

Introduction to Program Evaluation
P&HD Psychology 315

Leonard Bickman, Ph.D.
Office: 3rd Floor Peabody Administration Building
Phone: 322-8694
E-mail: Leonard.bickman@vanderbilt.edu

Program evaluation is the craft of applying scientific research methods in a thoughtful way to the task of finding out what interventions “work”. This is accomplished by systematically investigating the effectiveness of program (e.g., human services, education, health, organizational, criminal or juvenile justice) processes and outcomes within their political and organizational context. The primary goal is to inform social action and, by extension, improving the conditions for program recipients and participants. Secondly we hope to add to knowledge about the problem and reasons why the program works or doesn’t work.

The **purpose** of the course:

Learn to design a simple evaluation and to be a savvy and critical user of evaluation information.

The **course objectives**:

1. To understand the distinction between program evaluation and research
2. To develop an understanding of different kinds of evaluation questions.
3. To develop awareness and sensitivity about the concerns and information needs of program stakeholders.
4. To develop skill in discussing evaluation questions, design, and uses.
5. To develop an understanding of how program evaluation is used in program planning.
6. To develop an understanding of how the fundamentals of research are used in program evaluation (basic procedures, methodology, and instrumentation).
7. To develop an understanding of the role of program fidelity/integrity.
8. To become familiar with trade-offs in evaluation design and data collection.
9. To develop an understanding of common threats to validity and credibility of evaluation design and findings.
10. To gain experience in planning and conducting an evaluation.
11. To develop skill in communicating qualitative and quantitative information to evaluation consumers.
12. To be able to balance methodological rigor, resources, stakeholder concerns, feasibility and ethical issues.
13. To develop a competent and user-friendly evaluation report that is useful to a specific stakeholder audience.

Textbooks

Posavac, J & Carey, R.G. (2003) Program Evaluation Methods and Case Studies, 6th Edition, Upper Saddle River N.J., Prentice Hall. This is the main text and is assigned throughout the semester.

Hedrick, T. E., Bickman, L., & Rog, D. J. (1993). *Applied research design: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. This is a supplemental text for which students will read at their own pace. The material in this book are discussed throughout the course.

Course structure:

The classes will be devoted to brief lectures, exercises, and discussions. Not all of the reading material will be covered in class. We may spend more time on certain material and not cover others. However, I will attempt to cover the key points identified in the syllabus for each class. You can always raise a question about a reading that was not covered in class. The lectures will be used to convey basic information concerning the scientific methodology and practicalities of evaluation. The class exercises and discussions are important and your consistent participation is part of your course grade.

Assigned readings:

The readings are important and you will be expected to contribute to the class discussions by summarizing the material, by considering the strengths and weaknesses of examples of evaluation research, and by offering your interpretation of the findings. For each class there are required reading assignments and supplemental readings. You will choose at least one of the supplemental readings each week and be prepared to present it in class. All reading assignments are due on the day they are listed in the syllabus.

Course project:

Complete a comprehensive program evaluation *plan* or *proposal* for a client who wants the information that you gather, analyze, and report. Note that you may work in pairs. Also, note that “evaluation” encompasses several types of efforts. Throughout the course you will complete incremental assignments for your evaluation, culminating in a formal report for your client, a copy of which will be turned in for course credit. The point of the project is to demonstrate your competence in the basic steps of planning an evaluation of a real-world program. You are responsible for finding the organization that wants the evaluation plan. I will be happy to assist you. There are several models of evaluation that are described in P&C. You should use the social sciences and theory driven models in project.

The primary deliverables of the project include:

1. A memo of understanding (MOU) with your client about the scope of work (SOW)
2. A program logic model and brief literature summary of the findings in this area,
3. An evaluability assessment – include potential barriers and identification of stakeholders
4. Description of the method and measures
5. A description of the analytic plan and detailed budget with justification
6. An IRB application and informed consent documents
7. A formal evaluation plan/proposal.
8. A presentation of the plan to the class and client

The evaluation reports are due **on the last day of class**. No reports are accepted after that date.

Course exams and grading

There will be a final based on text, readings, and class presentations.

- Final 30%
- Class participation, 20%
- Evaluation project report, 50%

Course Outline

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
<p>1</p>	<p>Welcome!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is exciting about evaluation? • Overview of course material • History of evaluation • Discussion of class project 	
<p>2</p>	<p>Evaluation theories and models– An overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of evaluation • Fitting the evaluation to the program • What evaluators do • Theories/models of evaluation • Dysfunctional attitudes toward evaluation <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u> P&C Chapter 1 Program Evaluation : an overview P &C Chapter 2 – Planning an evaluation</p> <p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2004). Exemplars as case studies: Reflections on the links between theory, practice, & context_ • Stuffembeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation Models <p><u>Supplemental Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Datta, L.- Important Questions, Intriguing Method, Incomplete Answers • Henry, G. T.- How Modern Democracies Are Shaping Evaluation and the Emerging Challenges for Evaluation • King, J. A.- The Challenge of Studying Evaluation Theory • May, I., & Thorngate, W.- Reducing Anxiety and Resistance in Policy and Programme Evaluations • Pawson, R. (2002). Evidence-based policy: In search of a method. • Pawson, R. (2002). Evidence-based policy: The promise of ‘realist synthesis.’ • Ryan, K.- Servicing Public Interests in Educational Accountability: Alternative Approaches to Democratic Evaluation • Virtanen, P., & Uusikyla, P.- Exploring the Missing Link between Cause and Effect <p><u>Class Participation:</u> Describe a model of evaluation that most appeals to you and why</p>	

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
3	<p>Program theory, logic models and evaluability assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • selecting criteria and setting standards • Indicators of recipient outcomes and program effects • The logic of logic models • Selecting criteria and setting standards • Review and discussion of evaluation projects <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u></p> <p>Chapter 3 Selecting Criteria and Setting Standards</p> <p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birckmayer, J. D., & Weiss, C. H. (2000). Theory Based Evaluation in Practice • Friedman, V. J.(2001). Designed Blindness: An Action Science Perspective on Program Theory Evaluation • Leeuw, Frans L. (2003). Reconstructing Program Theories: Methods Available and Problems to be Solved • Scriven, M. (1998). Minimalist Theory: The Latest Theory that Practice Requires • Sidani, S., & Sechrest, L. (1999). Putting Program Theory Into Operation <p><u>Supplemental Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bickman, L. (1996)The Application of Program Theory to the Evaluation of a Managed Mental Health Care System • Bowen, K. A. S. (2000) Development of Local Program Theory: Using Theory-Orientated Evaluation to Make a Difference • Cole, G. E. (1999) Advancing the Development and Application of Theory-based Evaluation in the Practice of Public Health • Kaplan, S. A., & Garrett, K. E.(2005) The use of logic models by community-based initiatives • Larsen, P. D.(2001) From Programme Theory to Constructivism • Mackenzie, M., & Blamey, A (2005) The Practice and the Theory • Pawson, R. (2002). Does Megan’s Law Work? A Theory Driven Systematic Review • Reynolds, A. J. (2005) Confirmatory Program Evaluation: Application to Early Childhood Evaluations • Rosas, S. R. (2005) Concept Mapping as a Technique for Program Theory Development • Sapyta, J., Riemer, M., & Bickman, L. (2005). Feedback to Clinicians: Theory, Research, & Practice • Shaw, I, & Crompton, A.(2003) Theory, Like Mist on Spectacles, Obscures Vision • Stame, N. (2004) Theory-based Evaluations and Types of Complexity • Thurston, W. E., Graham, J., & Hatfield, J. (2003) Evaluability Assessment: A Catalyst for Program Change and Improvement. • Vaessen, J. (2004) Stakeholder Values in Program Theory Evaluation • Van Der Knapp, P. (2004) Theory-based Evaluation and Learning: Possibilities and Challenges • Yamploskaya, S., Nesman, T. M., Hernadez, M., & Koch, D. (2004) Using Concept Mapping to Develop a Logic Model and Articulate a Program Theory: A Case Example 	
3	<u>Class Participation:</u>	

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
	Develop a logic model for Dr. Bickman’s CFIT project in class by using him as an informant	
4	<p>Criteria, standards and Measurement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources of Data • Good Assessment procedures • Types of measures of Evaluation Criteria • Measurement of quality <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u> P&C Chapter 4 Developing Measures</p> <p><u>Required reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dusenbury, L., et al. (2005). Quality of implementation: developing measures crucial to understanding the diffusion of preventive evaluations • Miller, M. R., et al. (2005). Relationship Between Performance Measurement and Accreditation: Implications for Quality Care and Patient Safety • Mowbray, C. T., Holter, M. C., Teague, G. B., & Bybee, D. (2003). Fidelity Criteria: Development, Measurement, and Validation • Saunders, R. C., & Heflinger, C. A. (2004). Integrating Data from Multiple Public Sources <p><u>Supplemental Reading :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bickman, L., Karver, M. S., & Schut, J. A. (1997) Clinician Reliability and Accuracy in Judging Appropriate Level of Care • Bickman, L., et al. (2000) What Information Do Clinicians Value for Monitoring Adolescent Client Progress and Outcomes? • DeVoe, E. R., & Kantor, G. K. (2002) Measurement Issues in Child Mistreatment and Family Violence Prevention Programs • Fitz-Gibbons, C. T. (2002) Evaluation in an Age of Indicators • Minkoff, K. (2002) Developing Standards of Care for Individuals with Co-occurring Psychiatric and Substance Abuse Disorders <p><u>Class Participation:</u> Presentation of Evaluability Assessment</p>	<p>MOU Evaluability Assessment</p>

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
5	<p>Types of Evaluation I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs assessment • Outcome (Are there changes in any target outcomes?) • Impact (e.g., Can observed outcomes be attributed to the program?) <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u> P & C chapter 6 - The Assessment of need</p> <p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., Church, M., & Fort, L. (2004). Shoestring evaluation: Designing impact evaluations under budget, time, and data constraints • Calsyn, R. J., Kelemen, W. L., Jones, E. T., & Winter, J. P. (2001). Reducing Overclaiming in Needs Assessment Studies • Easterling, D. (2000) Using Outcome Evaluation to Guide Grant Making: Theory, Reality, and Possibilities • Ryan, K. (2002). Shaping Educational Accountability Systems <p><u>Supplemental Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bhavaraju, R. R., & Pirog, L. T. (2002) Increasing the Efficacy of School-Based Directly Observed Therapy: From Needs Assessment to Program Implementation • Bledsoe, K. L., & Graham, J. A. (2005) The Use of Multiple Evaluation Approaches in Program Evaluation • Davis, H., Day, C., Cox, A., & Cutler, L. (2000) Child and Adolescent Mental Health Needs Assessment and Service Implications in an Inner City Area • Mohr (1999) The Qualitative method of impact analysis. • Partin, M. R., & Slater, J. S.- Promoting Repeat Mammography Use: Insights from a Systematic Needs Assessment <p><u>Class Participation:</u> Project Progress Report. Describe the client, the program, the setting, and the evaluation questions that your project will address.</p>	Logic model

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
6	<p>Types of Evaluations II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program monitoring, implementation & Fidelity • Process evaluation (How does the program operate?) • Cost effectiveness/benefit <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u></p> <p>P & C Chapter 7 – Monitoring the operations of Programs P & C chapter 11 Costs and Outcomes</p> <p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brousselle, A.(2004) What Counts is not Falling.... but Landing • Levin, H. M. (2001). Waiting for Godot: Cost-effectiveness evaluation in education • Nores, M., Belfield, C. R., Barnett, W. S., & Schweinhart, L. (2005). Updating the economic impacts of the High Scope/Perry Preschool Program • Saunders, R. P., Evans, M. H., & Joshi, P. (2005). Developing a Process-Evaluation Plan for Assessing Health Promotion Program Implementation: A How to Guide <p><u>Supplemental Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barth, M.C. (2004) A Low-Cost, Post Hoc Method to Rate Overall Site Quality in a Multi-Site Demonstration. • Campbell, H. F., & Brown, R. P. C. (2005). A multiple account framework for cost-benefit analysis • Foster, E. M., & Bickman, L. (2000). Refining the cost analyses of the Fort Bragg evaluation: The impact of cost offset and cost shifting • Oakley, A., Strange, V., Stephenson, J., Forrest, S., & Monteiro, H. (2004). Evaluating Processes: A case study of a randomized controlled trial of sex education. • Roman, J. (2004) Can Cost-Benefit Analysis Answer Criminal Justice Policy Questions, and if So, How? <p><u>Class Participation</u></p> <p>Present and discuss the program logic model.</p>	

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time series • Non-equivalent designs • Regression-Discontinuity • Observing other dependent variables <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u> Chapter 9 Quasi-experimental approaches to outcome evaluation</p> <p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blankhertz, L. (1998). Deliberate sampling for heterogeneity- A critical multiplist perspective • Morton, V., & Torgerson, D. J. (2004). Regression to the mean: Treatment effect without the intervention • Grocott, P., Cowley, S., & Richardson, A. (2002). Solving methodological challenges using a theory-driven evaluation in the study of complex patient care <p><u>Supplemental Reading :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lambert, W., & Bickman, L. (2004). The “clock-setting” cure: How children’s symptoms might improve after ineffective treatment • Luellen, J.K., Shadish, W. R., & Clark, M. H. (2005). Propensity scores <p><u>Class Participation:</u></p> <p>Design a subtly poor study</p>	
<p>March 8</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SPRING BREAK</p>	

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
<p>9</p>	<p>Evaluation research design III – Randomized Experiments</p> <p>Objections to experimentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When to experiment • Research Policy and experiments – IES, <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u></p> <p>P&C chapter 10 – Using Experiments to Evaluate Programs</p> <p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cook, T. D. (2003). Why have educational evaluators chosen not to do randomized experiments? • Staines, G. L., McKendrick, K., Perlis, T., Sacks, S. & De Leon, G. (1999). Sequential assignment and treatment-as-usual. • Weinstein, M, (2004) Randomized Design and the Myth of Certain Knowledge: Guinea Pig Narratives and Cultural Critique <p><u>Supplemental Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boruch, R. (2005). Better evaluation for evidence-based policy: Place randomized trials in education, criminology, welfare, & health. • Cook, T. D. (2005). Emergent principles for the design, implementation, and analysis of cluster-based experiments in social science. • Farrington, D.P. (2003) British Randomized Experiments on Crime and Justice. • Howe, A. (2004) A Critique of Experimentalism. • Petrosino, A. (2000) Mediators and Moderators in the Evaluation of Programs for Children: Current Practice and Agenda for Improvement <p><u>Class Participation:</u></p> <p>Develop an interview or survey that would test a graduate student’s understanding of experimental design</p>	

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
<p>10</p>	<p>Evaluation Design IV Mixed methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When to use qualitative approaches • Carrying Out Qualitative evaluation • Naturalistic evaluations • The “qualitative-quantitative debates • Methods for design and data collection • Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches • Triangulation – mixing methods, sources, or measures <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u></p> <p>P & C chapter 12 – Qualitative Evaluation Methods</p> <p><u>Required reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greene, J. C., Benjamin, L., & Goodyear, L. (2001). The merits of mixing methods in evaluation. • Greene, J. C. (2002). With a splash of soda, please: Towards active engagement with difference. • Kushner, S. (2002). I’ll take mine neat: Multiple methods but a single methodology. <p><u>Supplemental Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawrenz archipelago mixed methods • Luo, M., & Dappen, L. (2005). Mixed-methods design for an objective-based evaluation of a magnet school assistance project.. • McConney Synthesizing mixed methods • Teddlie, C. (2005). Methodological issues related to causal studies of leadership <p><u>Class Participation:</u></p> <p>Present and discuss methods and measures you will use in your evaluation project.</p>	<p>Methods & Measures</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Controversy in Evaluation</p>	

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ft. Bragg Continuum of Care • Fighting Back Drug Prevention Program <p><u>Required reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bickman, L. (1997). Resolving issues raised by the Fort Bragg evaluation: New directions for mental health services research. • Bickman, L. (1996). A continuum of care: More is not always better. • Datta, L. E. (2000). Seriously seeking fairness: Strategies for crafting non-partisan evaluations in a partisan world. • Fitzpatrick, J. (2002). A conversation with Leonard Bickman. • Sherwood, K. E. (2005). Evaluation of the fighting back initiative. <p><u>Supplemental Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behar, L. B. (1997). The Fort Bragg evaluation: A snapshot in time. • Bickman, L. & Mulvaney, S. (2005) Large Scale Evaluations of Children’s Mental Health Services: The Ft. Bragg and Stark County Studies • Bickman, L. (1996). Implications for evaluators from the Fort Bragg evaluation. • Bickman, L. (1996). Reinterpreting the Fort Bragg evaluation findings: The message does not change. • Bickman, L., Lambert, E. W., Andrade, A. R., Penaloza, R. V. (2000). The Fort Bragg continuum of care for children and adolescents: Mental health outcomes over 5 years. • DeLeon, P. H., & Williams, J. G. (1997). Evaluation research and public policy formation. • Friedman, R. M. (1996). The Fort Bragg study: What can we conclude? • Friedman, R. M., & Burns, B. J. (1996). The evaluation of the Fort Bragg demonstration project: An alternative interpretation of the findings. • Hoagwood, K. (1997). Interpreting Nullity: The Fort Bragg experiment- A comparative success or failure? • Huang, L. et al. (2005). Transforming mental health care for children and their families. • Saxe, L., & Cross, T. P. (1997). Interpreting the Fort Bragg children’s mental health demonstration project: The cup is half full. • Sechrest, L., & Walsh, M. (1997). Dogma or data: Bragging rights. • Weisz, J. R., Han, S. S., & Valerie, S. M. (1997). More of what?: Issues raised by the Fort Bragg study. <p><u>Class Participation</u></p> <p>Role play being an expert witness in a court case where a state is being sued to provide a continuum of care.</p>	
12	Balancing human subjects concerns, good methods and problem importance	Analytic plan an

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations not worth doing - Design sensitivity and power analysis • Practical (or ‘clinical’) significance • What if there is no ‘effect’? • The role of values in evaluation • Balancing human subjects concerns <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u> P & C chapter 5 Ethics in Program Evaluation</p> <p><u>Required reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA (2005) The complexity of the IRB process: Some of the things you wanted to know about IRBS but were afraid to ask. • Mabry, L. (1999). Circumstantial Ethics. • Weisburd, D. (2003). Ethical practice and evaluation of interventions in crime and justice. <p><u>Supplemental Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cashen, L. H., & Geiger, S. W., (2004) Statistical Power and the Testing of Null Hypotheses: A Review of Contemporary Management Research and Recommendations for Future Studies • Oakes, J. M. (2002). Risks and wrongs in social science research. • Scheirer, M. A. (1998). Commentary: Evaluation planning is the heart of the matter. • Shaw, I. F. (2003). Ethics in qualitative research and evaluation. <p><u>Class Participation</u></p> <p>Present detailed plan and budget</p>	<p>detailed budget</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>. Reporting and use of evaluation findings</p>	<p>IRB Application</p>

<i>Week</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Project Assignment due</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a Communication Plan • Personal Presentations of Findings • Content of Formal Written Evaluation Reports • Progress Reports and Press Releases • Obstacles to Effective Utilization • Dealing with Mixed Findings • Using Evaluations when there is no Effect • Developing a learning Culture <p><u>Textbook Assignment</u> P & C chapters 13 Evaluation Reports: Interpreting and Communicating Findings Chapter 14 – How to Encourage Utilization</p> <p><u>Required reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alkin, M. C., & Taut, S. M. (2003). Unbundling evaluation use. • Birkeland, S., Graham, E. M., & Weiss, C. (2005). Good reasons for ignoring good evaluation: The case of the drug abuse resistance education (D.A.R.E.) program. • Henry, G. T. (2003). Influential Evaluations. • Iriti, J. E., Bickel, W. E., & Nelson, C. A. (2005). Using recommendations in evaluation: A decision making framework for evaluators. • Valovirta, V. (2002). Evaluation utilization as argumentation. <p><u>Supplemental Reading:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexander, H. (2003). Health-service evaluations: Should we expect the results to change practice. • Joly, B. M. (2003). Writing community-centered evaluation reports. • May, H. (2004). Making statistics more meaningful for policy research and program evaluation. • Rolfson, M., & Torvatn, H. (2005). How to ‘Get through’: Communication challenges in formative evaluation. • Weiss, C. H., Graham, E. M., & Birkeland, S. (2005). An alternate route to policy influence: How evaluations affect D.A.R.E. <p><u>Class Participation:</u> Present IRB issues raised by your project</p>	
14	<i>Presentation of Evaluation Projects</i>	Final Project Report
	<i>Final Exam</i>	TBA

References

- Alexander, H. (2003). Health-service evaluations: Should we expect the results to change practice.
- Alkin, M. C., & Taut, S. M. (2003). Unbundling evaluation use.
- Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., Church, M., & Fort, L. (2004). Shoestring evaluation: Designing impact evaluations under budget, time, and data constraints
- Behar, L. B. (1997). The Fort Bragg evaluation: A snapshot in time.
- Bhavaraju, R. R., & Pirog, L. T. (2002). Increasing the efficacy of school-based directly observed therapy: From needs assessment to program implementation
- Bickman, L. & Mulvaney, S. Large Scale Evaluations of Children's Mental Health Services: The Ft. Bragg and Stark County Studies (2005), In R. Steele & M. Roberts (Eds.) Handbook of Mental Health Services for Children, Adolescents, and Families, pp. 371-386. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers
- Bickman, L. (1996). A continuum of care: More is not always better.
- Bickman, L. (1996). Implications for evaluators from the Fort Bragg evaluation.
- Bickman, L. (1996). Reinterpreting the Fort Bragg evaluation findings: The message does not change.
- Bickman, L. (1997). Resolving issues raised by the Fort Bragg evaluation: New directions for mental health services research.
- Bickman, L. (1996). The application of program theory to the evaluation of a managed mental health care system
- Bickman, L., & Mulvaney, S.- Large scale evaluations of children's mental health services: The Fort Bragg and Stark County studies.
- Bickman, L., et al. (2000). What information do clinicians value for monitoring adolescent client progress and outcomes?
- Bickman, L., Karver, M. S., & Schut, J. A. (1997). Clinician reliability and accuracy in judging appropriate level of care
- Bickman, L., Lambert, E. W., Andrade, A. R., Penaloza, R. V. (2000). The Fort Bragg continuum of care for children and adolescents: Mental health outcomes over 5 years.
- Birckmayer, J. D., & Weiss, C. H. (2000). Theory Based Evaluation in Practice
- Birkeland, S., Graham, E. M., & Weiss, C. (2005). Good reasons for ignoring good evaluation: The case of the drug abuse resistance education (D.A.R.E.) program.
- Blankhertz, L. (1998). Deliberate sampling for heterogeneity- A critical multiplist perspective
- Bledsoe, K. L., & Graham, J. A. (2005). The use of multiple evaluation approaches in program evaluation
- Boruch, R. (2005). Better evaluation for evidence-based policy: Place randomized trials in education, criminology, welfare, & health.
- Bowen, K. A. S. (2000). Development of local program theory: Using theory-orientated evaluation to make a difference
- Brousselle, A. (2004). What counts is not falling.... but landing
- Calsyn, R. J., Kelemen, W. L., Jones, E. T., & Winter, J. P. (2001). Reducing Overclaiming in Needs Assessment Studies
- Campbell, H. F., & Brown, R. P. C. (2005). A multiple account framework for cost-benefit analysis
- Cole, G. E.- Advancing the Development and Application of Theory-based Evaluation in the Practice of Public Health
- Cook, T. D. (2003). Why have educational evaluators chosen not to do randomized experiments?
- Cook, T. D. (2005). Emergent principles for the design, implementation, and analysis of cluster-based experiments in social science.
- Datta, L. E. (2000). Seriously seeking fairness: Strategies for crafting non-partisan evaluations in a partisan world.
- Datta, L. (2003). Important questions, intriguing method, incomplete answers.
- Davis, H., Day, C., Cox, A., & Cutler, L. (2000). Child and adolescent mental health needs assessment and service implications in an inner city area.
- DeLeon, P. H., & Williams, J. G. (1997). Evaluation research and public policy formation.

- DeVoe, E. R., & Kantor, G. K. (2002). Measurement issues in child mistreatment and family violence prevention programs.
- Dusenbury, L., et al. (2005). Quality of implementation: developing measures crucial to understanding the diffusion of preventive evaluations
- Farrington, D. P. (2003). Methodological quality standards for evaluation research
- Fitz-Gibbons, C. T. (2002). Evaluation in an age of indicators.
- Fitzpatrick, J. (2002). A conversation with Leonard Bickman.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2004). Exemplars as case studies: Reflections on the links between theory, practice, & context
- Foster, E. M., & Bickman, L. (2000). Refining the cost analyses of the Fort Bragg evaluation: The impact of cost offset and cost shifting
- Friedman, R. M. (1996). The Fort Bragg study: What can we conclude?
- Friedman, R. M., & Burns, B. J. (1996). The evaluation of the Fort Bragg demonstration project: An alternative interpretation of the findings.
- Friedman, V. J. (2001). Designed Blindness: An Action Science Perspective on Program Theory Evaluation
- Greene, J. C. (2002). With a splash of soda, please: Towards active engagement with difference.
- Greene, J. C., Benjamin, L., & Goodyear, L. (2001). The merits of mixing methods in evaluation.
- Grocott, P., Cowley, S., & Richardson, A. (2002). Solving methodological challenges using a theory-driven evaluation in the study of complex patient care
- Henry, G. T. (2003). Influential evaluations.
- Henry, G. T. (2001). How modern democracies are shaping evaluation and the emerging challenges for evaluation
- Hoagwood, K. (1997). Interpreting Nullity: The Fort Bragg experiment- A comparative success or failure?
- Huang, L. et al. (2005). Transforming mental health care for children and their families.
- Iriti, J. E., Bickel, W. E., & Nelson, C. A. (2005). Using recommendations in evaluation: A decision making framework for evaluators.
- Joly, B. M. (2003). Writing community-centered evaluation reports.
- Kaplan, S. A., & Garrett, K. E. (2005). The use of logic models by community-based initiatives.
- King, J. A. (2003). The challenge of studying evaluation theory.
- Kushner, S. (2002). I'll take mine neat: Multiple methods but a single methodology.
- Lambert, E. W., Doucette, A., & Bickman, L. (2001). Measuring mental health outcomes with pre-post designs.
- Lambert, W., & Bickman, L. (2004). The "clock-setting" cure: How children's symptoms might improve after ineffective treatment.
- Larsen, P. D. (2001). From programme theory to constructivism.
- Leeuw, Frans L. (2003). Reconstructing Program Theories: Methods Available and Problems to be Solved
- Levacic, R. (2005). Educational leadership as a causal factor.
- Levin, H. M. (2001). Waiting for godot: Cost-effectiveness evaluation in education
- Luellen, J.K., Shadish, W. R., & Clark, M. H. (2005). Propensity scores
- Luo, M., & Dappen, L. (2005). Mixed-methods design for an objective-based evaluation of a magnet school assistance project.
- Mabry, L. (1999). Circumstantial Ethics.
- Mackenzie, M., & Blamey, A. (2005). The practice and the theory.
- Mark, M., Henry, G., & Julnes, G. (1999). Toward an integrative framework for evaluation practice
- May, H. (2004). Making statistics more meaningful for policy research and program evaluation.
- May, I., & Thorngate, W.- Reducing Anxiety and Resistance in Policy and Programme Evaluations
- Maynard, R. A. (2000). Whether a sociologist, economist, psychologist or simply a skilled evaluator
- Miller, M. R., et al. (2005). Relationship Between Performance Measurement and Accreditation: Implications for Quality Care and Patient Safety
- Minkoff, K.- Developing Standards of Care for Individuals with Co-occurring Psychiatric and Substance Abuse Disorders
- Morton, V., & Torgerson, D. J. (2004). Regression to the mean: Treatment effect without the intervention

- Mowbray, C. T., Holter, M. C., Teague, G. B., & Bybee, D. (2003). Fidelity Criteria: Development, Measurement, and Validation
- Nores, M., Belfield, C. R., Barnett, W. S., & Schweinhart, L. (2005). Updating the economic impacts of the High Scope/Perry Preschool Program
- Oakes, J. M. (2002). Risks and wrongs in social science research.
- Oakley, A., Strange, V., Stephenson, J., Forrest, S., & Monteiro, H. (2004). Evaluating Processes: A case study of a randomized controlled trial of sex education.
- Partin, M. R., & Slater, J. S.- Promoting Repeat Mammography Use: Insights from a Systematic Needs Assessment
- Pawson, R. (2002). Does Megan's Law Work? A Theory Driven Systematic Review
- Pawson, R. (2002). Evidence-based policy: In search of a method.
- Pawson, R. (2002). Evidence-based policy: The promise of 'realist synthesis.'
- Pawson, R. (2003). Nothing as practical as a good theory
- Reich, S. & Bickman, L. (2005). "Quasi-Experimental Design." In Epstein, M., Kutash, K., & Duchnowski, A. (eds.) Outcomes for Children and Youth. 2nd edition. Austin, TX: Proed.
- Reynolds, A. J.- Confirmatory Program Evaluation: Application to Early Childhood Evaluations
- Rolfson, M., & Torvatn, H. (2005). How to 'Get through': Communication challenges in formative evaluation.
- Rosas, S. R.- Concept Mapping as a Technique for Program Theory Development
- Ryan, K. (2002). Shaping Educational Accountability Systems
- Ryan, K.- Servicing Public Interests in Educational Accountability: Alternative Approaches to Democratic Evaluation
- Sapyta, J., Riemer, M., & Bickman, L. (2005). Feedback to Clinicians: Theory, Research, & Practice
- Saunders, R. C., & Heflinger, C. A. (2004). Integrating Data from Multiple Public Sources
- Saunders, R. P., Evans, M. H., & Joshi, P. (2005). Developing a Process-Evaluation Plan for Assessing Health Promotion Program Implementation: A How to Guide
- Saxe, L., & Cross, T. P. (1997). Interpreting the Fort Bragg children's mental health demonstration project: The cup is half full.
- Scheirer, M. A. (1998). Commentary: Evaluation planning is the heart of the matter.
- Scriven, M. (1998). Minimalist Theory: The Latest Theory that Practice Requires
- Sechrest, L., & Walsh, M. (1997). Dogma or data: Bragging rights.
- Shaw, I., & Crompton, A.- Theory, Like Mist on Spectacles, Obscures Vision
- Shaw, I. F. (2003). Ethics in qualitative research and evaluation.
- Sherwood, K. E. (2005). Evaluation of the fighting back initiative.
- Sidani, S., & Sechrest, L. (1999). Putting Program Theory Into Operation
- Staines, G. L., McKendrick, K., Perlis, T., Sacks, S. & De Leon, G. (1999). Sequential assignment and treatment-as-usual.
- Stame, N.- Theory-based Evaluations and Types of Complexity
- Stozlenberg, L., & D'Alessio, S. J. (2003). "Born to be wild" The effect of the repeal of Florida's mandatory motorcycle helmet-use law on serious injury and fatality rates.
- Stuffembeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation Models
- Teddle, C. (2005). Methodological issues related to causal studies of leadership
- The complexity of the IRB process: Some of the things you wanted to know about IRBS but were afraid to ask.
- Thurston, W. E., Graham, J., & Hatfield, J.- Evaluability Assessment
- Vaessen, J.- Stakeholder Values in Program Theory Evaluation
- Valovirta, V. (2002). Evaluation utilization as argumentation.
- Van Der Knapp, P.- Theory-based Evaluation and Learning: Possibilities and Challenges
- Virtanen, P., & Uusikyla, P.- Exploring the Missing Link between Cause and Effect
- Weisburd, D. (2003). Ethical practice and evaluation of interventions in crime and justice
- Weiss, C. H., Graham, E. M., & Birkeland, S. (2005). An alternate route to policy influence: How evaluations affect D.A.R.E.
- Weisz, J. R., Han, S. S., & Valerie, S. M. (1997). More of what?: Issues raised by the Fort Bragg study.

5/10/2006

Weston, T.- Formative Evaluation for Implementation: Evaluating Educational Technology Applications and Lessons

Yamploskaya, S., Nesman, T. M., Hernandez, M., & Koch, D.- Using Concept Mapping to Develop a Logic Model and Articulate a Program Theory: A Case Example