

UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA at CHAPEL HILL  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Course:       **SOWO 292 Evaluation of Social Interventions, Section 957**

Professor:    **Sara S. vander Straeten, ACSW**

**CB# 3550, Suite 548F, School of Social Work, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3550**

**Office Hours: Fridays in Charlotte Noon to 1:00 PM and by appointment**

**Phone: office: (919) 962-7222**

**Carrboro home: (919) 967-7462**

**Black Mountain home (828) 669-1536**

**Email: [svanders@email.unc.edu](mailto:svanders@email.unc.edu) or [Vstraeten@aol.com](mailto:Vstraeten@aol.com)**

**Blackboard Course Sites: <http://blackboard.unc.edu>**

Semester:     **Spring, 2002**

**Course Description:**

Students develop knowledge of the purposes of evaluation research, and the technology and methodology necessary to evaluate social work interventions.

**Course Objectives:**

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to demonstrate the following:

1. Skill in developing and implementing social intervention research that is relevant to social work practice and policy;
2. Skill in evaluating social intervention research and applying the findings to social work practice and policy;
3. Skill in qualitative and quantitative research design, measurement, data analysis, and knowledge dissemination;
4. Knowledge of the practical, political, and economic issues related to social intervention research;
5. Skill in designing social intervention research that is sensitive to and addresses racial, gender, social, economic, and other issues of difference;
6. Ability to apply knowledge of ethics to the design of social intervention research.

**Expanded Description**

This course introduces advanced students to the processes necessary for the evaluation of social work practice and policy evaluation. Building on the knowledge gained in the foundation course SoWo 102, Introduction to Research Methodology, the course provides a results-based accountability framework so students may gain:

- (a) skills in accessing and assessing public databases and research literature as a foundation for evidence-based practice,
- (b) knowledge of evaluation models and methodology available to implement results-based evaluation, and
- (c) the ability to work within a results-based accountability system in their social work practice.

**Required Texts:**

- Hatry, H., van Houten, T., Plantz, M.C. and Greenway, M.T. (1996). *Measuring program outcomes: A practical approach*. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America.
- Padgett, D.K. (1998). *Qualitative methods in social work research: Challenges and rewards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Royse, D.; Thayer, B.A.; Padgett, D.K. & Logan, T.K. (2001) *Program evaluation: An introduction*. (3rd Edition) Belmont, CA: Brooks-Cole.

The required texts are available in the health sciences bookstore. Supplemental readings are available at the Charlotte campus at a site that is accessible to students. Some supplementary readings are available on-line through the blackboard website. They may be accessed by clicking on the web address in the syllabus posted on the site. Additional supplementary readings may be assigned based upon the needs of the class members at the discretion of the instructor.

**Teaching Methods**

Most class periods will include a lecture by the instructor, class discussion, and a skill building activity. Each student is expected to participate regularly in class discussions about the concepts studied and to participate in each of the skill-building exercises. Skill building exercises will integrate readings and previous assignments into the exercises.

While integration of practice material is always encouraged in discussions, the written assignments are also designed to allow students to apply the knowledge gained from the readings, presentations, and assignments to their own field and/or practice settings. Readings have been chosen as examples of general principles as they operate in the local North Carolina context.

Individual consultation with the instructor, librarians, field supervisor, other practitioners and student colleagues is encouraged as the student prepares for assignments. However, the student is expected to be the sole author of all written assignments. If a student has any questions about whether consultation with others is appropriate, she should ask the instructor.

Written assignments are designed to build upon each other. Keeping a notebook of assignments is encouraged.

Some classes have chosen to adopt a class evaluation project. If the instructor chooses to work on a common evaluation project, material pertaining to the project will be woven throughout class sessions as appropriate.

**Assignments and Course Performance Assessment:**

Six graded assignments	40%
Mid-term portfolio	30%
Final portfolio	<u>30%</u>
Course Total	100%

Written assignments are due at the beginning of class on the date noted. Assignments may be submitted in writing or as an email attachment in Word or in the drop box on the blackboard site. Assignments that are submitted as an email attachment or in the drop box will receive a confirmation that the assignment has been received. If there was a problem opening the assignment the student will be notified. When submitting assignments by email, please take the proper precautions to assure that your file is virus-free.

A short description of each of the assignments is included at the end of this syllabus. Detailed instructions for written projects, oral class presentations, and final portfolio will be provided in separate documents.

### **Format for Written Work**

Assignments must be typed and use APA format (including, but not limited to, APA guidelines on line spacing, margins, punctuation, within text citations, reference list, and headings). Students should refer to the *UNC School of Social Work Style Guide: A Writing Manual for Social Work Students* and/or the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) for information on APA format. In addition, students should refer to the School of Social Work Style Guide, pages 26-32, for guidelines on how to cite others' work properly and avoid plagiarism.

### **Grading System**

The six written assignments will be graded using a point system and the grades averaged for the final grade.

<u>Points</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<69	F
70 - 79	L
80 - 93	P
94 - 100	H

Midterm and final portfolios will be graded using the letter grades above using the following guidelines

- H** Portfolio is complete and submitted on time. All components meet competency standards (both content and style) and at least 50% of the portfolio components exceed competency standards and evidence work of high quality.
- P** Portfolio is complete and submitted on time or with an exception that has prior approval of instructor. At least 80% of portfolio work meets competency standards (both content and style).
- L** Portfolio is complete and submitted late without prior approval of instructor (only if instructor elects to accept work) or portfolio is complete, submitted on time, and more than 50% but less than 80% of portfolio meets competency standards (both content and style).
- F** Portfolio is incomplete, submitted late without prior approval of instructor, or less than 50% of the portfolio meets competency standards (both content and style).

**Policy on Unexcused Absences**

Because class periods contain skill building components it is important that students attend class. It is expected that students will attend each class. However, absences may be excused by the instructor for good cause and an effort may be made to provide supplemental work that will provide skill building outside of class. Students should request an excused absence in an email to the instructor (a) before the class period if the absence is anticipated, or (b) within a week after the absence if the absence was unanticipated. Students may have two unexcused absences with no penalty.

**Policy on Incompletes and Late Assignments**

There are six out of class assignments (worth 10 points each) that have due dates that must be met for full credit to be assigned. Students must notify the instructor *before* the due date and time by email if an assignment is going to be turned in late. Whenever possible, students should notify the instructor at least 24 hours before the due date. Extensions may be given at the instructor's discretion for extenuating circumstances. Extensions will not be granted in all cases. Students will lose five points (i.e. from an 85 to an 80) for each 24 hours beyond the due date and time (including weekends) for unexcused late assignments or late assignments that are not discussed with the instructor.

The dates for the midterm and final portfolio review are fixed. Students must notify the instructor *before* the due date and time by email if it is impossible to meet the time requirements. Alternate arrangements may be made at the instructor's discretion. Consideration for a grade of incomplete will be made on a case by case basis depending upon circumstances.

**Policy on Academic Dishonesty**

All written assignments (projects, logic models) should include the following signed pledge. We will discuss the procedures to use if assignments are turned in by email.

"I have neither given or received unauthorized aid in preparing this written work."

Students are also held responsible for properly citing references in their written work. This topic is discussed at length in the SSW Writing Guide. Students should review the Writing Guide content on citations and plagiarism.

Students in the class who observe or are aware of academic dishonesty on the part of classmates are expected to inform the instructor. Academic dishonesty is contrary to the ethics of the social work profession, unfair to other students, and will not be tolerated in any form.

**Policy on Accommodations for Students with Disabilities**

Students with disabilities that affect their participation in the course or fulfillment of course requirements may notify the instructor. Special accommodations in instructional format, or the format of assignments, will be considered.

**Course Outline**  
**SoWo 292 Section 958**

*Note: Reading assignments are to be completed by the class date for which they are listed.*

<b>Class Date</b>	<b>Topics and Readings</b>
January 11	<b>Course Orientation: Paradigms of Evaluation and Practice</b> Introduction to Evaluation of Social Interventions and Evidence-based Practice Understanding Context in Intervention Research
January 18*	<b>Foundations for Accountable Practice:</b> History, Ethics, Issues of Diversity, Social Justice, and Inclusion  <i>Review Readings-Introduction</i> Royce et al.: Chapter 1 Introduction pp.1-29 Padgett: Chapter 1 Introduction pp.1-17 Chapter 2 The Researcher as Instrument pp.18-24 Hatry et al.: Glossary of Terms p xv Introduction to Outcome Measurement pp. 1-5 Exhibits 2-D, 2-E, 2-F pp. 41-48  <i>Preparatory Readings – Ethical Issues</i> Royce et al.: Chapter 2 Ethical Issues in Program Evaluation pp. 30 - 50 Padgett: Chapter 4 Ethical Issues in Qualitative Research pp. 33-44
January 25	<b>Ethics and Introduction to Evidence Based Practice</b>  Kerpelman, L.C., Connell, D.B. & Gunn, W.J. (2000). Effect of a monetary sanction on immunization rates of recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, <i>JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association</i> 284(1) July 5 pp 53-59. <a href="http://jama.ama-assn.org/issues/v284n1/rpdf/joc00011.pdf">http://jama.ama-assn.org/issues/v284n1/rpdf/joc00011.pdf</a> Please bring to class for our in-class exercise  Davis, M.M. & Lantos, J.D. (2000). Ethical considerations in the public policy laboratory. <i>JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association</i> 284(1) July 5 pp 85-87. <a href="http://jama.ama-assn.org/issues/v284n1/rpdf/jco00088.pdf">http://jama.ama-assn.org/issues/v284n1/rpdf/jco00088.pdf</a> Please bring to class for our in-class exercise  The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights <a href="http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html">http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html</a>  The Social Work Code of Ethics <a href="http://www.naswdc.org/Code/ethics.htm">http://www.naswdc.org/Code/ethics.htm</a>

Emanuel, E.J., Wendler, D. & Grady, C. (2000) What makes clinical Research ethical? *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association* 283(20) May 24/31 pp 2701-2711.  
<http://jama.ama-assn.org/issues/v283n20/rpdf/jsc90374.pdf>

Gambrill, E. (1999). Evidence-based practice: An alternative to authority-based practice. *Families in Society*, 80 (4) 341-350.

February 1

## **Evidence-based Practice, Theories of Change and Logic Models**

Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D.C., MacKenzie, D.L., Eck, J., Reuter, P. & Bushway, S.D. (July, 1998) Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice Research Brief. <http://www.preventingcrime.org/171676.pdf>

Godfrey, M., Randall, T., Long, A., & Grant, M. (2000). Review of Effectiveness and Outcomes: Home Care Executive Summary. Exeter: University of Exeter Center for Evidence-Based Social Services. Pages 9-17. <http://www.ex.ac.uk/cebss/files/HomeCare.pdf>

### *Evidence Based Mental Health Research Reviews*

Bulick, C.M. (2000). Cognitive behavior therapy was more effective than interpersonal psychotherapy for bulimianervosa. *Evidence-Based Mental Health* (3)4 105.

<http://www.ebmentalhealth.com/cgi/reprint/3/4/105.pdf>

Bursdajn, H. (2000). Cognitive behavioural therapy, systemic behavioural family therapy, and non-directive supportive therapy had similar long term effectiveness for major depressive disorder in adolescents.

*Evidence-Based Mental Health* (3)4 105.

<http://www.ebmentalhealth.com/cgi/reprint/3/4/108.pdf>

Goldfinger, S.M. (2000). 2 core experimental and 4 behavioural dimensions of the initial prodrome in schizophrenia emerged. *Evidence-Based Mental Health* (3)4 108.

<http://www.ebmentalhealth.com/cgi/reprint/3/4/127.pdf>

Malla, A. (2000). Positive family interaction was associated with fewer relapses in patients admitted to hospital for psychotic disorder.

*Evidence-Based Mental Health* (3)4 105.

<http://www.ebmentalhealth.com/cgi/reprint/3/4/120.pdf>

McKenna, H. (2000). Adolescents managed their asthma or diabetes in gendered ways with the aim of projecting different gendered identities. *Evidence-Based Mental Health* (3)4 120.

<http://www.ebmentalhealth.com/cgi/reprint/3/4/125.pdf>

Williams, R. (2000). Parents and general practitioners differed in some of their views of child hyperactivity. *Evidence-Based Mental Health* (3)4 126. <http://www.ebmentalhealth.com/cgi/reprint/3/4/126.pdf>

Coffman, J. (1999). *Learning from logic models: An example of a family/school partnership program*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~hfrp/pubs/onlinepubs/logic.pdf>

Weiss, C. (1995). Nothing as practical as good theory: Exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families in Connell, J.P, Kubish, A.C., Schorr, L.B. & Weiss, C.H. (eds.) *Evaluating comprehensive community initiatives Vol 1: Concepts methods, and contexts*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

<http://www.aspenroundtable.org/vol1/weiss.htm>

February 8\*

## **Needs Assessment**

*Preparatory Reading – Needs Assessment*

Royce et al.: Chapter 3 Needs Assessment pp 51-81.

United Way of Asheville and Buncombe County (1994). *Challenges in Buncombe County: The 1994 Needs Assessment Report*. Asheville, NC: Author.

United Way of Asheville and Buncombe County (1995). *United Way focusing on communities: The 1995 focused assessment report*. Asheville, NC: Author.

United Way of Asheville and Buncombe County (1998). *Focusing on access: The 1998 focused assessment report*. Asheville, NC: Author.

Putnam, R.D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* (6)1 65-78.

[http://www.press.jhu.edu/demo/journal\\_of\\_democracy/v006/6.1putnam.html](http://www.press.jhu.edu/demo/journal_of_democracy/v006/6.1putnam.html)

Rash, B.C. & McCoy, B. (February 28, 2001) Social Capital Benchmark Survey: Executive summary for the Charlotte region. Charlotte, NC: Foundation for the Carolinas.

[http://www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey/docs/carolinas\\_sh.pdf](http://www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey/docs/carolinas_sh.pdf)

February 15

## **Process Evaluation and Outcome Evaluation:**

Evaluability, Outputs, and Outcomes

*Preparatory Reading*

Royce et al.: Chapter 4, Qualitative Methods in Evaluation 82-107  
Chapter 5, Formative and Process Evaluation 108-149

Hatry, H., van Houten, T., Plantz, M.C. and Greenway, M.T. (1996). *Measuring program outcomes: A practical approach*. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America. Pages 11-58

February 22

**Client and Program Outcome Designs**  
**Program and Community Impact Designs**

Royce et al.: Chapter 9, Group Research Designs 213-248

Padgett: Chapters 3, 5, 6

Orthner, D.K. & Cole, G. (1999), *Developing a measurement system for NC Schools for the Deaf and Blind*. Chapel Hill: Jordan Institute for Families.

vander Straeten, S.S. & Taylor-Sonoskus, A. (1999). EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, in A.Taylor-Sonoskus & S. vander Straeten, An Outcome Evaluation of Buncombe County's First Funded Smart Start Plan: Mapping the Objectives. Asheville, NC: Buncombe County Partnership for Children.

Orthner et al., (1995). *Impact Evaluation of the North Carolina JOBS Program*. Chapel Hill: Human Services Research & Design Laboratory.

March 1

**Program Cost Analyses**

Royce et al.: Chapter 10, Cost-Effectiveness and Cost Analysis Designs  
249- 263

Hamilton, W.; Burstein, N.; Moss, D.; & Hargreaves, M.  
(1994). CAP: New York state's experiment with economic incentives. *Public Welfare*, 52 (Winter): 6-17.

Peveler, R. (2001). A depression management programme reduced Depression in frequent users of healthcare but did not reduce healthcare visits. *Evidence-Based Mental Health* (4)4 78.

Peveler, R. (2001). A depression management programme increased depression free days and costs in depressed frequent users of general healthcare. *Evidence-Based Mental Health* (4)4 79.

<http://ebmentalhealth.com/cgi/reprint/4/3/79.pdf>

The Perry Preschool Project Significant Benefits: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project. Read webpage and then view slides of the project using Power Point.

<http://www.highscope.org/wwwroot/research/RESPER.HTM>

Sorenson, J.E. Cost Dynamics of Frontier Mental Health Services: Letter to the Field #12

<http://www.wiche.edu/mentalhealth/frontier/index.htm>

Sorenson, J.E. Client Outcomes and Costs in Frontier Mental Health Services: Letter to the Field #13

<http://www.wiche.edu/mentalhealth/frontier/index.htm>



March 8

## Secondary Data Analysis

Casey Family Foundation (nd) *Foster children in a life course perspective: A summary of the case record study*. Research report 1

<http://casey.org/research/reports/FCLCPers/Fanshel%20Report1.pdf>

Casey Family Foundation (nd) *Foster children in a life course perspective: A summary of the case record study*. Research report 2 found at

<http://casey.org/research/reports/FCLCPers/Fanshel%20Report2.pdf>

Duncan, D.F. III, Flair, K.A.Y. & Benton, M. (1998). *It's a nasty job but somebody's got to do it: Using administrative data to assess the impact of welfare reform*. Prepared for The National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics Annual Workshop, August 2-5, 1998, Chicago, IL. Chapel Hill, NC: Jordan Institute for Families.

<http://ssw.unc.edu/workfirst/reports/Nastyjob.pdf>

O'Brien, D., Prendergast, K., Thompson, E., Frucher, M. & Aldeen, H.T. (2000). *The red tape divide: State-by-state review of food stamp applications*. Chicago, IL: America's Second Harvest.

[http://www.secondharvest.org/policy/food\\_stamp\\_study.pdf](http://www.secondharvest.org/policy/food_stamp_study.pdf)

North Carolina Justice and Community Development Center (2000). *The Achievement Gap 2001: A progress Report*. Raleigh, NC: Author

<http://ncjustice.org/edlaw/testexsumm2001.pdf>

March 15

## Spring Break

March 22

## Measurement Instruments for Evaluation:

Constructing and Using Interview Guides, Questionnaires, Scales and Indexes

Royce et al.: Chapter 11, Measurement Tools and Strategies 264-295  
12, Illustrations of Instruments 296-323

Padgett: Chapter 5, Entering the Field and Sampling Strategies 45-54  
6, Data Collection, 55-71

Hatry, H., van Houten, T., Plantz, M.C. and Greenway, M.T. (1996). *Measuring program outcomes: A practical approach*. Alexandria, VA: United Way of America. Pages 59-104, 147-163

March 29

## Good Friday, No class

April 5

## Quantitative Data Analysis: Introduction and Descriptive Statistics

Royce et al.: Chapter 14 Making Sense of Evaluation Data

April 12	<b>Quantitative Data Analysis: Statistics of Association and Difference</b>  Royce et al.: Chapter 14 Making Sense of Evaluation Data
April 19	<b>Qualitative Data Analysis</b>  Padgett: Chapter 7, Data Management and Analysis 72-87 Chapter 8, Rigor and Relevance in Qualitative Research 88-103 Chapter 10, Multimethod Research, The Synergy of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods 126-140
April 26	<b>Overcoming Evaluation Challenges, Constructing Evaluation Reports and Managing Dissemination</b>  Royce et al.: Chapter 13, Pragmatic Issues 324-343 15, Writing Evaluation Proposals, Reports, and Journal Articles 374-396  Padgett: Chapter 9, Telling the Story: Writing Up the Qualitative Study 104-125 Epilogue, Qualitative Methods in Social Work Education, Toward Developing an Infrastructure 141-149  Hatry, H., van Houten, T., Plantz, M.C. and Greenway, M.T. (1996). <i>Measuring program outcomes: A practical approach</i> . Alexandria, VA: United Way of America. Pages 125-146
May 3	Final portfolios due

## **\*Assignments**

- January 25** Write a two to five page paper describing the program you will use to develop a system of practice evaluation. Include the demographics of the area the program serves, the population the program serves, the agency supporting the program, the mission of the agency, the program itself including program resources, constraints and activities. Discuss whether the program you will use meets the definition of a program in the *Program Evaluation* text. From your paper begin to develop your program logic model by filling in the Inputs, Activities, and Mission columns using the Logic Model Template. Attach this portion of your logic model to your paper.
- February 8** Review the literature in your field of practice using the perspective of evidence based practice. Select two articles for review that could be used in evaluating practice relevant to your program. Try to find articles that contain a meta analysis or research summary, or that use quantitative or qualitative methods. Write a paper of at least four pages that includes:
1. an introduction that lays out the field of practice you are reviewing, the question(s) you are researching, and the search strategy you used, including key words,
  2. a review of each article describing article question, the setting, the intervention, the outcome measures, the main results, the conclusions and your commentary, and
  3. a conclusion that gives your views on the relevance of the research articles to your practice.
- February 22** Develop outputs and outcomes for your program logic model. Revise the Inputs and Activities and Mission columns as needed and fill in the Outputs, Short-Range Outcomes, Mid-Range Outcomes and Long-Range Outcomes sections. Attach a 2-3 page paper explaining the outputs and outcomes you have developed and their relationships to the mission, inputs and activities of the program. Describe how the logic model explains the program's theory of change.
- February 28** Research midterm portfolio is due at the beginning of the class period. Assignments for this portfolio submission include sections on:
1. Demographics
  2. Ethics
  3. Program and intervention descriptions
  4. Accessing literature for evidence-based practice
  5. Evaluating literature for evidence-based practice
  6. Needs Assessment
  7. Logic Model and Theory of Change
- Descriptions of what needs to be included in the portfolio
- March 1** Post your revised program and intervention descriptions along with your revised logic model on blackboard as directed. Read and review the logic models and accompanying descriptions of your student colleagues. On the designated blackboard discussion forum give feedback to each of the members of your group by **April 26<sup>th</sup>**. Feedback should include questions as well as comments. Use the feedback and ensuing dialog to help prepare your final portfolio. Include in your final portfolio at least a page that describes how you used the feedback from your student colleagues in the preparation of your final work.

- April 5th** Write a 3-5 page design for a system of data collection for your program. Include descriptions of the methods you would use for process evaluation, outcome evaluation, and impact evaluation. Attach a copy of an instrument that you will use in this system of evaluation to collect quantitative or qualitative data. Detailed directions for completing this assignment will be posted on blackboard
- April 23rd** Hand in data analysis exercises and written summaries from quantitative and qualitative workshop projects.
- May 3<sup>rd</sup>** **Final portfolio due in paper (hard) copy only** by Noon to the Charlotte campus classroom. Portfolios will be retained as proof of competency so please make a duplicate copy for yourself.

In addition to your revised midterm portfolio sections, the final portfolio should include sections relating to a system of evaluation for the program you plan to evaluate. These sections should include:

- 8 . Research questions for process, outcome and impact evaluations
- 9 . Research designs for process, outcome and impact evaluations
- 10 . Quantitative and qualitative methods that will be employed in the process, outcome, and impact evaluations
- 11 . At least one instrument that you would analyze quantitatively and one instrument that you would use qualitatively
- 12 . Challenges and constraints you expect to encounter in developing your system of how you plan to deal with these challenges and constraints