

PSYC*6840 Program Evaluation, Course Outline: Winter 2025

General Information

Some courses are offered virtually and some face to face. **This course is offered using the Face-to-Face format. The course has a set day, time, and location of class.**

Course Title: Program Evaluation

Course Description:

- This course introduces students to key components of program evaluation. The course comprises readings, lectures, discussions, presentations, and in-class exercises.
- Emphasis is placed on participation, application of knowledge and development of evaluation skills, including methods of program evaluation and the process of consultation with program staff.
- Students will engage in a project that involves working with an organization to design a plausible program evaluation plan and then present this plan to the group.

Credit Weight: 0.5

Academic Department (or campus): Psychology

Semester Offering: Winter 2025

Class Schedule and Location: Mondays, 2:30-5:20pm; Macdonald Institute (MINS) 128

Instructor Information

Instructor Name: Dr. Genevieve Monaghan, Ph.D., C.Psych

Instructor Email: gmonag03@uoguelph.ca

Office location and office hours: TBD

Course Content

Specific Learning Outcomes:

By the end of the term, students will be able to:

1. Understand how psychology is uniquely positioned to contribute to program evaluation across different settings.

2. Identify key characteristics of the following approaches to program evaluation: needs assessment, evaluability assessment, process evaluation, and outcome evaluation.
3. Identify methodologies and data analysis approaches (e.g., participatory, quantitative, qualitative methods) relevant to program evaluation.
4. Engage community stakeholders in mutually beneficial and respectful partnership (for the purpose of designing a program evaluation plan).
5. Assess evaluation needs, process, and outcome-related issues in the context of designing a program evaluation plan.
6. Create a program logic model.
7. Apply program evaluation knowledge and skills to design a program evaluation plan.
8. Evaluate existing programs (from the literature) and the nature of their evaluation process and findings.
9. Present their learning to their peers in a clear, concise, engaging format.

Lecture Content:

Week	Date	Content	Due?
1	Jan 06 2025	Course introduction: what is program evaluation and why does it matter? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key terms • role of psychology • overview of 3 part assignment • community partnership plan 	
2	Jan 13 2025	Community partner 1: Children's foundation Community partner 2: St Joe's Hamilton Engaging with Stakeholders	
3	Jan 20 2025	Community partner 2: TBD Community partner 4: TBD Engaging with Stakeholders	
4	Jan 27 2025	Theories of Change and Logic Modelling	
5	Feb 03 2025	Evaluation questions, indicators, and frameworks	PART 1
6	Feb 10 2025	Guest Lecture Performance measurement and formative evaluation	
7	Feb 17 2025	FAMILY DAY	
8	Feb 24 2025	Outcome evaluation and evaluation designs	
9	Mar 03 2025	Culture and Context	PART 2

10	Mar 2025	10	Data collection strategies	
11	Mar 2025	17	Data analysis	
12	Mar 2025	24	Communication of findings	Part 3 presentations
13	Mar 2024	31	Last day of class Course summary	Part 3 presentations
14	April 7 2024	PART 3 DUE		

Lecture

Readings:

Week	Readings
1	<p><u>Required Reading:</u></p> <p>Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Part 1: The Landscape of Evaluation. In Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: the Guilford Press. (pp. 1-48).</p> <p>Optional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McKegg, K., Oakden, J., Wehipeihana, N., King, J. (2018). Evaluation Building Blocks: A Guide. The Kinnect Group: www.kinnect.co.nz • Patton, Michael Quinn (2014). Evaluation Flash Cards: Embedding Evaluative Thinking in Organizational Culture. St. Paul, MN: Otto Bremer Foundation, ottobremer.org. • Patton, M. Q. (2013). Utilization-focused evaluation checklist. Retrieved from https://wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists. • IDRC Evaluation (2012). Identifying the Intended User(s) and Use(s) of an Evaluation.
2 & 3	<p><u>Required Reading:</u></p> <p>Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Ch. 7: Working with Stakeholders. In Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: the Guilford Press. (First half of chapter, pp. 209-229).</p> <p>John M. Bryson, Michael Quinn Patton (2015). Analyzing and Engaging Stakeholders (Ch. 2). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 4th Ed. Kathryn E. Newcomer, Harry P. Hatry, Joseph S. Wholey, Eds.</p>

4	<p><u>Required Reading:</u></p> <p>Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Ch. 7: Working with Stakeholders. In Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: the Guilford Press. (second half of chapter, pp. 229- 243).</p> <p><u>Other Useful Resources:</u></p> <p>Hoggarth, Liz, Comfort, Hilary (2010). Identifying Outcomes (Ch. 3). A Practical Guide to Outcome Evaluation. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.</p> <p>MacDonald, G. (2018). Checklist of key considerations for development of program logic models. Retrieved from https://wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists.</p> <p>Treasury Board of Canada (2012). Theory-Based Approaches to Evaluation: Concepts and Practices https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/audit/evaluation/centre-excellence-evaluation/theory-based-approaches-evaluation-concepts-practices.html</p>
5	<p><u>Required Reading:</u></p> <p>Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Ch. 8: Evaluation Purposes, Types and Questions. In Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: the Guilford Press. (pp. 245-286).</p> <p><u>Other Useful Resources:</u></p> <p>Hoggarth, Liz, Comfort, Hilary (2010). What Do I need to Know to Answer the Key Evaluation Questions? (Ch. 6). A Practical Guide to Outcome Evaluation. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.</p> <p>Goldie MacDonald (2002). Criteria for Selection of High-Performing Indicators: A Checklist to Inform Monitoring and Evaluation. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia. Retrieved from https://wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists.</p> <p>Peel Regional Evaluation Platform (n.d.). Evaluation Readiness Quiz. Retrieved from https://peeevaluates.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/PREP_Download_Eval-Readiness_Quiz.pdf</p>
6	<p><u>Require Reading:</u></p>

	<p>Graham (2018). Formative Evaluation Toolkit: A Step-by-Step Guide and Resources for Evaluating Program Implementation and Early Outcomes. Administration for Children and Families. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.</p> <p><u>Other Useful Resources</u></p> <p>Poister, T.H., (2015). Performance Measurement: Monitoring Program Outcomes (Ch. 5). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 4th Ed. Kathryn E. Newcomer, Harry P. Hatry, Joseph S. Wholey, Eds.</p>
8	<p><u>Required Reading:</u></p> <p>Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Ch. 9: Evaluation Designs. In Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: the Guilford Press. (pp. 287-334).</p> <p><u>Other Useful Resources</u></p> <p>Rida Abboud & Caroline Claussen (2016). The use of Outcome Harvesting in learning-oriented and collaborative inquiry approaches to evaluation: An example from Calgary, Alberta. Evaluation and Program Planning, Volume, 59, p.47-54</p>
7	FAMILY DAY
9	<p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <p>Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres. (2016). USAI (Utility, Self-Voicing, Access, Inter-Relationality) Research Framework. Toronto: Author.</p> <p>Dean-Coffey, Jara (2018). What's Race Got to Do With It? Equity and Philanthropic Evaluation Practice. American Journal of Evaluation, 39 (4), 527-542.</p> <p><u>Other Useful Resources</u></p> <p>Stafford Hood, Rodney K. Hopson, Karen E. Kirkhart (2015). Culturally Responsive Evaluation (Ch. 12). In Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 4th Ed. Kathryn E. Newcomer, Harry P. Hatry, Joseph S. Wholey, Eds.</p> <p>Cram, F. (2018). Conclusion: Lessons about Indigenous evaluation. In F. Cram, K. A. Tibbetts, & J. LaFrance (Eds.), Indigenous Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 159, 121–133.</p>

10	<p>Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Chapter 10: Data Collection Strategies and Indicators. In Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: the Guilford Press. (pp. 335-394).</p> <p><u>Other Useful Resources</u></p> <p>Harry P. Hatry, Kathryn E. Newcomer (2015) Pitfalls in Evaluations (Ch. 26). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 4th Ed. Kathryn E. Newcomer, Harry P. Hatry, Joseph S. Wholey, Eds.</p> <p>Lasby, D. (2018). The State of Evaluation: Measurement And Evaluation Practices In Ontario's Nonprofit Sector. Toronto: Ontario Nonprofit Network and Imagine Canada.</p>
11	<p><u>Required Reading:</u></p> <p>Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Chapter 12: Data Analysis and Interpretation. In Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: the Guilford Press. (pp. 425-458).</p>
12	<p><u>Required Reading:</u></p> <p>Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Chapter 13: Communication and Utilization of Findings. In Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: the Guilford Press. (pp. 461-495).</p> <p><u>Other Useful Resources</u></p> <p>Grob, George (2015). Writing for Impact (Ch. 28). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 4th Ed. Kathryn E. Newcomer, Harry P. Hatry, Joseph S. Wholey, Eds.</p>
13	Course Wrap Up

Course Assignments:

Assignment	Due Date	Contribution to Final Mark (%)	Learning Outcomes Assessed
PE Project Part 1	Feb 10 2025	20%	1-4, 6

PE Project Part 2	Mar 10 2025	20%	1-6
PE Project Part 3	Apr 07 2025	40%	1-4, 6, 7, 9
Presentation*	Final 1-2 classes	8%	All
Participation (attendance)**	ongoing	6%	All
Participation (active discussion/contribution)**	ongoing	6%	All

Additional information:

(*) 8% of your final mark is determined by your class presentation. Each group members will present 1 of the 3 parts to the class.

(**) 12% of your final mark is determined by participation - 0.5% for each class attended (totalling 6%) and 0.5% for your participation during the class. For those with valid absences, alternatives can be discussed with the instructor.

See more information about these assignments at the end of this document.

Course Resources

No Textbook or Learning Resource Costs Associated with the Course

All resources for this course can be found within the Courselink site. There are no costs for required or recommended textbooks or learning resources for students in this course.

Assigned Readings

We will be reading mostly from the primary text; however there are some additional resources listed and posted on courselink.

Recommended Texts (available on courselink):

Mertens, D. & Williams, A. (2019). Program Evaluation Theory and Practice (2nd Ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.

Other Resources:

Articles are posted on courselink

Course Policies

Course Updates and Announcements

Course updates and announcements will be posted on Courselink; please check this regularly.

Submission & Grading Policies

Please submit all assignments by email by 11:59pm on the due date. Please see the [Graduate Grade Interpretation](#) for the University grading policy.

Late Assignments & Extensions

Assignments submitted late will receive a deduction of 10% per calendar day. If you know you will be unable to complete an assignment by its due date, please let me know in advance. Extensions may be granted depending on circumstances. Proper documentation (e.g., medical note) may be required in the event of late assignments or extension requests.

Course Policy regarding use of electronic devices and recording of lectures:

I will make my slides available on courselink. Electronic recording of classes by students is expressly forbidden without consent of the instructor. When recordings are permitted they are solely for the use of the authorized student and may not be reproduced, or transmitted to others, without the express written consent of the instructor. As a student, you have the right to protect your privacy online and may choose to turn off your video and/or audio when in session. In the event that your video and/or audio remain on, please note that you are consenting to your presence in lecture recordings. Under no circumstances are you permitted to transmit copies of the recordings to others, without the express written consent of the instructor. Since much of the class will involve discussion, I will check with the group at the first class to see whether people are comfortable with their contributions being recorded.

Course Policy on Group Work:

This course involves extensive groupwork. Students will be graded based on their individual contributions as well as the overall final product of the group.

University Policies

Disclaimer:

Please note that a revision of the format of course offerings, changes in classroom protocols, and academic schedules is occasionally required. Any such changes will be announced via CourseLink and/or class email. This includes on-campus scheduling during the semester, mid-terms and final examination schedules.

Academic Consideration

When you find yourself unable to meet an in-course requirement because of illness or compassionate reasons, please advise the course instructor in writing, with your name, id#, and e-mail contact. See the academic calendar for information on regulations and procedures for

Academic Consideration:

[Grounds for Academic Consideration](#)

Academic Misconduct

The University of Guelph is committed to upholding the highest standards of academic integrity and it is the responsibility of all members of the University community, faculty, staff, and students to be aware of what constitutes academic misconduct and to do as much as possible to prevent academic offences from occurring.

University of Guelph students have the responsibility of abiding by the University's policy on academic misconduct regardless of their location of study; faculty, staff and students have the responsibility of supporting an environment that discourages misconduct. Students need to remain aware that instructors have access to and the right to use electronic and other means of detection. Please note: Whether or not a student intended to commit academic misconduct is not relevant for a finding of guilt. Hurried or careless submission of assignments does not excuse students from responsibility for verifying the academic integrity of their work before submitting it. Students who are in any doubt as to whether an action on their part could be construed as an academic offence should consult with a faculty member or faculty advisor.

The Academic Misconduct Policy is detailed in the [Graduate Calendar](#):

Illness

Medical notes will not normally be required for singular instances of academic consideration, although students may be required to provide supporting documentation for multiple missed assessments or when involving a large part of a course (e.g., final exam or major assignment).

Accessibility

The University of Guelph is committed to creating a barrier-free environment. Providing services for students is a shared responsibility among students, faculty and administrators. This relationship is based on respect of individual rights, the dignity of the individual and the University community's shared commitment to an open and supportive learning environment. Students requiring service or accommodation, whether due to an identified, ongoing disability or a short-term disability should contact [Student Accessibility Services](#) as soon as possible.

For more information, contact SAS at 519-824-4120 ext. 54335 or email accessibility@uoguelph.ca or the [Student Accessibility Services Website](#)

Student Feedback Questionnaire

These questionnaires (formerly course evaluations) will be available to students during the last 2 weeks of the semester. Students will receive an email directly from the Student Feedback Administration system which will include a direct link to the questionnaire for this course. During this time, when a student goes to login to Courselink, a reminder will pop-up when a task is available to complete.

[Student Feedback Questionnaire](#)

Drop date

The last date to drop one-semester courses, without academic penalty, is Friday April 4, 2025. For regulations and procedures for Dropping Courses, see the [Schedule of Dates in the Academic Calendar](#).

Instructors must provide [meaningful and constructive feedback, at minimum 20% of the final course grade, prior to the 40th class day](#). For courses which are of shorter duration, 20% of the final grade must be provided two-thirds of the way through the course.

[Current Graduate Calendar](#)

Additional Course Information

Course instructors are allowed to use software to help in detecting plagiarism or unauthorized copying of student assignments. Plagiarism is one of the most common types of academic misconduct on our campus. Plagiarism involves students using the work, ideas and/or the exact wording of other people or sources without giving proper credit to others for the work, ideas and/or words in their papers. Students can unintentionally commit misconduct because they do not know how to reference outside sources properly or because they don't check their work carefully enough before handing it in. Whether or not a student intended to commit academic misconduct is not relevant for a finding of guilt. Hurried or careless submission of assignments does not excuse students from responsibility for verifying the academic integrity of their work before submitting it. Students who are in any doubt as to whether an action on their part could be construed as an academic offence should consult with a faculty member or faculty advisor.

In this course, your instructor will be using Turnitin.com to detect possible plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration or copying as part of the ongoing efforts to prevent plagiarism in the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences.

A major benefit of using Turnitin is that students will be able to educate and empower themselves in preventing misconduct. In this course, you may screen your own assignments through Turnitin as many times as you wish before the due date. You will be able to see and print reports that

show you exactly where you have properly and improperly referenced the outside sources and materials in your assignment.

Description of Course Assignments

Overview of 3-Part Program Evaluation Project

Over the course of the term, you will work in teams to develop a program evaluation plan in partnership with a community organization. You will apply knowledge from your readings and class discussions/exercises to create an evaluation plan that can be used by your community partner. This project involves collaborating with a community program/organization. To complete your project, you will need to arrange approximately 2-3 meetings with your organization/program throughout the term. **Organize your first meeting as soon as possible (this process often takes longer than anticipated).** Your first meeting must occur before Part 1 is due.

Each assignment involves creating sections of what will ultimately become a comprehensive evaluation plan. As you learn more about the program over the term, your understanding of the evaluation purpose and intended outcomes may evolve. Consequently, there is some overlap in the questions asked across assignments.

Project Components & Due Dates

- **PE Project Part 1:** Due **February 10, 2025**
- **PE Project Part 2:** Due **March 10, 2025**
- **PE Project Part 3:** Due **April 7, 2025**

All parts of the project should be submitted via email by 11:59 PM on the due date.

Part 1: Program Overview (20%)

Write a brief overview of your partner organization and the specific program for which you are designing a program evaluation plan. This assignment should be no more than 10 pages, double-spaced, and should include the following sections:

1. **Description of Organization:** Provide a brief description of the organization, including its mission, structure, other programs delivered, and any additional information to explain the context within which the program operates.
2. **Description of Program:** Summarize the goals of the specific program to be evaluated. Include an overview of program content/curriculum, theoretical/empirical/practical

basis, and a brief explanation of how the program works (e.g., recruitment of participants, location, etc.).

3. **Evidence of Need for Program:** Identify the key needs in the community that the program is designed to address. What issues in the lives of the people served does this program aim to resolve?
4. **Stakeholders:** Describe the program stakeholders, including those involved in program delivery, those who can use the evaluation results, and those directly served by the program.
5. **Evaluation Purpose and Considerations:** Explain why the organization is interested in evaluation and the questions to be addressed. Describe how the program intends to use the evaluation findings. Reflect on your approach to the evaluation design and the questions or issues you will consider as you move to Part 2.

Assessment of Part 1:

Criteria	Points
Program Description	4
Program Purpose & Theory	4
Evidence of Need for Program	2.5
Stakeholders	2.5
Evaluation Questions & Considerations	5
Grammar/Style	2
Total	20

Part 2: Exploratory Assessment & Program Logic Model (20%)

Building on Part 1, this assignment involves an overview of program needs, readiness for evaluation, and a detailed program logic model. Include the following sections:

1. **Program Logic Model Diagram and Written Description:** Create a logic model that includes key activities, short-term outcomes, long-term outcomes, and the ultimate goal. Optionally, include outputs, guiding principles, or target populations. Submit a diagram

(e.g., PowerPoint) and a text description (~2 pages), including validity assumptions for the causal links.

2. **Evaluability Assessment (Max 2 Pages, Double-Spaced):** Outline the program's readiness for evaluation, including:
 - Agreement on program goals among stakeholders.
 - Clarity and feasibility of program design.
 - Agreement on evaluation needs and goals among stakeholders.
 - Accessibility of evaluation data (include specific examples).
 - Willingness and ability of intended users to use evaluation results.
3. **Evaluation Questions:** Identify specific evaluation questions, addressing at least three prioritized outcomes (short-term or long-term) from your logic model. Explain how these questions are practical and useful to the program.

Assessment of Part 2:

Criteria	Points
Program Logic Model	10
Evaluability Assessment	4
Evaluation Questions	4
Grammar/Style	2
Total	20

Part 3: Evaluation Plan (40%)

Develop and describe a plan for conducting an outcome evaluation, including consideration of process-related issues. Your plan should include:

1. **Evaluation Framework Table:** Include columns for:
 - Outcome Objective.
 - Evaluation Questions.
 - Indicators (data required to answer evaluation questions).
 - Measures and Tools (methods for collecting data).
 - Data Sources (information origin, timing, and collector).
2. **Evaluation Design:** Provide detailed descriptions of:

- Measures/Tools: Discuss their validity, reliability, and whether they are existing or custom-developed.
 - Administration Details: Who administers tools, timing, and quality assurance.
 - Data Management: Storage and handling procedures.
3. **Analysis and Interpretation:** Describe:
 - Planned analyses.
 - Interpretation criteria for success.
 - Major validity threats and mitigation strategies.
 - How findings will be presented and used by the program.
 4. **Ethical Considerations:** Briefly outline ethical issues and their impact on your design.
 5. **Executive Summary:** Create a half-page summary for senior management, highlighting the evaluation's value and requirements for implementation.

Assessment of Part 3:

Criteria	Points
Evaluation Framework Table	10
Evaluation Design	8
Analysis and Interpretation	8
Ethical Considerations	4
Executive Summary	4
Overall Coherence of Plan	4
Grammar/Style	2
Total	40

Part 3 Presentation (8%)

Prepare a presentation of up to 30 slides (30-45 minutes), summarizing your project. Explain the project's importance and potential impact. Be creative! Assessment includes group and individual components:

- **Group** **(4%):**

- Clarity of slides (1%).
- Creativity of slides (1%).
- Presentation flow (1%).
- Audience engagement (1%).

- **Individual** **(4%):**

- Clarity of presentation (1%).
- Preparation (1%).
- Creativity (1%).
- Audience engagement (1%).