SOCA6240 - Social Program Evaluation
Course Outline

Course Co-ordinator: Lena Rodriguez
Room: W314
Ph: 49215094
Fax: 49216933
Email: Lena.Rodriguez@newcastle.edu.au
Consultation hours: Tuesday 2-4pm

Course Overview
Semester: Semester 2 - 2007
Unit Weighting: 10

Teaching Methods
Email Discussion Group
Tutorial

Contact Hours
Email Discussion Group for 2 hours per week for the full term
Tutorial for 2 hours per week for the full term

Brief Course Description
The purpose of this subject is to introduce students to the range of research activities, techniques and applications essential for designing, implementing and appraising social programs, including those addressing health, mental health and social welfare issues.

Learning Materials/Texts

Course Objectives
The specific objectives are to provide students with the knowledge and skills to assess the extent and severity of problems requiring social interventions; design
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programs to ameliorate social problems; assess the utility of new programs and initiatives; and assess the merits of existing programs and attempts to improve them. Students will develop the ability to increase the effectiveness of program management and administration; satisfy accountability requirements of program sponsors; and maximise the use of evaluation results to improve programs.

**Course Content**
1. Programs, policies and evaluations
2. Diagnostic procedures
3. Tailoring evaluations and program monitoring
4. Strategies for impact assessment
5. Randomised designs for impact assessment
6. Quasi-experimental impact assessments
7. Assessment of full-coverage programs
8. Measuring efficiency: cost-benefit analysis
9. Social context of evaluation-dissemination and utilisation of evaluation results

**Assessment Items**

| Essays / Written Assignments | Classroom presentations of reading, qualitative data analysis project, major essay |

**Assumed Knowledge**

n/a

**Callaghan Campus Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL PROGRAM EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enquiries: School of Humanities and Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2 - 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist. Learn</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>19:00 - 20:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

and Tutorial | Tuesday | 11:00 - 13:00 | [GP1-30] |

**Plagiarism**

University policy prohibits students plagiarising any material under any circumstances. A student plagiarises if he or she presents the thoughts or works of another as one's own. Without limiting the generality of this definition, it may include:

- copying or paraphrasing material from any source without due acknowledgment;
- using another's ideas without due acknowledgment;
- working with others without permission and presenting the resulting work as though it was completed independently.

Plagiarism is not only related to written works, but also to material such as data, images, music, formulae, websites and computer programs.

Aiding another student to plagiarise is also a violation of the Plagiarism Policy and may invoke a penalty.
For further information on the University policy on plagiarism, please refer to the Policy on Student Academic Integrity at the following link -


The University has established a software plagiarism detection system called Turnitin. When you submit assessment items please be aware that for the purpose of assessing any assessment item the University may -

- Reproduce this assessment item and provide a copy to another member of the University; and/or
- Communicate a copy of this assessment item to a plagiarism checking service (which may then retain a copy of the item on its database for the purpose of future plagiarism checking);
- Submit the assessment item to other forms of plagiarism checking

Written Assessment Items

Students may be required to provide written assessment items in electronic form as well as hard copy.

Extension of Time for Assessment Items, Deferred Assessment and Special Consideration for Assessment Items or Formal Written Examinations

Students are required to submit assessment items by the due date, as advised in the Course Outline, unless the Course Coordinator approves an extension of time for submission of the item. University policy is that an assessment item submitted after the due date, without an approved extension, will be penalised.

Any student:

1. who is applying for an extension of time for submission of an assessment item on the basis of medical, compassionate, hardship/trauma or unavoidable commitment; or

2. whose attendance at or performance in an assessment item or formal written examination has been or will be affected by medical, compassionate, hardship/trauma or unavoidable commitment;

must report the circumstances, with supporting documentation, to the appropriate officer following the instructions provided in the Special Circumstances Affecting Assessment Procedure - Policy 000641.

Note: different procedures apply for minor and major assessment tasks.

Please go to the Policy at http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000641.html for further information, particularly for information on the options available to you.

Students should be aware of the following important deadlines:

- Requests for Special Consideration must be lodged no later than 3 working days after the due date of submission or examination.
· **Requests for Extensions of Time on Assessment Items** must be lodged no later than the due date of the item.

· **Requests for Rescheduling Exams** must be received in the Student Hub no later than ten working days prior the first date of the examination period

Your application may not be accepted if it is received after the deadline. Students who are unable to meet the above deadlines due to extenuating circumstances should speak to their Program Officer in the first instance.

### Changing your Enrolment

The last dates to withdraw without financial or academic penalty (called the HECS Census Dates) are:

For semester 1 courses: 31 March 2007

For semester 2 courses: 31 August 2007

For Trimester 1 courses: 16 February 2007

For Trimester 2 courses: 8 June 2007


Students may withdraw from a course without academic penalty on or before the last day of semester. Any withdrawal from a course after the last day of semester will result in a fail grade.

Students cannot enrol in a new course after the second week of semester/trimester, except under exceptional circumstances. Any application to add a course after the second week of semester/trimester must be on the appropriate form, and should be discussed with staff in the Student Hubs.

To change your enrolment online, please refer to


### Faculty Information

The Student Hubs are a one-stop shop for the delivery of student related services and are the first point of contact for students on campus.

The four Student Hubs are located at:

**Callaghan campus**

· Shortland Hub: Level 3, Shortland Union Building

· Hunter Hub: Student Services Centre, Hunter side of campus
Faculty website
Faculty of Education and Arts
http://www.newcastle.edu.au/faculty/education-arts/

Contact details
Callaghan
Phone: 02 4921 5000
Email: EnquiryCentre@newcastle.edu.au

The Dean of Students
Resolution Precinct
Phone: 02 4921 5806
Fax: 02 4921 7151
Email: resolutionprecinct@newcastle.edu.au

Deputy Dean of Students (Ourimbah)
Phone: 02 4348 4123
Fax: 02 4348 4145
Email: resolutionprecinct@newcastle.edu.au

Various services are offered by the University Student Support Unit:

Alteration of this Course Outline

No change to this course outline will be permitted after the end of the second week of the term except in exceptional circumstances and with Head of School approval. Students will be notified in advance of any approved changes to this outline.

Web Address for Rules Governing Postgraduate Academic Awards

STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY OR CHRONIC ILLNESS

The University is committed to providing a range of support services for students with a disability or chronic illness.

If you have a disability or chronic illness which you feel may impact on your studies, please feel free to discuss your support needs with your lecturer or course coordinator.

Disability Support may also be provided by the Student Support Service (Disability). Students must be registered to receive this type of support. To register please contact the Disability Liaison Officer on 02 4921 5766, or via email at: student-disability@newcastle.edu.au

As some forms of support can take a few weeks to implement it is extremely
important that you discuss your needs with your lecturer, course coordinator or Student Support Service staff at the beginning of each semester.

For more information related to confidentiality and documentation please visit the Student Support Service (Disability) website at: www.newcastle.edu.au/services/disability

Online Tutorial Registration:
Students are required to enrol for a specific Tutorial time for this course via the Online Registration system:
β http://studinfo1.newcastle.edu.au/rego/stud_choose_login.cfm
Registrations close at the end of week 2 of semester.

Studentmail and Blackboard: www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/
This course uses Blackboard and studentmail to contact students, so you are advised to keep your email accounts within the quota to ensure you receive essential messages. To receive an expedited response to queries, post questions on the Blackboard discussion forum if there is one, or if emailing staff directly use the course code in the subject line of your email. Students are advised to check their studentmail and the course Blackboard site on a weekly basis.

Written Assignment Presentation and Submission Details
Students are required to submit assessment items by the due date. Late assignments will be subject to the penalties described below.

Hard copy submission:
β Type your assignments: All work must be typewritten in 11 or 12 point black font. Leave a wide margin for marker’s comments, use 1.5 or double spacing, and include page numbers.
β Word length: The word limit of all assessment items should be strictly followed – 10% above or below is acceptable, otherwise penalties may apply.
β Proof read your work because spelling, grammatical and referencing mistakes will be penalised.
β Staple the pages of your assignment together (do not use pins or paper clips).
β University Assessment Item Coversheet: All assignments must be submitted with the University coversheet available at: http://www.newcastle.edu.au/study/forms/
β By arrangement with the relevant lecturer, assignments may be submitted at any Student Hub located at:
  o Level 3, Shortland Union, Callaghan
  o Level 2, Student Services Centre, Callaghan
β Date-stamping assignments: All students must date-stamp their own assignments using the machine provided at each Student Hub. If mailing an assignment, this should be address to the relevant School. Mailed assignments are accepted from the date posted, confirmed by a Post Office date-stamp; they are also date-stamped upon receipt by Schools.
β Do not fax or email assignments: Only hard copies of assignments will be considered for assessment. Inability to physically submit a hard copy of an assignment by the deadline due to other commitments or distance from campus is an unacceptable excuse.
β Keep a copy of all assignments: It is the student’s responsibility to produce a copy of their work if the assignment goes astray after submission. Students are advised to keep updated back-ups in electronic and hard copy formats.

Online copy submission to Turnitin
In addition to hard copy submission, students are required to submit an electronic version of the following assignments to Turnitin via the course Blackboard website. Prior to final submission, all students have the opportunity to submit one draft of their assignment to Turnitin to self-check their referencing. Assignments will not be marked until both hard copy and online versions have been submitted. Marks may be deducted for late submission of either version.

**Penalties for Late Assignments**
Assignments submitted after the due date, without an approved extension of time will be penalised by the **reduction of 5% of the possible maximum mark** for the assessment item for each day or part day that the item is late. Weekends count as one day in determining the penalty. Assessment items submitted **more than ten days** after the due date will be awarded **zero marks**.

**Special Circumstances**
Students wishing to apply for Special Circumstances or Extension of Time should apply online @ [http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000641.html](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000641.html)

**No Assignment Re-submission**
Students who have failed an assignment are not permitted to revise and resubmit it in this course. However, students are always welcome to contact their Tutor, Lecturer or Course Coordinator to make a consultation time to receive individual feedback on their assignments.

**Remarks**
Students can request to have their work re-marked by the Course Coordinator or Discipline Convenor (or their delegate); three outcomes are possible: the same grade, a lower grade, or a higher grade being awarded. Students may also appeal against their final result for a course. Please consult the University policy at: [http://www.newcastle.edu.au/study/forms/](http://www.newcastle.edu.au/study/forms/)

**Return of Assignments**
Students can collect assignments from a nominated Student Hub during office hours. Students will be informed during class which Hub to go to and the earliest date that assignments will be available for collection. Students must present their student identification card to collect their assignment.

**Preferred Referencing Style**
In this course, it is recommended that you use the Harvard in-text referencing system (similar to the APA system) for referencing sources of information used in assignments. Inadequate or incorrect reference to the work of others may be viewed as plagiarism and result in reduced marks or failure.

An in-text citation names the author of the source, gives the date of publication, and for a direct quote includes a page number, in parentheses. At the end of the paper, a list of references provides publication information about the source; the list is alphabetised by authors’ last names (or by titles for works without authors). Further information on referencing and general study skills can be obtained from:

 Infoskills:  

**Student Representatives**
Student Representatives are a major channel of communication between students and the School. Contact details of Student Representatives can be found on School websites.
**Student Communication**
Students should discuss any course related matters with their Tutor, Lecturer, or Course Coordinator in the first instance and then the relevant Discipline or Program Convenor. If this proves unsatisfactory, they should then contact the Head of School if required. Contact details can be found on the School website.

**Essential Online Information for Students**
Information on Class and Exam Timetables, Tutorial Online Registration, Learning Support, Campus Maps, Careers information, Counselling, the Health Service and a range of free Student Support Services can be found at:  

**Resources**

**Library and Blackboard**

Students will need to read a number of chapters from Evaluation: A Systematic Approach 7th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2004 (Rossi P, Lipsey M, and Freeman, H). Relevant chapters will be available through Short Loans at the Auchmuty library (shelf reference: 361.61072Ross). For distance students these chapters will be available electronically.

For information regarding Blackboard see your CCEB Postgraduate Student Guide Booklet provided with your initial modules.

For on campus students you also have the option of purchasing this book, although this is not compulsory. You can make inquiries to order it through United Campus Bookshop ([http://www.ucb.net.au/](http://www.ucb.net.au/)) or the Co-Op Bookshop ([http://www.coop-bookshop.com.au](http://www.coop-bookshop.com.au)).

Student will also need to read two chapters from Anthropology, Development and the Post-modern Challenge (Gardner K and Lewis D). Chapter 4 is provided in the Readings and Chapter 6 via Short Loans.

Recommended textbooks (available at the Auchmuty library)

**Readings**

**Seminar 1**

**Seminar 2**

**Seminar 3**
USAID. Number 1 Performance monitoring and evaluation TIPS. USAID. 1996.
Coupal F, Simoneau M. Participatory evaluation: A case study of CCIC Humanitarian Fund projects in Haiti. Mosaic. 2001

Seminar 4

Seminar 5

Seminar 6

Seminar 7
USAID. Number 2 Performance monitoring and evaluation TIPS. USAID. 1996.

Optional

Seminar 8
Seminar 9
Optional

Seminar 10
Optional

Seminar 11
Seminar 12

Optional

Seminar 13
Keen J, Packwood T. Qualitative research: Case study evaluation. BMJ 1995; 311:444-446.

Optional

Optional Readings
These are supplied in the Book of Readings attached to the relevant seminar.


Additional Readings
The following readings are recommended for those who wish more in-depth information. They are not provided with these modules.


Green EC. Can qualitative research produce reliable quantitative findings? Field Methods 2001; 13: 3-19.


Useful Web Sites
Students may find it useful to consult web sites for further sources of data, reports, ideas, and methods. Below is a list that may be helpful.
http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/
http://www.eldis.org/
http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/particip/information/
http://www.ids.ac.uk/impact/
http://www.dfid.gov.uk/
http://www.usaid.gov/
http://www.basics.org/
http://www.ehproject.org/
http://www.oxfam.org.uk/
http://www.who.int/home-page/
http://www.unicef.org/
http://www.unhchr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home
http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/
http://www.worldbank.org/
http://www.imf.org/
http://www.undp.org/ UN Development Programme
http://www.unifem.undp.org/ UN Development for Women
http://www.evaluation.org.uk/ UK Evaluation Society
http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/ Canadian Evaluation Society
http://www.cgap.org/
http://www.mosaic-net-intl.ca/whatis.html

Readings & Tutorial Format
This subject is designed to encourage the maximum participation by students using a combination of problem-solving exercises, discussion questions, and hands-on workshops over the term. Little time will be spent on passive listening to presentations by the lecturer.

Students will complete the two or three core readings and case study readings ahead of time. The outline/critique of two core readings each week will be circulated 48 hours prior to the workshop by those assigned to present these readings. For on-campus students the first part of the class will be devoted to reviewing these outlines. Then, the remainder will be spent on exercises and discussion questions.

Students are reminded that only one of the chapters from Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (Rossi P, Lipsey M, Freeman H) is reproduced in the course pack. The chapter for Seminar 4 is available on Blackboard and further chapters need to be
Introduction

Seminar 1
During our first meeting, we will run through the structure and content of the course, introduce some of the key ideas, discuss course assessment and allocate weekly presentations of readings. By way of introduction, students are expected to read the following two chapters prior to our meeting.

Reading

Issues to Discuss

• What historical events helped to shape the current field of evaluation research?
• What are the fundamental activities comprising evaluation research?
• What is the relationship between evaluation research and social science research?
• What is the explicit and implicit logic underlying planned evaluation activities?

Key Concepts
Be prepared to explain these key concepts:

• Social program
• Program evaluation
• Comprehensive evaluation
• Stakeholders
• Products of evaluations
• Logic of evaluation (explicit vs implicit)

Module One: Evaluation and Social Programs – Theory & Political Context
Module One examines evaluation theory (Seminar 2) and the political nature of program evaluation (Seminar 3).

Issues to Discuss
How do Don Campbell and Lee Cronbach differ on the issue of how evaluation relates to the scientific research enterprise?
What are underlying political issues that arise in most evaluations?
What is participatory evaluation? How does participation address, if at all, issues of power, empowerment and politics?
Key Concepts

- Bandwidth and fidelity
- External and internal validity
- Performance indicators
- Social theory
- Formative and summative assessments
- Functional evaluation
- Quasi-experiment
- Randomised experiment
- Threats to validity
- Theory of evaluation
- Interrupted time series
- Regression discontinuity design
- Participatory monitoring and evaluation

MODULE 1 - EVALUATION AND SOCIAL PROGRAMS - Theory and Political Context

Seminar 2

Evaluation Theory
Readings for Week 2 introduce students to the two classic paradigms that have influenced the evolution of program evaluation methods.

Readings

Workshop Activities
# Exercises

Students are to read the four case studies shown below and answer the following questions:

1. What threats are there to the internal and external validity of the four studies reported?

2. Which (if any) of these evaluation designs are randomised, which are quasi-experimental and which are neither?

3. Give examples from these designs of bandwidth being sacrificed for fidelity and vice versa.

N.B: Distance learning fellows are to complete 2 of the 3 questions above and email answers to the tutor by **Error! Reference source not found.**

---

**Case 1**

**EXHIBIT 7-B  An Evaluation of the Effects of Public Housing**

This quasi-experiment was designed to assess the impact of moving from slum housing to good-quality public housing on family health, student achievement, occupational attainment, and housing satisfaction.

Taking advantage of the opening of a new housing project in Baltimore, the authors chose families on the waiting list (and not admitted) who could be matched on twenty-six characteristics with those who were admitted to the new housing project. A total of 396 families were admitted to the housing project, and 633 families were chosen as constructed controls, the surplus being obtained because of the greater attrition rate anticipated among control families.

All of the families were followed by means of eleven interviews between 1955 and 1958. The interviews covered inventories of illnesses experienced by the families, their social psychological adjustment, and the school performance of school-age children. In addition, an initial interview before admission to the public housing project was undertaken with participating families and with control families.

Only minor differences were found between participants and controls: those in public housing were more satisfied with their housing and liked their neighbors more, but there were few discernible effects on illness or the school performance of children.

---

Case 2

EXHIBIT 8-F  Making Welfare Work and Work Pay
The Minnesota Family Investment Program

Case 3

**EXHIBIT 10-D** Measuring the Effect of TV Violence on Children's Aggressive Behavior

In an attempt to provide rigorous answers to public concern over whether the viewing of TV programs depicting violence and aggression affect children's aggressive behavior, the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) sponsored an elaborate panel study of young children in which aggressiveness and TV viewing were measured repeatedly over several years.

In the main substudy, samples of elementary school classes, Grades 2 through 6, drawn from Fort Worth and Minneapolis schools, formed the basis for ongoing panel study. In each of 100 classes with both male and female children in 59 classes were interviewed six times in the period 1970 to 1973. (Additional substudies were conducted with female elementary school children and with samples of high school students in the same cities.) At each interview wave, the children in the classes were asked to rate each other on aggressiveness using questionnaires that included such items as "Billy is likely to punch and kick another child?" The questionnaires also picked up information about the socioeconomic background of the children.

In addition, at every interview, the children were each asked to check those programs they had watched recently on lists of programs shown daily. The programs previously had been rated by media experts according to the amount of violence depicted in them. To check the accuracy of recall, several nonexistent programs were placed on the checklists. Additional interviews were conducted with the children's teachers and parents.

The analyses undertaken related the viewing of TV violence to changes in the children's aggressive behavior at subsequent interview times, controlling statistically for the initial level of the children's aggressiveness. The results estimated the additional amount of aggressiveness that resulted from high levels of exposure to violence on TV programs. While the direction of effects indicated a small increment in aggressiveness associated with high levels of viewing of TV violence, that increment was not statistically significant.

During the early 1980s, many states raised the minimum drinking age from 18 to 21, especially after passage of the Federal Uniform Drinking Age Act of 1984, which reduced highway construction fund to states that maintained a drinking age less than 21. The general reason for this was the widespread perception that lower drinking ages had led to dramatic increases in the rate of alcohol-related traffic accidents among teenagers. Assessing the impact of raising the drinking age, however, is complicated by downward trends in accidents stemming from the introduction of new automobile safety factors and increased public awareness of the dangers of drinking and driving.

Wisconsin raised its drinking age to 19 in 1984, then to 21 in 1986. To assess the impact of these changes, David Figlio examined an 18-year time series of monthly observations on alcohol-related traffic accidents, stratified by age, that was available from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation for the period from 1976 to 1993. Statistical time-series models were fit to the data for 18-year-olds (who could legally drink prior to 1984), for 19- and 21-year-olds (who could legally drink prior to 1986), and for over-21-year-olds (who could legally drink over the whole time period). The outcome variable in these analyses was the rate of alcohol-related crashes per thousand licensed drivers in the respective age group.

The results showed that, for 18-year-olds, raising the minimum drinking age to 19 reduced the alcohol-related crashes by an estimated 26% from the prior average of 2.2 per month per 1,000 drivers. For 19- and 20-year-olds, raising the minimum drinking age to 21 reduced the monthly crash rate by an estimated 19% from an average of 1.8 per month per 1,000 drivers. By comparison, the estimated effect of the legal changes for the 21-and-over group was only 2.5% and statistically nonsignificant.

The evaluator's conclusion was that the imposition of increased minimum drinking ages in Wisconsin had immediate and conclusive effects on the number of teenagers involved in alcohol-related crashes, resulting in substantially fewer than the prelegislation trends would have generated.


---

**Data**

Seminar 3

Politics and Participation

Week 3 introduces two themes that run through the entire course: Politics and Participation. Included in the readings are briefings from the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) that give introductory notes about participatory evaluations. In addition, there is a case study from Haiti to give students an idea of an evaluation context and the relevance of participatory evaluation techniques and practices.

Readings


USAID. Number 1 Performance monitoring and evaluation TIPS. USAID. 1996.


OR


Exercise

Read the following abstracts of aid project evaluations and then consider these questions:

1. From your knowledge of two of these countries, what would you list as the main political obstacles to successful evaluation of the projects concerned.

2. On the same basis as the above, consider the main social and cultural obstacles to successful evaluation.

Abstract One

Paddy Irrigation and Water Management in Southeast Asia: a World Bank Project

The object of this study is to assess the agro-economic impacts of investments is gravity-fed irrigation schemes in the paddylands of Southeast Asia, and to determine whether and how the quality of operation and maintenance (O&M) services influences the sustainability of those impacts. The study team selected six gravity-fed irrigation schemes with reservoirs for water storage in Thailand, Myanmar and...
Vietnam. Four were large schemes – at least 40 000 hectares – and the other two were small tanks of about 1000 hectares. The six schemes, which were widely dispersed across the region, were chosen for their variety and not their representativeness. Nevertheless, the findings were similar at all sites, which suggests that the lessons learned have wider application. The study included an audit of a flood control and drainage project at three sites in Bangladesh to identify differences in O&M organisation and effectiveness between irrigation and flood control.

Fieldwork was carried out in three phases in late 1994 and early 1995. An Operations Evaluation Department (OED) impact study team comprising bank staff and international and local consultants visited farmers and officials at the scheme’s sites and pertinent public irrigation authorities. The fieldwork had a participatory orientation, as the team arranged interactive group and household interviews in all four countries. The fieldwork was also carried out rapidly: on average the team spent one and a half weeks on each site.
Abstract Two

Women workers in the new putting-out systems in Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines: An International Labour Organisation project

The objects if the project were to enable selected government and non-government agencies (eg, those involved in labour, industry, social welfare, rural development, community development, and matters concerning women) to initiate actions to facilitate women homeworkers’ access to social services and socio-legal protection.

FINDINGS: Much progress towards the achievement of the objectives had been made in Thailand and the Philippines, while the pace had been slower in Indonesia. The project design was generally realistic although it was unreasonable to expect the project to result in legislation protecting the women or their inclusion in the State social security schemes. Considerable progress had been made in improving socio-economic benefits in Thailand through the work of a network of homeworkers called Chiangmai Homenet. The project had helped empower women who had become active in local and national groups acting as advocates for homeworkers. This had improved their status economically and politically. The development of homeworkers’ organisations varied: the national network in the Philippines was well-established; a basis had been laid for setting up a national network in Thailand whilst Indonesia had still to become independent.

RECOMMENDS: Consolidation phase focusing on ensuring sustainability with emphasis on strengthening the intermediary NGOs and homeworkers’ organisations. Encouraging governments to include homeworkers in their national development plans.

LES SONS LEARNED: The project demonstrated that NGOs are the key actors in organising homeworkers. NGOs and homeworkers’ organisations can campaign for the development of government policy and legislation in support of homeworkers within the overall government policy environment which supports employment promotion in the informal sector. However, considerable time is needed to bring about real improvements in homeworkers’ living and working conditions.

Module Two: Social Change, Development and Participation

Evaluation practices are based upon processes of social change. Social change is itself embedded within cultural, political economic and related processes. When assessing the literature or engaging with evaluation, it is important to maintain an awareness of what is being evaluated, for whom, by whom, and why? The sometimes-problematic role of the social scientist working for development programs, including evaluations, is also worth noting.

Students should consider the questions raised in Gardner’s work and come to seminars prepared to discuss them in more depth.

Issues to Discuss

How do issues of power arise in evaluation practice?
When and where might participatory approaches to evaluation be used?
What ethical and professional dilemmas face social scientists serving as consultants to development projects (eg, as evaluators)?
How might evaluation influence social change?

Key Concepts

- Empowerment
- Power Relations
- Participatory approaches
- Ethics
- Policy vs statistical significance
- Community development
- Participant observation
- Access
- Social justice
- Social structure

**MODULE 2 - SOCIAL CHANGE, DEVELOPMENT AND PARTICIPATION**

**Seminar 4**

Social Change in Development & Evaluation

**Readings**


**Seminar 5**

Change and Participation

**Readings**


Module Three: Evaluation Methods

Module 3 provides an overview of the main forms and approaches to evaluation. Students should expand and refine their understandings of the perspectives already covered, and consider when different forms are appropriate as well as the consequences of choosing participatory or non-participatory approaches.

**Issues to Discuss**

How do you decide upon an evaluation design?
How are needs assessed in participatory vs non-participatory programs?

Are participatory methods incompatible with rigorous experimental designs?

What are the important differences involved in evaluating a program using a ‘true’ experiment compared with a quasi-experimental design?

Key Concepts

- Needs assessment
- Incidence vs prevalence rates
- Evaluation design
- Program monitoring
- Process and outcome evaluation
- Public accountability
- Accessibility
- Coverage & bias in coverage
- Project management and planning
- Principles of participation, learning, negotiating & flexibility
- Participatory rural appraisal
- Proactive, clarificative, interactive and impact evaluations
- Utilisation
- Randomisation
- Confounding factors
- Control vs experimental group
- Quasi experimental design

SPECIAL NOTE: MODULE 3 AND 4 INVOLVE SEMINARS 6 – 11 AND THE ORDER OF READINGS MAY VARY.

Seminar 6

Evaluation Forms and Needs Assessment

Readings


Seminar 7
Qualitative Data Collection

**Readings**
USAID. Number 2 Performance monitoring and evaluation TIPS. USAID. 1996.


**Optional Reading**

Seminar 8
Qualitative Data Analysis: Part One

**Readings**


Seminar 9
Qualitative Data Analysis: Part Two

**Readings**


**Optional Reading**
Module Five: Theory into Practice – An Evaluation Proposal

During this period, students will work on their major projects. Presentations of the projects will be given in the final seminar. There will also be time in the first seminar for each person to discuss their project and address problems/issues that are arising. Readings for this module are intended to provide useful background information for the major project, including examples of evaluation frameworks applied by major international agencies to their own programs and reports of evaluation studies using qualitative methods.

Seminar 10

Participatory Methods & Cases – PRA and PAR

Readings


Optional

Seminar 11
Monitoring & Impact Designs

Readings


Exercise

Read report of the World Bank Project in Indonesia—Kampung Improvement Program. Activity in class will divide into 3 groups.

Group 1. From the report, what are the key program theory components underlying how the impact results are presented and discussed?

Groups 2 & 3 will design an evaluation framework detailing information needs and strategies for assessing coverage efficiency.

Module Four: Qualitative Methods in Evaluation Research
This module gives students practical skills in using qualitative methods for program evaluation. During these four weeks, students are expected to be engaging with their qualitative research project. Some seminar time each week will be devoted to discussing student experiences and questions related to the collection and analysis of their qualitative data.

Objectives

1. Familiarise students with key features of in-depth, open-ended interviewing in relation to program evaluation;

2. Develop an interview schedule with open-ended questions and follow-up probes to be used during a fieldwork exercise;

3. Focus on ‘needs-assessment’ issues in relation to a social health program such as:
   a. consumer-felt need for assistance or a new service;
   b. potential gap between service goal and actual provision of program;
   c. barriers or problem processes minimising effectiveness of a program.
Key Concepts

- Qualitative methods
- Contextual vs non-contextual methods
- Focus groups
- Interviewing: structured, semi-structured, open-ended
- Key informants
- Ethnography
- Case studies
- Coding
- Observation
- Fieldwork stages
- Grounded theory
- Computer assisted qualitative data analysis
- Non-probability sampling

MODULE FIVE: THEORY INTO PRACTICE - An Evaluation Proposal

Seminar 12

Tailored Evaluation Frameworks: Nutrition, Poverty & Rural Health

Optional Reading

Seminar 13

Examples of Qualitative Evaluations; Project Presentations

Brief research reports of qualitative evaluations that may be useful background reading for the major project.

Readings


Keen J, Packwood T. Qualitative research: Case study evaluation. BMJ 1995; 311:444-446.

Assessment Tasks

A set of issues for discussion and key concepts accompany each module. Prior to each seminar, on-campus students only are expected to have considered these learning objectives and arrive prepared to actively participate in seminar discussions. Distance students will follow the same general time schedule but will not be taking part in seminar discussions, although participation in blackboard discussions is expected.

Two Presentations for On-Campus Students

Each on-campus student will give two presentations (@ 7 marks each, comprising an outline and critique of an assigned seminar reading. However, the readings can be supplemented by material from the additional reading list or other sources. Each presentation should be 10 to 15 minutes in length followed by a class discussion. A written version of the presentation (400-500 words) should be posted on Blackboard on Monday prior to the Wednesday tutorial. Distance Learning Students will also post two critiques of seminar readings, after consulting with the tutor.

(Total 14 marks)

Qualitative Data Analysis Project

To gain practical experience in generating and analysing qualitative data, a small project will be completed involving face-to-face interviews with two informants related to a social or health program. The informants can be consumers, program providers (managers) or both. The open-ended structured interviews will explore informant perceptions (‘needs assessment’) that would help identify a potential focus for undertaking a program evaluation. Students will generate a (partial) transcript of the interviews and learn hand coding. A brief report (1200-1500 words) of the data coding and finding interpretations will be prepared.

(Total 36 marks)

Submission Date: Friday 28th September 2007
Major Essay
Students will prepare an essay of 3,000 words on one of the following topics:

a) What is participatory evaluation and how does it address issues of power, empowerment and politics? Please illustrate with an example of where it would be a useful method of evaluation.

b) What ethical and professional dilemmas face social scientists serving as consultants, e.g. as evaluators, to development projects and discuss the underlying political issues that may arise?

c) Discuss what is meant by ‘needs-assessment’ issues in relation to social health programs. Consider the following: consumer-felt need for assistance or a new service, the potential gap between service goals and actual provision of the program and discuss any barriers or problems that may minimise effectiveness of the program.

(Total 50 marks)

Submission Date: Friday 2nd November 2007

COURSE FEEDBACK TO CCEB
Your feedback about this course, the assessment tasks and any other problems is vital to the continuous improvement of this course. Please submit comments electronically via Blackboard. The feedback form will appear later in the course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading guide</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49% or less</td>
<td>Fail (FF)</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>An unacceptable effort, including non-completion. The student has not understood the basic principles of the subject matter and/or has been unable to express their understanding in a comprehensible way. Deficient in terms of answering the question, research, referencing and correct presentation (spelling, grammar etc). May include extensive plagiarism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% to 64%</td>
<td>Pass (P)</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>The work demonstrates a reasonable attempt to answer the question, shows some grasp of the basic principles of the subject matter and a basic knowledge of the required readings, is comprehensible, accurate and adequately referenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65% to 74%</td>
<td>Credit (C)</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>The work demonstrates a clear understanding of the question, a capacity to integrate research into the discussion, and a critical appreciation of a range of different theoretical perspectives. A deficiency in any of the above may be compensated by evidence of independent thought. The work is coherent and accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% to 84%</td>
<td>Distinction (D)</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>Evidence of substantial additional reading and/or research, and evidence of the ability to generalise from the theoretical content to develop an argument in an informed and original manner. The work is well organised, clearly expressed and shows a capacity for critical analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% upwards</td>
<td>High Distinction (HD)</td>
<td>High Distinction</td>
<td>All of the above, plus a thorough understanding of the subject matter based on substantial additional reading and/or research. The work shows a high level of independent thought, presents informed and insightful discussion of the topic, particularly the theoretical issues involved, and demonstrates a well-developed capacity for critical analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Week beginning</td>
<td>Lecture Topic &amp; Assessment at a Glance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>July 16</td>
<td>Seminar 1: Introduction and Welcome to the Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>July 23</td>
<td>Seminar 2: Evaluation Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>Seminar 3: Politics and Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>August 6</td>
<td>Seminar 4: Social Change in Development and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>Seminar 5: Change and Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>August 20</td>
<td>Seminar 6: Evaluation Forms and Needs Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>August 27</td>
<td>Seminar 7: Qualitative Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>Seminar 8: Qualitative Data Analysis: Part One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>Seminar 9: Qualitative Data Analysis: Part Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>September 17</td>
<td>Seminar 10: Participatory Methods and Cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>September 24</td>
<td>Seminar 11: Monitoring and Impact Designs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mid-Semester Recess: Monday 1 October to Friday 12 October 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Week beginning</th>
<th>Lecture Topic &amp; Assessment at a Glance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Seminar 12: Tailored Evaluation Frameworks: Nutrition, Poverty and Rural Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>Seminar 13: Examples of Qualitative Evaluations: Project Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>October 29</td>
<td>NO FORMAL TUTORIAL – AS NEEDED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>