

SS3422: PROGRAMME PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Effective Term

Semester A 2022/23

Part I Course Overview

Course Title

Programme Planning and Evaluation

Subject Code

SS - Social and Behavioural Sciences

Course Number

3422

Academic Unit

Social and Behavioural Sciences (SS)

College/School

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CH)

Course Duration

One Semester

Credit Units

3

Level

B1, B2, B3, B4 - Bachelor's Degree

Medium of Instruction

English

Medium of Assessment

English

Prerequisites

Nil

Precursors

Nil

Equivalent Courses

SS3422 Programme Evaluation

Exclusive Courses

Nil

Part II Course Details

Abstract

This course will provide a fundamental understanding of the purpose, design, and implementation of program evaluations in human service settings. Proficient knowledge of the concepts, skills and steps to plan and to implement a programme evaluation will enable students to assess and conduct programme evaluation studies of sociological practice in human service settings.

Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

CILOs		Weighting (if app.)	DEC-A1	DEC-A2	DEC-A3
1	Recognize the contexts and explain the purpose, design and characteristics of the role and practice of programme evaluation in human services;	30	x	x	
2	Identify evaluation requirements in the planning, designing and managing human service interventions for continuous quality improvement;	20	x	x	
3	Assess programme evaluability and recognize appropriate programme evaluation designs to monitor human service deliveries; and	30	x	x	x
4	Plan small scale programme evaluation studies.	20	x	x	

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 real-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.

Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)

TLAs	Brief Description	CILO No.	Hours/week (if applicable)
1	TLA1: Lecture	Weekly lectures, with topics prepared and presented by lecturers. The lectures may assign student to read essential and/or supplementary readings concerning the topics.	1, 2, 3, 4

2	TLA2: Tutorial	Beginning from the 5th 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.	1, 2, 3, 4	
3	TLA3: 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.	3, 4	

Assessment Tasks / Activities (ATs)

ATs	CILO No.	Weighting (%)	Remarks (e.g. Parameter for GenAI use)
1 AT1: ProgrammeEvaluation Research Report Review	1, 2	40	
2 AT2: Group Project	1, 2, 3, 4	20	
3 AT3: Group Presentation	3, 4	10	
4 AT4: Quiz	1, 2, 3, 4	30	

Continuous Assessment (%)

100

Examination (%)

0

Assessment Rubrics (AR)**Assessment Task**

1. Programme Evaluation Research Report Review

Criterion

Organisation: Refers to format and presentation: logical structure, good use of headings where appropriate# effective presentation.

Originality: Refers to original thinking, creativity, innovative analysis and critique

Analysis: Refers to the quality, clarity, and depth of the analytical work involved in addressing questions and issues

English writing: Grammar, spelling, sentence construction, etc.

Referencing: Refers to the use of an accurate referencing system, appropriate citations in the essay, and avoidance of plagiarism.

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

an excellent paper# very good mastery of the ideas or concepts, with excellent or innovative analysis or critique. A is on the edge of this category, but still very good

Good (B+, B, B-)

a solid paper with reasonably good analysis and use of information.

Fair (C+, C, C-)

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” .

Marginal (D)

barely a pass. Many serious flaws and shortcomings, but adequate effort and some research

Failure (F)

does not demonstrate the minimum research effort and documentation# or substantial plagiarism

Assessment Task

2. Group Project

Criterion

1. Ability to show good understanding and thoughtful ideas of an evaluation proposal

Excellent (A+, A, A-)

High

Good (B+, B, B-)

Significant

Fair (C+, C, C-)

Moderate

Marginal (D)

Basic

Failure (F)

Not even reaching the marginal level

Part III Other Information

Keyword Syllabus

Origin and key concepts, current trends and issues in program evaluation. Uses and purposes of evaluation. Research designs and methods in programme evaluation. Setting boundaries and analyzing the evaluation context. Design and implementation of performance measurement system. Data analysis and interpretation. Reporting and using evaluation information. Client satisfaction. Goal attainment scaling. Ethical issues. Writing evaluation proposals and programme evaluation exercises.

Reading List

Compulsory Readings

Title	
1	Donna, D. M. & Mertens, A.T. (2012) Program evaluation theory and practice : a comprehensive guide. New York, NY : Guilford Press.

2	Wholey, J.S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, C. E. (Eds) (2010) Handbook of practical programevaluation, 3rd Ed. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass. (check for electronic resource)
---	--

Additional Readings

Title	
1	Bamberger, M., Rugh, J. and Mabry, L. (2006). RealWorld evaluation. London: Sage.
2	Bloom, M., & Fischer, J. (2006). Evaluation practice: Guidelines for the accountable professional(5th ed.).New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
3	Donaldson, S. I., Christie, C. A., and Mark, M. M. (ed.) (2009) What Counts as Credible Evidencein Applied research and Evaluation Practices? SAGE
4	Donaldson, S. I., & Scriven, Michael (Eds.). (2003). Evaluating social programs and problems:Visions for the new millennium. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
5	Donna, D. M. & Mertens, A. T. (2012) Program evaluation theory and practice : a comprehensiveguide. New York: Guilford Press.
6	Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). Program evaluation:Alternativeapproaches and practical guidelines (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
7	McDavid, J. C., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (2006). Program evaluation and performance measurement.Thousand Oaks, Calif.:Sage Publications.
8	Nugent, W. R., Sieppert, Jackie D., & Hudson, Walter W. (2001). Practice evaluation for the 21stCentury. USA: Wardsworth.
9	Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Wright, S. R. (2004). Evaluation: A systematic approach (4th ed.).London: Sage Publications.
10	Schallock, R. L. (2001). Outcome-based evaluation (2nd ed.). NY: Kluwer Academic/PlenumPublishers.
11	Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation models. New directions for evaluation, 2001(89): 7-89.
12	Unrau, Y. A, Gabor, P. A. & Grinnell, Jr., R. M. (2007) Evaluation in social work [electronicresource] : the art and science of practice. New York : Oxford University Press.
13	Yuen, F. K. O., & Terao, K. L. (2003). Practical grant writing and program evaluation. UK: Brooks/Cole Thomson Learning.