

**City University of Hong Kong  
Course Syllabus**

**offered by Department of Applied Social Sciences  
with effect from Semester B 2017/2018**

---

---

**Part I Course Overview**

**Course Title:** Programme Design & Evaluation

**Course Code:** SS5423

**Course Duration:** One semester

**Credit Units:** 3

**Level:** P5

**Medium of Instruction:** English

**Medium of Assessment:** English

**Prerequisites:**  
(Course Code and Title) Nil

**Precursors:**  
(Course Code and Title) Nil

**Equivalent Courses:**  
(Course Code and Title) Nil

**Exclusive Courses:**  
(Course Code and Title) Nil

## Part II Course Details

### 1. Abstract

This course provides participants with a critical understanding and application of designing and evaluating social programmes in human service settings. Proficient knowledge of the concepts, steps and skills to design and evaluate programmes will enable participants to have programmes implemented for continuous quality improvement.

### 2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

(CILOs state what the student is expected to be able to do at the end of the course according to a given standard of performance.)

No.	CILOs	Weighting (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	A2	A3
1.	describe the principles of programme design and evaluation and analyse existing practices of programme designing and evaluation;	20%	√	√	
2.	recognize the contexts and explain the purpose, design and characteristics of the role and practice of programme design and evaluation;	20%	√	√	
3.	identify evaluation requirements in the planning, designing and managing human service interventions for continuous quality improvement; and	30%	√	√	
4.	assess programme evaluability and recognize appropriate programme evaluation designs and methods to monitor human service deliveries.	30%	√	√	√
		100%			

A1: Attitude

*Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.*

A2: Ability

*Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.*

A3: Accomplishments

*Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.*

### 3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)

(TLAs designed to facilitate students' achievement of the CILOs.)

TLA	Brief Description	CILO No.						Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	4			
Lectures	Weekly lectures, with topics prepared and presented by	√	√	√	√			

	lecturers. The lectures may assign student to read essential and/or supplementary readings concerning the topics.							
Tutorial	Beginning from the 6 <sup>th</sup> week, approximately one hour weekly will be reserved for tutorial discussion. The purpose is to allow students to present and discuss the progress of their critique of their selected programme evaluation research report.	√	√	√	√			
Class Assignments	Individual and/or group assignments are provided to help students understand the applications of programme evaluation and related concepts.	√	√	√	√			
Group Presentation	Students are required to form small groups to prepare a programme evaluation proposal. There will be an oral presentation from each group on the progress of the preparation at the end of the teaching week.			√	√			

#### 4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

(ATs are designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs.)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.					Weighting	Remarks
	1	2	3	4			
Continuous Assessment: 100%							
Programme Evaluation Research Report Review To conduct a critical review of a selected programme evaluation study. The outcome of the individual project is to enable the participant to understand an evaluation research report with reference to the programme's design and evaluability. Each participant has to make an oral presentation on the selected study in the tutorial session and submit the final version (1500 words) in		√	√			20%	

writing.								
Class activities Both individual and/or group assignments on selected issues of academic and practical interests are introduced so as to assess students' understanding and application of programme evaluation and related concepts.	√	√	√	√			20%	
Group Project Students will form a group to select a programme from a human service organization and develop a proposal for the evaluation of the selected programme. There will be an oral presentation (10%) of the progress for each proposal, followed by class discussion and the submission of the final version (3000 words) of the Proposal (20%) at the end of the Semester.	√	√	√	√			30%	
Quiz A 90-minute multiple-choice and essay-type of quiz to assess the participants' understanding of the basic concepts and principles of programme design and evaluation.	√	√	√				30%	
Examination: ____% (duration: _____, if applicable)								100%

## 5. Assessment Rubrics

(Grading of student achievements is based on student performance in assessment tasks/activities with the following rubrics.)

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
1. Programme Evaluation Research Report Review (20%)	<p>1. Organisation: Refers to format and presentation: logical structure, good use of headings where appropriate; effective presentation.</p> <p>2. Originality: Refers to original thinking, creativity, innovative analysis</p> <p>3. Analysis: Refers to the quality, clarity, and depth of the analytical work involved in addressing questions and issues</p> <p>4. Research effort: Includes resourcefulness, effort, and diligence in the search for and presentation of suitable information</p> <p>5. English writing: Grammar, spelling, sentence construction, etc.</p> <p>6. Referencing: Refers to</p>	An excellent paper; very good mastery of the ideas or concepts, with excellent or innovative analysis. A is on the edge of this category, but still very good	A solid paper with reasonably good analysis and use of information.	Documentation, analysis, writing, use of concepts, referencing, and effort are mostly adequate for a passing grade, but with enough flaws and shortcomings that it cannot be judged to be “good” or “very good”.	Barely a pass. Many serious flaws and shortcomings, but adequate effort and some research	Does not demonstrate the minimum research effort and documentation; or substantial plagiarism

	the use of an accurate referencing system, appropriate citations in the essay, and avoidance of plagiarism.					
2. Group Project (30%)	<p>1. Organisation: Refers to format and presentation: logical structure, good use of headings where appropriate; effective presentation.</p> <p>2. Originality: Refers to original thinking, creativity, innovative analysis</p> <p>3. Analysis: Refers to the quality, clarity, and depth of the analytical work involved in addressing questions and issues</p> <p>4. Research effort: Includes resourcefulness, effort, and diligence in the search for and presentation of suitable information</p> <p>5. Ability in communication: English proficiency</p>	An excellent presentation; very good mastery of the ideas or concepts, with excellent or innovative analysis. A is on the edge of this category, but still very good	A solid presentation with reasonably good analysis and use of information.	Documentation, analysis, use of concepts, referencing, and effort are mostly adequate for a passing grade, but with enough flaws and shortcomings that it cannot be judged to be “good” or “very good”.	Barely a pass. Many serious flaws and shortcomings, but adequate effort and some research	Does not demonstrate the minimum research effort and documentation
3. Class assignments (20%)	Ability to apply relevant concepts and skills related to programme evaluation and design.	High	Significant	Moderate	Basic	Not even reaching marginal levels
4. Quiz (30%)	Scores of MCQ and essay-type questions obtained	75 marks or above	60 to 74 marks	45 to 59 marks	40 to 44 marks	Below 40 marks

### Part III Other Information (more details can be provided separately in the teaching plan)

#### 1. Keyword Syllabus

(An indication of the key topics of the course.)

The context of program evaluation; Program design, Logic model, and program management; Fundamentals of program evaluation; The evaluation practice; Ethics in programme design and evaluation; Needs assessment and evaluability assessment; Quantitative and qualitative approaches; single-systems designs; indicators construction; Validity and reliability of performance measurement tools; Data analysis and interpretation; Distinguishing effectiveness and efficiency; Report Writing.

#### 2. Reading List

##### 2.1 Compulsory Readings

(Compulsory readings can include books, book chapters, or journal/magazine articles. There are also collections of e-books, e-journals available from the CityU Library.)

1.	Royse, D., Bruce, A. T. & Padgett, D. K. (2010) <i>Program Evaluation: An Introduction, 5th Ed.</i> Belmont, C A.: Wadsworth.
2.	Wholey, J.S., Hatry, H.P., & Newcomer, K.E. (Eds). (2010) <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation, 3rd Ed [electronic resource]</i> . San Francisco : Jossey-Bass. (E-book)

##### 2.2 Additional Readings

(Additional references for students to learn to expand their knowledge about the subject.)

1.	Bamberger, M., Rugh, J. & Mabry, L. (2006) <i>Real World Evaluation</i> . London: Sage.
2.	Bloom, M. & Fischer, J. (2006) <i>Evaluation Practice: Guidelines for the Accountable Professional, 5th Ed.</i> New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
3.	Darling R. B. (2000) <i>The Partnership Model in Human Services : Sociological Foundations and Practices</i> . New York : Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers.
4.	Donaldson, Stewart I. & Scriven, M. (Eds). (2003) <i>Evaluating Social Programs and Problems: Visions for the New Millennium</i> . London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
5.	Donna, D. M. & Mertens, A.T. (2012) <i>Program evaluation theory and practice : a comprehensive guide</i> . New York, NY : Guilford Press.
6.	Engel, R.J. & Schutt, R.K. (2005) "How to Read a Research Article" in <i>The Practice of Research in Social Work</i> . London: Sage Publications.
7.	Fitzpatrick, J.L., Sanders, J.R. & Worthen, B.R. (2004) <i>Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines, 3rd Ed.</i> Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
8.	Frechtling, J.A. (2007) <i>Logic Modelling Methods in Program Evaluation</i> . Wiley.
9.	Grinnell, Jr. R. M., & Unrau, Y. A. (2014). <i>Social work research and evaluation: Foundations of evidence-based practice, 10th Ed.</i> Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10.	McDavid, J.C. & Hawthorn, L.R.L. (2006) <i>Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement</i> . Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
11.	Nugent, W.R.; Sieppert, J.D. and Hudson, W.W. (2001) <i>Practice Evaluation for the 21st Century</i> . USA: Wadsworth.
12.	Posavac, E. J. & Carey, Raymond G. (2010) <i>Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies 8th Ed.</i> NJ: Prentice Hall.
13.	Rossi, P.H., Freeman, H.E., & Wright, S.R. (2004) <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, 4th Ed.</i> London: Sage Publications.

14.	Schalock, R.L. (2001) <i>Outcome-based Evaluation, 2nd Ed.</i> NY: Kluwer Academic. Plenum Publishers.
15.	Stufflebeam, D.L. (2001) "Evaluation Models." In <i>New directions for evaluation</i> . Volume 2001 Issue 89. Special Issue.
16.	Stufflebeam, D.L. & Shinkfield, A.J. (2007) <i>Evaluation theory, models, and applications</i> . San Francisco, Calif. : Jossey-Bass.
17.	Unrau, Y.A., Gabor, P.A., & Grinnell, R.M.Jr. (2001) <u>Evaluation in the Human Services</u> . UK: Brooks/Cole Thomson Learning.
18.	Unrau, Y. A., Gabor, P. A. & Grinnell, Jr., R. M. (2007) <i>Evaluation in social work: The art and science of practice, 4th Ed [electronic resource]</i> . Oxford ; New York : Oxford University Press (E-book).