignments for completing the program evaluation.
- Task:** Groups will develop a work plan outlining the sequence and tasks for the program evaluation. It should include information on the evaluation design and data collection, as well as the tasks and deadlines assigned to group members. A potential template is available for students to use in MyHeritage.
- Success:** One group member will post the finalized work plan to the assigned MyHeritage Forum. Student grades will be assessed based on the plan's completeness, clarity, fairness, and feasibility. See Appendix A for the rubric. Feedback for this assignment will be completed by mid-term grades submission, due by the faculty on Wednesday, 03/25/26 at 5:00 PM.

Assignment 04c: Agency Logic Model

- Meta:** *Points* 100 pts (10% of student's final grade); *Deadline* An initial draft must be submitted before class on Monday, 3/9. A final draft will be completed by Monday, 03/16/26 at 8 AM; *Completion* initial draft via a forum post on MyHeritage and final draft via an uploaded document on MyHeritage Assignments.
- Purpose:** Developing a logic model is an essential part of program evaluation. Groups will include the logic model in the executive summary and presentation. They will submit it as a forum post and, during class, engage in peer review. This process will help groups formulate a superior final product.
- Task:** Group members will interview staff at their evaluation agency. The logic model examines how a program is implemented by understanding its resources, staff activities, program processes, and outcomes (often framed as immediate, intermediate, and long-range). Royse (2022) provides some context for this in chapter six.
- Success:** The final draft of the logic model will be submitted by group members to the MyHeritage assignments. See Appendix B for the rubric. Grades are assigned based on the content of the logic model. Feedback for this assignment will be completed by mid-term grades submission, due by the faculty on Wednesday, 03/25/26 at 5:00 PM.

Assignment 04d: Executive Summary of the Program Evaluation

- Meta:** *Points* 200 pts (20% of student's final grade); *Deadline* Monday 05/11/26 by 08:00 AM; *Submission* via Anthology through the assignments section of MyHeritage.
- Purpose:** The executive summary gives students the opportunity to engage in scholarly writing that clearly articulates the outcomes of the program evaluation they completed.

Task: The *Executive Summary of the Program Evaluation* is used as a key assignment¹ for SOWK 460w. The CSWE (2022) describes its ninth competency as students' ability to evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Specifically, students will be assessed regarding the identified practice behavior of "select and use culturally responsive methods for evaluation of outcomes; and critically analyze outcomes and apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness" (p. 13). While this assignment is completed as a group, each member will submit a copy to the Anthology Portfolio, allowing us to track each student's competency attainment.

Each group must hand in one final paper, 10-15 pages long, consisting of seven sections: introduction, logic model, ethical framework, methods, data/findings, narrative/discussion, and references.

- The **introduction** provides a description of the agency, a clearly defined research question, and a review of the literature on the agency type or the population served, including at least 10 academic/peer-reviewed articles.
- The **logic model** includes a brief description and a figure that illustrates the program's resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact.
- The **ethical framework** explains the considerations you took into account when designing the project. It should be described clearly and consistently. Potential questions answered include: How will you interact with clients, the institution, and subjects? How will you protect the rights and privacy of subjects? With whom will you share data, and why? Did your tasks/timeline ultimately go the way you thought it would? What took longer and why? What was more complicated than you expected, and why?
- The **methods** section explains how you collected your data. Consider the following questions: Why did you do it this way? Is it because of what was available? How did others collect data in the literature? If you did it differently than they did, why not?
- The **data/findings** include a narrative briefly explaining what you found in objective language. You do not need to interpret the results. Use tables and graphs to display data in a simplified way. The tables/graphs should be neat, clear, and self-explanatory.
- You will interpret your findings in the **narrative/discussion** section. What are your conclusions about the institution? What do you recommend? What needs to change? Does it relate to the literature in the introduction? If not, why not? Explain your findings in the context of the literature.
- The **references** section is an APA-formatted list of references cited in your paper.
- Many students will also include documents as **appendices**. These might include forms used or other artifacts from your research that are discussed in the body of the executive summary.

¹ Heritage University's social work program selects assignments across the curriculum for students to demonstrate each practice behavior defined by the CSWE to act as key assignments. These assignments are submitted to Heritage's online portfolio, Anthology Portfolio, and given to all students at each site using the same grading rubric. Student scores help provide data for faculty to self-evaluate the program.

Success: Students will submit a paper demonstrating their ability to use scholarly writing to describe their research project clearly. See Appendix C for the rubric. I will provide feedback before final grades are due by Wednesday, 05/20/25, at 5 PM.

Assignment 04e: Program Evaluation Group Presentation

Meta: Points 200 pts (20% of student's final grade); Deadline During class Monday 05/04/26; Submission via in-person presentation.

Purpose: Sharing the results of our research is a vital aspect of the research process. This presentation allows students to provide an academic presentation regarding their research findings. Furthermore, it will enable students to formally present their findings to agency staff and effectively disseminate their research.

Task: Along with submitting the final paper for the student's research project, it is also recommended that students return their findings to the agency where they completed their program evaluation through a presentation. Along with offering the agency a copy of the final report, students will invite staff to participate in a final presentation to discuss their findings. This final presentation will occur during week 16, on Monday, 05/04/26, during class time. If students would like to present at a different time accommodate the program evaluation stakeholders' time, they can request this from the instructor. The group presentation is about 15 to 20 minutes long. All the students will receive the same grade for the presentation, and each student is expected to have some part in presenting. Presentations will approximately follow a format like the one listed here:

1. Introduction and Stakeholder Engagement
 - a. Introduction (1 slide)
 - b. Connections to Scholarship (1-2 slides)
 - c. Evaluation Purpose (1 slide)
 - d. Stakeholders (1 slide)
2. Cultural Competence (1 slide)
3. Description of the Program Being Evaluated (1 slide)
4. Logic Model (1 slide)
5. Evaluation Design
 - a. Evaluation Questions (1 slide)
 - b. Design, Methods, Indicators & Standards (1 slide)
6. Analysis, Results, & Interpretation
 - a. Analysis (1 slide)
 - b. Results (3-5 slides)
 - c. Interpretation (1-2 slides)
7. Use & Dissemination (1 slide)
8. References (1 slide)

Success: Students will facilitate a showcase of their research using strong presentation skills. See Appendix D *Academic Presentation Rubric for the Program Evaluation* for the basis of the feedback and grades. I will provide feedback before final grades are due by Wednesday 05/20/26 at 5 PM.

Assignment 5: Extra Credit Assignment Options

I offer students two different opportunities for extra credit. The first is a minor assignment where the student finds an example of a published program evaluation in an academic journal and writes a description reviewing the study and describing the process the research went through in completing the evaluation. The second is a more intensive paper examining their group's process in writing a descriptive report on its development and usefulness. These assignments are extra credit and not mandatory.

Assignment 5a: [Extra Credit] Review of a Published Program Evaluation Paper

Meta: *Points* 50 pts (5% of total grade in extra credit); *Deadline* Monday 05/11/26 by 8 AM; *Completion* via MyHeritage Assignments using Turnitin.

Purpose: Program evaluations are frequently published or submitted as formal reports. Reviewing these published versions and providing a review helps engage students in how to write a program evaluation. Offering an assignment for extra credit gives students a designated manner to increase their grades for this class.

Task: Students will find a program evaluation that has been published. The article could be a journal article or a published report on an authoritative website. Students will review and summarize the study that was completed by writing a short paper that is between 500 and 750 words in length.

Success: Students will submit a paper demonstrating strong academic writing and critical thinking skills. I will provide feedback before final grades are due by Wednesday 05/20/26 at 5 PM.

Assignment 5b: [Extra Credit] Descriptive Review of Groups Program Evaluation

Meta: *Points* 100 pts (10% of total grade in extra credit); *Deadline* Monday 05/11/26 by 8 AM; *Completion* via MyHeritage Assignments using Turnitin.

Purpose: Evaluating our research process is not usually included in a program evaluation but helps improve our research skills and understanding gained during a project. Offering an assignment for extra credit gives students a designated manner to increase their grades for this class.

Task: The descriptive review of a student's group program evaluation is a paper where students can self-reflect about their project and, through informal interviews with their groupmates and the agency stakeholders, attempt to describe the process and understand the impacts of the program evaluation they have completed. It is to be between 1,250 to 1,500 words in length. It will reflect on the program evaluation process, the feelings and impressions of the group members and stakeholders involved in the process, and the potential changes or reactions the agency stakeholders have to the process.

Success: Students will submit a paper demonstrating academic skills. They will be able to demonstrate scientific writing skills. I will provide feedback before final grades are due by Wednesday 05/21/25 at 5:00 PM.

Course Guidelines and Expectations

Description of course expectations

Students are expected to engage during class sessions, having completed the week's reading. Because this is a research-focused class, students need to engage in ethical practices. Students are to consider ethical obligations throughout the research process. Research is often outside of students' comfort zones, and students should take on a growth mindset in learning about and implementing their research projects.

Description of Assignment Types

The students' real-world program evaluation is the most significant aspect of this class, and it has several smaller components. These include weekly journal entries completed via MyHeritage course forums to keep students on track. Groups also submit a work plan to designate who is doing what for the program evaluation, an agency logic model, an executive summary written as a research paper, and a final presentation. During weeks with readings from the textbook, there are reading quizzes. There are also two papers that can be written to earn extra credit.

Along with learning through assignments, this class has in-class sessions with lectures, small/large group discussions, opportunities to practice and improve program evaluation skills, and time to work on the program evaluation assignment. Five asynchronous weeks give students more time to work on their program evaluation. There are assignments due those weeks, or there might be forums on MyHeritage.

Designated Style

Writing for this course will use the American Psychological Association (APA) style guide. While optional for this course, their seventh edition style guide is listed as a recommended supplemental textbook for students.

Course Schedule

The planned course schedule is as follows:

Week	Date	Content	Reading Assignment	Due Dates
1	1/19 - 1/25 Asynchronous	Introduction to Social Work Program Evaluation; reviewing course syllabus	Course Syllabus	A-01: Asynchronous Participation due Monday (1/26) at 8 AM
2	1/26 - 2/1 Class 1/26	Steps in Program Evaluation; choosing groups for the program evaluation project	Royse (2022) Chapters 1 and 2	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz due before class
3	2/2 - 2/8 Asynchronous	Ethics and Program Evaluations	American Evaluation Association (2018)	A-01: Asynchronous Participation and A-03: CITI Research Ethics and Compliance Training due Monday (2/9) at 8 AM

Week	Date	Content	Reading Assignment	Due Dates
4	2/9 - 2/15 Class 2/9	Using Qualitative and Mix Methods Designs	Royse (2022) Chapters 3 and 4	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz due before class and A-04b: Group Work Plan for the Program Evaluation due Monday (2/16) at 8 AM
5	2/16 - 2/22 Asynchronous	Group Research Designs and Writing about an Ethical Framework	Royse (2022) Chapter 7 and McDonald et al. (2015)	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz and A-04a: Journal Entry due Monday (2/23) at 8 AM
6	2/23 - 3/1 Class 2/23	Quality Assurance Designs and Understanding an Agency Through a Logic Model	Royse (2022) Chapter 5	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz due before class and A-04a: Journal Entry due Monday (3/2) at 8 AM
7	3/2 - 3/8 Class 3/2	Research Question, Formative Evaluation, More on Logic Models	Royse (2022) Chapter 6	Mid Term Course Evaluations via MyHeritage CourseEval and draft of A-04c: Agency Logic Model due before class Monday (3/9)
8	3/9 - 3/15 Class 3/9	Instruments, Scales, and Measurement Tools; Peer review logic models	Royse (2022) Chapter 8	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz due before class A-04a: Journal Entry , and final A-04c: Agency Logic Model due Monday (3/16) at 8 AM
9	3/16 - 3/22 No Class	Spring Break		
10	3/23 - 3/29 Asynchronous	What to Include in Your Literature Review and Cost Analysis in Evaluation	Royse (2022) Chapter 9	Midterm Grades submitted by Instructor Wednesday (3/25) by 5 PM, A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz and A-04a: Journal Entry due Monday (3/30) at 8 AM
11	3/30 - 4/5 Class 3/30	Writing a Methods Section and Challenges in Program Evaluation	Royse (2022) Chapter 10	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz due before class and A-04a: Journal Entry due Monday (4/6) at 8 AM
12	4/6 - 4/12 Class 4/6	Research Context and Cultural Competence	Royse (2022) Chapter 11	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz due before class and A-04a: Journal Entry due Monday (4/13) at 8 AM
13	4/13 - 4/19 Class 4/13	Writing About Data and Findings	Royse (2022) Chapter 12	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz due before class and A-04a: Journal Entry due Monday (4/20) at 8 AM
14	4/20 - 4/26 Class 4/20	Writing Evaluation Reports	Royse (2022) Chapter 13	A-02: Chapter Reading Quiz due before class and A-04a: Journal Entry due Monday (4/27) at 8 AM

Week	Date	Content	Reading Assignment	Due Dates
15	4/27 - 5/3 Asynchronous	Finalizing Executive Summaries		A-01: Asynchronous Participation and A-04a: Journal Entry due Monday (5/4) at 8 AM
16	5/4 - 5/10 Class 5/4	Student Program Evaluation Symposium		A-04e: Program Evaluation Group Presentation due Monday (5/4) during class
End of Course	5/11 - 5/17 <u>Wednesday</u> 5/13	Wrap-Up, Final Grading, and Course Evaluations; Joined end-of-semester celebration and potluck		Course Evaluations via MyHeritage CourseEval and Final Grades submitted by Instructor Wednesday (5/20) by 5 PM and A-04d: Executive Summary of the Program Evaluation along with the extra credit options A-05a: Review of Program Evaluation and 05b: Descriptive Review of Groups Program Evaluation due Monday (5/11) at 8 AM

Attendance

Regular attendance and class participation are expected and considered essential for successful academic work. Heritage regularly updates its full attendance policy available in the current catalog: [Attendance Policy](#). Remember that Heritage University Student Affairs is ready to help solve problems that interfere with attending class. Email them at studentaffairs@heritage.edu.

Reasonable Accommodation for Religious Holidays

Consistent with Heritage University's mission and values and pursuant to RCW [28B.137.010](#) as amended, and Substitute Senate Bill 5166, HU allows student reasonable absences for reasons of faith or for organized activities conducted under the auspices of a religious denomination, church, or religious organization. The student requesting an excused absence for reasons of faith must submit the Request for Absence for Reasons of Faith Form to their instructor(s) at least two (2) weeks prior to the beginning of the semester in which the absence is anticipated to occur. The form is located on the Student Forms page under the Students Tab in MyHeritage. Full policy and procedures are located in the current catalog under Academic Policies, Attendance.

Support and Resources

Tutoring at the Academic Skills Center [Log into MyHeritage before using links]

The ASC has in-person and online appointments, drop-in services also both in-person and online. To view our schedule, or make an in-person or online appointment, visit the ASC page on MyHeritage under Student Services. To learn more about any of these services, call the ASC at (509) 865-8517 or email us ASC@heritage.edu.

Library

The librarians are here to assist you! Use the online chat on the [HU Library Website](#). For research and general assistance, feel free to stop by, call a reference librarian at (509) 865-8520, or email Library@heritage.edu.

Credit Hour Requirements

Federal regulations require that all courses follow the Heritage University definition of a credit hour as described in HU Policy. For the current policy, see the catalog entry [credit hour policy](#).

Online Course Exchange Appeals Process

Online Course Exchange students who wish to appeal an instructor's or facilitator's decision or request assistance with academic issues (such as requesting an incomplete or an extension) should contact HU's Online Course Exchange Liaison at Acadeum@heritage.edu.

Academic Honesty

Heritage University students have the responsibility to adhere to academic honesty in all their educational endeavors. Faculty has the responsibility to model academic honesty and to prevent, detect, and confront students who violate it. See [Academic Honesty Policy](#) and [Academic Honesty Procedure Diagram](#).

Campus Security & Safety

In an emergency, call 911. If you need campus security assistance between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., please call 509-865-8555 or ext. 8555 from any campus landline or email: CampusSecurity@heritage.edu. For a list of Campus Security services and Crisis Response Steps, see the [Safety and Security webpage](#).

Accommodations

For information about student disability services on campus, please visit the [Office of Disability Services \(ADA\) | Heritage University](#) webpage or email Officeofdisabilityservices@heritage.edu.

Safe Attendance Reminder

Heritage University is committed to providing a safe and healthy environment for all students, staff, and faculty. Our goal is to mitigate the potential for transmission of communicable diseases, including COVID-19, in our environment.

Anyone experiencing symptoms of viral illness, such as fever or chills, cough, fatigue, muscle or body aches, headache, new loss of taste or smell, sore throat, congestion or runny nose, nausea or vomiting, or diarrhea, should stay home and see medical attention. Anyone known to have a close exposure to COVID-19 should wear a mask and follow [CDC guidelines](#) for isolation and precautions.

In addition, Heritage University community members must be prepared to "Mask When Asked." Individuals can require that people who enter their offices wear masks. Faculty can require

that students mask in their classrooms. Students who need to have their classmates mask can request that themselves or speak to the Vice President for Student Affairs to ask for support. Our collective commitment to health and wellbeing of all members of the community is essential and appreciated.

References

- American Evaluation Association. (2018). American Evaluation Association guiding principles for evaluators. https://www.eval.org/Portals/0/Docs/AEA_289398-18_GuidingPrinciples_Brochure_2.pdf
- American Psychological Association. (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>
- Council on Social Work Education. (2022). 2022 EPAS: Educational policy and accreditation standards for baccalaureate and master's social work programs. <https://www.cswe.org/getmedia/bb5d8afe-7680-42dc-a332-a6e6103f4998/2022-EPAS.pdf>
- McDonald, D., Boddy, J., O'Callaghan, K., & Chester, P. (2015). Ethical professional writing in social work and human services. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 9(4), 359-374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2015.1009481>
- Royse, D. (2022). Program evaluation: *A practical guide for social work and the helping professions*. Cognella Academic Publishing.

Appendix

A. Group Work Plan Rubric

The *Group Work Plan Rubric* evaluates students' research project plans across four areas: completeness, clarity, fairness, and feasibility. Completeness assesses how well the plan incorporates components of the overall research project, from very few aspects to a thorough outline. Clarity evaluates how clearly the plan distinguishes between evaluation design and data collection, with the highest level providing detailed components, indicators, sources, responsibilities, and deadlines. Fairness examines the distribution of tasks among group members. Feasibility determines whether the tasks and components are practical.

B. Agency Logic Model Rubric

The *Agency Logic Model Rubric* evaluates student-using a student-developed rubric developed during 2024. It focuses on visual clarity, resources, staff activities, program processes, and outcomes. Visual/clarity assesses the identification of components. Resources evaluate the identification of agency resources. Staff activities review descriptions of agency services. Program processes assess descriptions of intended agency services. Short-term outcomes evaluate the definition of expected changes, including the target audience, timeframe, and desired level of change. Immediate-term outcomes review data collection and connection to program goals. Long-term outcomes assess the identification of data, outcomes, and implementations.

C. CSWE (2022) Competency 9 Practice Behaviors Rubric for Program Evaluation Executive Summary

The *CSWE (2022) Competency 9 Practice Behaviors Rubric* evaluates students' ability to use culturally responsive methods and critically analyze outcomes to improve practice. For 1A, it assesses the

clarity of the research question, use of academic literature, ethical framework, methods, and cultural considerations, ranging from unclear and unsupported to detailed and well-integrated. For 1B, it evaluates findings articulation, visuals, logic model development, and recommendations, progressing from vague and incomplete to clear, comprehensive, and actionable.

D. Academic Presentation Rubric for the Program Evaluation

The *Academic Presentation Rubric for Program Evaluation* evaluates organization, content, references, and delivery. The organization section assesses audience targeting, topic alignment, accuracy, and logical flow. Content evaluates adherence to assignment requirements. APA formatting and style are also assessed. Delivery assesses visual aids for quantity, clarity, attractiveness, and relevance.

Syllabus Form Updated 5-27-2025 (MJ)

Appendix A: Group Work Plan Rubric

Description	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Completeness	Very few aspects of the overall research project are included in the plan.	The plan includes several components, but a few significant processes are not included.	The plan generally outlines most of the research project.	The plan is thorough and covers the entire research project.
Clarity	The plan of what needs to happen in either the evaluation design or the data collection is unclear.	The plan provides some general idea of tasks that need to be completed but does not include a delineation between evaluation design and data collection.	The plan is understandable and includes information about the design and data collection.	The plan clearly articulates both the evaluation design and data collection that will take place within the research. The evaluation design includes components, indicators, sources, and what success looks like. The data collection identifies specific tasks, the person responsible, and deadlines for completing those tasks.
Fairness	The distribution of tasks is not fair for group members.	The distribution of tasks is somewhat fair for group members, but some significant tasks or components are unfairly assigned.	The group members are assigned tasks, but a few seem to have more or less work than others.	Group members are fairly distributed with tasks related to the assignment.
Feasibility	None of the components or tasks are feasible.	The program evaluation does not appear feasible, with significant components not likely to be completed.	The program evaluation appears feasible, but some aspects might seem out of scope or out of the student's ability to complete.	The program evaluation plan appears feasible and something the group can accomplish within the semester.

Appendix B: Agency Logic Model Rubric

Spring 2024 SOWK 460w class cooperatively developed this rubric.

Description	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Visual/Clarity	Unable to identify the components	Able to identify 3 of the components	Able to identify 4 of the components	Able to identify all of the components. The chart is easy to read and visually appealing
Resources	No identification of resources	Limited or unclear identification of resources	The majority of resources were identified	Complete understanding of resources identified
Staff Activities	Minimal to no description of staff services provided by the agency	Seldom description of the staff services provided by the agency	Partial description of most of the staff services provided by the agency	A clear description of all staff services provided by the agency
Program Processes	Minimal to no description of the intended service(s) of the agency	Seldom a description of half of the intended service(s) of the agency	Partial description of most of the intended service(s) of the agency	Clear description of the intended service(s) of the agency
Short-Term Outcomes	Limited or no data collected. Brief and unclear statements	Some data was collected, but it is very brief with little detail	Defines the expected change in the program	Specifies the target audience, timeframe, and desired level of change
Immediate Term Outcomes	Did not develop data collection or incomplete	It shows some connection to activities but needs clarification	Explains how the changes were implemented to the program's goals	Identifies relevant data collection methods to track the progress of program evaluation
Long-Term Outcomes	Vague or no data and outcomes identified	The outcome has been identified, but it is brief and unclear. The data is somewhat relevant to the outcome	Describes new implementations and long-term outcome goals; minor additions are needed to develop the logic model's long-term outcomes	Implementations and Long-term outcomes are identified and specified in depth under each category based on program-needed change(s) at the agency

Appendix C: CSWE (2022) Competency 9 Practice Behaviors Rubric for Program Evaluation Executive Summary

Practice Behavior A

Description	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
9a	Select and use culturally responsive methods for the evaluation of outcomes; and			
Clearly defined research question with extensive literature support	The research question is not identified. Very little appropriate evidence is presented, or the evidence presented is not tied to the argument or the research question.	The research question is weakly presented. A weak understanding of the literature is demonstrated. Five academic/peer-reviewed articles are cited in the body of the paper.	The research question is adequately presented. A basic understanding of the literature is demonstrated. Seven academic/peer-reviewed articles are cited in the body of the paper.	The research question is clearly presented. In-depth understanding of the literature demonstrated. Ten or more academic/peer-reviewed articles are cited in the body of the paper.
Strong and consistent ethical framework	No consistent ethical framework is articulated.	The ethical framework is vague, unsupported, and/or unconvincing.	The ethical framework is adequate, somewhat believable, somewhat convincing , and consistent with the research question.	The ethical framework is clear, believable, convincing, and consistent with the research question.
Relevant and well-aligned methods	Methods are unclear or inconsistent with the research question.	Methods are not clearly relevant or are weakly related to the research question.	Methods are somewhat relevant and are adequately related to the research question.	Methods are relevant and clearly relate to the research question.
Comprehensive discussion of cultural considerations	There is no discussion of cultural considerations related to the method.	Cultural considerations are abstractly discussed.	Cultural considerations are directly addressed and discussed but need more depth and thorough consideration.	There is an in-depth and thorough discussion of the cultural considerations related to the methods.
9b	critically analyze outcomes and apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.			
Clear findings with well-presented visuals	Very little appropriate evidence is presented, or the evidence presented is not tied to the research question or the contract.	The narrative wanders or only weakly relates to the research question, and tabular or graphic information is messy and difficult to understand.	The narrative adequately articulates findings, and tabular or graphic information is somewhat clear/the reader can understand it with limited effort.	The narrative clearly articulates findings, and tabular or graphic information is clear, neat, and easy to understand.
Comprehensive and detailed logic model	The logic model is incomplete or unclearly related to the program being evaluated.	The logic model weakly illustrates the program's resources, activities, output, outcomes, and impact; the model is messy, confusing, and difficult to understand.	The logic model adequately illustrates the program's resources, activities, output, outcomes, and impact; the model can be understood with limited effort.	The logic model clearly and completely illustrates the program's resources, activities, output, outcomes, and impact.

Description	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Clear conclusions with actionable recommendations	<p>The discussion does not appropriately explain conclusions, does not make concrete recommendations, and does not attempt to explain what the findings mean for the organization.</p>	<p>The discussion weakly explains student conclusions, makes vague or unconvincing recommendations that do not relate to the research question, and cannot explain what the findings mean for the organization.</p>	<p>The discussion adequately explains student conclusions, makes some recommendations, and adequately explains what the findings mean for the organization.</p>	<p>The discussion clearly explains student conclusions, makes concrete recommendations, and explains what the findings mean for the organization.</p>

Appendix D: Academic Presentation Rubric for the Program Evaluation

Description	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Presentation Organization: (audience, topic, accuracy, and logical sequence)	Zero to one of the four assessed areas fits the highly developed standards listed in the rubric.	At least two of the four assessed areas fit the highly developed standards listed in the rubric.	At least three assessed areas fit the highly developed standards listed in the rubric.	Audience: The presentation targets a scholarly audience with limited subject knowledge. Topic: It accurately follows the issues described in the syllabus. Accuracy: The information provided is factual and brought from scholarly sources. Logical Sequence: The presentation follows a logical and goal-oriented sequence that provides sufficient context for the audience.
Presentation Content: Completeness (follows assignment description)	The presentation does not follow the assignment description for what content to include.	The presentation includes five of the assigned content areas.	The presentation includes seven of the assigned content areas.	The presentation provides information related to all of the identified components, including an introduction, stakeholder engagement, cultural competence, program description, logic model, evaluation design, analysis, use plan, and references.
Presentation Content: Conceptual Foundations (explains what the program is and why the evaluation exists)	The presentation includes limited or unclear information about the program and evaluation context. Key elements such as the evaluation purpose, stakeholder engagement, cultural considerations, or connections to scholarship are missing, inaccurate, or insufficiently developed.	The presentation includes several elements related to the program context and evaluation purpose, with some attention to stakeholders, cultural competence, or scholarship. However, the information may be uneven, underdeveloped, or inconsistently connected to the overall evaluation.	The presentation clearly describes the program context and evaluation purpose and appropriately addresses stakeholder engagement and cultural competence. Relevant scholarship is used to support the evaluation rationale; however, these elements are presented largely as discrete components rather than as an integrated framework guiding the evaluation.	The presentation clearly articulates the program context, evaluation purpose, stakeholders, and cultural considerations. Connections to relevant scholarship are integrated to justify the evaluation focus and design.

Description	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Presentation Content: Evaluation & Findings (explains what was done and what it means)	The presentation provides minimal or unclear information about the evaluation process and findings. Key components such as the logic model, evaluation design, results, or interpretation are missing, inaccurate, or difficult to follow.	The presentation includes multiple components of the evaluation process and findings, such as the logic model, methods, or results. However, explanations may lack clarity, depth, or consistency, and the interpretation or use of findings may be limited or underdeveloped.	The presentation clearly explains the evaluation design, logic model, and findings. Results are presented accurately and are generally easy to follow. Interpretation of findings is appropriate and begins to address implications for practice or use of results, though connections among design, findings, and recommendations may be uneven or underdeveloped.	The presentation demonstrates a cohesive and analytically strong evaluation narrative. The evaluation design, logic model, findings, and interpretation are tightly aligned, with results clearly linked to evaluation questions and methods. Interpretation of findings is thoughtful and well-supported, and implications for practice or use of results are clearly articulated and grounded in the evaluation data.
Presentation Content: Scholarship (references)	References are not provided or discussed during the presentation.	There appears to be some attempt to describe the sources of information provided.	The presentation includes a reference list that generally looks like APA format.	The presentation slides include in-text citations identifying the sources of information throughout the presentation. The end of the presentation contains a reference list with citation entries in APA format. During the presentation delivery, the speaker will refer to the studies and their authors where appropriate.
Presentation Delivery: Visual Aids (quantity, attractiveness, clear, and additive)	Zero or one of the four assessed areas fits the highly developed standards listed in the rubric.	At least two of the four assessed areas fit the highly developed standards listed in the rubric.	At least three assessed areas fit the highly developed standards listed in the rubric.	Quantity: There are enough slides used in the presentation to provide a visual aid for the information required. Attractiveness: the slides are visually appealing. A theme is in the presentation. Clear: The slides are easy to read and do not contain too much text. Additive: The visuals used in the presentation are appropriate and enhance the message.