

**City University of Hong Kong  
Course Syllabus**

**offered by Department of Social & Behavioural Sciences  
with effect from Semester A 2022/23**

---

---

**Part I Course Overview**

<b>Course Title:</b>	Program Design and Evaluation
<b>Course Code:</b>	SS5423
<b>Course Duration:</b>	One Semester
<b>Credit Units:</b>	3
<b>Level:</b>	P5
<b>Medium of Instruction:</b>	English
<b>Medium of Assessment:</b>	English
<b>Prerequisites:</b> <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
<b>Precursors:</b> <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
<b>Equivalent Courses:</b> <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil
<b>Exclusive Courses:</b> <i>(Course Code and Title)</i>	Nil

## Part II Course Details

### 1. Abstract

This course aims to:

1. provide a fundamental understanding of the purpose, design, and implementation of program design and management
2. equip students about the scope and types of program evaluation and the practices of evaluations in human service settings
3. enable students to assess and conduct program evaluation studies of sociological practice in social service settings.

### 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.	Recognize the contexts and explain the purpose, design and characteristics of the role and practice of program planning and evaluation in human services;	20%	√	√	
2.	Identify evaluation requirements in the planning, designing and managing human service interventions for continuous quality improvement;	30%	√	√	√
3.	Assess program evaluability and recognize appropriate program evaluation designs to monitor human service deliveries; and	30%	√	√	√
4.	Plan small scale program evaluation studies.	20%	√	√	
		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			
TLA1: Lectures	Weekly lectures, with topics prepared and presented by lecturers. The lectures may assign student to read supplementary readings concerning the topics.	√	√	√	√			
TLA2: Assignments and tutorials	In the weekly lectures the students are required to participate in a wide variety of assignments. 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 evaluation proposal of selected program, and their critique on selected program evaluation research report.	√	√	√	√			
TLA3: Group presentation	Students are required to form small groups to prepare a program evaluation proposal. There will be oral presentation from each group on week 12.	√	√	√	√			

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

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

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CISO No.					Weighting	Remarks
	1	2	3	4			
Continuous Assessment: 65%							
AT1: Individual Paper  Each Participant has to conduct a critical review of a selected Program Evaluation Study.	√	√	√	√		25%	
AT2: Group Presentation  Participants will form a group with of 5 to 6 students, and they have to select a program from a human service organization and develop a proposal for the evaluation of the selected program. There will be an oral presentation for each group, followed by discussion.	√	√	√	√		20%	
AT3: Individual / Group Assignments  In the weekly lectures, students are required to complete in a wide variety of individual or group assignments.	√	√	√	√		20%	
AT4: In-class test: 35% (duration: 90 minutes, if applicable)							
Closed Book Examination  There will be a MCQs and short-essay typed quiz to assess the participants' understanding of concepts and principles of program planning and evaluation.	√	√	√			35%	
						100%	

## 5. Assessment Rubrics

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

Applicable to students admitted in Semester A 2022/23 and thereafter

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B)	Marginal (B-, C+, C)	Failure (F)
1. Individual Paper (25%)	It assesses the content, organization and fluency of the papers. Students should demonstrate the analytical ability and skilful application of theoretical and methodological concepts in the program evaluation.	<p>Strong evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rich content, ability to integrate and apply various theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>▪ Being able to show the understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>▪ Exact and fluent expression of original opinions;</li> <li>▪ Rigorous organization, coherent structure,</li> </ul>	<p>Some evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rich content, ability to integrate and apply various theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>▪ Being able to show the understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>▪ Exact and fluent expression of original opinions;</li> <li>▪ Rigorous organization, coherent structure, systematic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate content;</li> <li>• Limited or irrelevant use of theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>• Inadequate understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>• Loose organization;</li> <li>• Sentence fluency and articulation is merely acceptable;</li> <li>• Inadequate creative, insightful, and original ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vague and devoid of content, weak ability to integrate and apply various theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>• Not being able to show the understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>• Loose organization of composition;</li> <li>• Unsystematic expression of ideas;</li> <li>• Seriously insufficient/no</li> </ul>

		<p>systematic composition;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Creative, and insightful ideas.</li> </ul>	<p>composition;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Creative, and insightful ideas.</li> </ul>		<p>reference.</p>
<p>2. Group Presentation (20%)</p>	<p>It assesses students' ability to explain with rich content, excellent grasp of the materials with in-depth and extensive knowledge of the topic; rigorous organization, coherent structure; original ideas; creative use of presentation methods.</p>	<p>Strong evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rich content, excellent grasp of the materials with in-depth and extensive knowledge of the topic;</li> <li>• Being able to show the understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>• Rigorous organization, coherent structure;</li> </ul>	<p>Some evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rich content, excellent grasp of the materials with in-depth and extensive knowledge of the topic;</li> <li>• Being able to show the understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>• Rigorous organization, coherent structure;</li> <li>• Insightful ideas and analysis of the topic;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loose organization, merely acceptable identified content;</li> <li>• Inadequate grasp of the relevant theories and concepts;</li> <li>• Inadequate understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>• Simple and unilateral ideas, without clear explanation;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor grasp of relevant theories and concepts;</li> <li>• Limited familiarity with the topic; not being able to show the understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>• Loose organization;</li> <li>• Unsystematic ideas which cannot express the topic;</li> <li>• Devoid of personal ideas and opinions;</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insightful ideas and analysis of the topic;</li> <li>• Superior presentation skills: fluent expression and appropriate diction, clear delivery of ideas, creative use of presentation methods, exact time-management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior presentation skills: distinct pronunciation, fluent expression and appropriate diction, clear delivery of ideas, creative use of presentation methods, exact time-management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Merely acceptable articulation and expression of ideas; merely acceptable presentation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear expression of ideas, poor time management.</li> </ul>
3. Class Assignments (20%)	Ability to apply relevant concepts and skills related to program design and evaluation.	High	Significant	Basic	Not even reaching marginal levels
4. Closed Book in-class test (35 %)	Ability to understand and apply the sociological knowledge and concepts in a variety of occupational settings.	Strong evidence for the ability to understand and describe the sociological knowledge and concepts in a	Good evidence for the ability to understand and describe sociological knowledge and concepts n a	Fair evidence for the ability to understand and describe the sociological knowledge in a variety of	Insufficient evidence for the ability to understand and describe the sociological knowledge and

		variety of occupational settings.	variety of occupational settings.	occupational settings.	concepts in a variety of occupational settings.
--	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------	---

Applicable to students admitted before Semester A 2022/23

Assessment Task	Criterion	Excellent (A+, A, A-)	Good (B+, B, B-)	Fair (C+, C, C-)	Marginal (D)	Failure (F)
1. Individual Paper (25%)	It assesses the content, organization and fluency of the papers. Students should demonstrate the analytical ability and skilful application of theoretical and methodological concepts in the program evaluation.	<p>Strong evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rich content, ability to integrate and apply various theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>▪ Being able to show the understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>▪ Exact and fluent expression of original opinions;</li> <li>▪ Rigorous</li> </ul>	<p>Some evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rich content, ability to integrate and apply various theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>▪ Being able to show the understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>▪ Exact and fluent expression of original opinions;</li> <li>▪ Rigorous organization,</li> </ul>	<p>Limited evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rich content, ability to integrate and apply various theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>▪ Being able to show the understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>▪ Exact and fluent expression of original opinions;</li> <li>▪ Rigorous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate content;</li> <li>• Limited or irrelevant use of theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>• Inadequate understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>• Loose organization;</li> <li>• Sentence fluency and articulation is merely acceptable;</li> <li>• Inadequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vague and devoid of content, weak ability to integrate and apply various theoretical and methodological concepts;</li> <li>• Not being able to show the understanding of various concepts;</li> <li>• Loose organization of composition;</li> <li>• Unsystematic expression of</li> </ul>



		organization, coherent structure, systematic composition; ▪ Creative, and insightful ideas.	coherent structure, systematic composition; ▪ Creative, and insightful ideas.	organization, coherent structure, systematic composition; ▪ Creative, and insightful ideas.	creative, insightful, and original ideas.	ideas; • Seriously insufficient/no reference.
2. Group Presentation (20%)	It assesses students' ability to explain with rich content, excellent grasp of the materials with in-depth and extensive knowledge of the topic; rigorous organization, coherent structure; original ideas; creative use of presentation methods.	Strong evidence of: • Rich content, excellent grasp of the materials with in-depth and extensive knowledge of the topic; • Being able to show the understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts; • Rigorous organization,	Some evidence of: • Rich content, excellent grasp of the materials with in-depth and extensive knowledge of the topic; • Being able to show the understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts; • Rigorous organization, coherent structure;	Limited evidence of: • Rich content, excellent grasp of the materials with in-depth and extensive knowledge of the topic; • Being able to show the understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts; • Rigorous organization, coherent structure;	• Loose organization, merely acceptable identified content; • Inadequate grasp of the relevant theories and concepts; • Inadequate understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts; • Simple and unilateral ideas, without	• Poor grasp of relevant theories and concepts; • Limited familiarity with the topic; not being able to show the understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts; • Loose organization; • Unsystematic ideas which cannot express the topic;

		<p>coherent structure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insightful ideas and analysis of the topic;</li> <li>• Superior presentation skills: fluent expression and appropriate diction, clear delivery of ideas, creative use of presentation methods, exact time-management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insightful ideas and analysis of the topic;</li> <li>• Superior presentation skills: distinct pronunciation, fluent expression and appropriate diction, clear delivery of ideas, creative use of presentation methods, exact time-management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insightful ideas and analysis of the topic;</li> <li>• Superior presentation skills: distinct pronunciation, fluent expression and appropriate diction, clear delivery of ideas, creative use of presentation methods, exact time-management.</li> </ul>	<p>clear explanation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Merely acceptable articulation and expression of ideas; merely acceptable presentation skills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devoid of personal ideas and opinions;</li> <li>• Unclear expression of ideas, poor time management.</li> </ul>
3. Class Assignments (20%)	Ability to apply relevant concepts and skills related to program design and evaluation.	High	Significant	Moderate	Basic	Not even reaching marginal levels
4. Closed Book in-class test (35 %)	Ability to understand and apply the sociological knowledge and concepts in a variety of occupational settings.	Strong evidence for the ability to understand and describe the sociological	Good evidence for the ability to understand and describe sociological	Fair evidence for the ability to understand and describe the sociological	Limited evidence for the ability to understand and describe the sociological	Insufficient evidence for the ability to understand and describe the

		knowledge and concepts in a variety of occupational settings.	knowledge and concepts n a variety of occupational settings.	knowledge in a variety of occupational settings.	knowledge and concepts, in a variety of occupational settings.	sociological knowledge and concepts in a variety of occupational settings.
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**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.)*

1.1 The context of program evaluation

The nature and scope of program evaluation; Origin and development of program evaluation; The relationship between evaluation and Applied Sociology; Social research, applied research and evaluation research

1.2 Program planning, Logic model, and program management

What is program? The scope within a program; Characteristics of program design; New paradigm for program planning; Steps in program planning; Different models of program design: Logic model; Planning and evaluation; Managing a service program

1.3 Fundamentals of program evaluation

Different types of program evaluation; Alternative ways of classification; Paradigms within program evaluation; Evaluation approaches; The Content, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) model

1.4 The evaluation practice

Framework for evaluation; Evaluation criteria and standards; Political and interpersonal aspects of evaluation; Ethical Issues in evaluation; Utilization of evaluation findings; A word on evaluation proposal

1.5 Needs assessment and evaluability assessment

What is needs assessment? Steps in doing needs assessment evaluation; Evaluability assessment and its coverage; How is evaluability assessment performed? EA and other types of evaluation

1.6 Quantitative and qualitative approaches

Experimental Design Approach: Quasi-experimental designs; Single System Designs (SSDs); Survey research; Qualitative research designs; Multiple methods and triangulation

1.7 Data collection and measurement

Data sources and types of data; Indicators construction and instrument consideration; Selecting valid and reliable performance measures; Goal attainment scaling

1.8 Data analysis and interpretation

Basic principles and issues of analysis; Tests of significance of group differences; Visual inspection and analysis; Distinguishing effectiveness and efficiency

1.9 Report Writing

Writing a research report: Reporting fixed design (quantitative) research; Reporting flexible design (qualitative) research; The case of evaluation report

**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.	Newcomer, K. E., Hatry, H. P., & Wholey, J. S. (Eds). (2015) <i>Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, 4th Ed.</i> San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
----	---

2.	Mertens, D. M. & Wilson, A.T. (2019) <i>Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide, 2th Ed.</i> New York: Guilford Press.
----	--

## 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. (2009) <i>Evaluation Practice: Guidelines for the Accountable Professional, 6<sup>th</sup> Ed.</i> New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
3.	Donaldson, Stewart I. & Scriven, M. Eds. (2003) <i>Evaluating Social Programs and Problems: Visions for the New Millennium.</i> London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
4.	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.
5.	Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R. & Worthen, B. R. (2011) <i>Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines, 4th Ed.</i> Boston: Pearson.
6.	Funnell, S. C. & Rogers, P. J. (2011) <i>Purposeful Program Theory: Effective Use of Theories of Change and Logic Models.</i> CA: John Wiley & Sons.
7.	Grinnell, Jr. R. M., & Unrau, Y. A. (2014) <i>Social work research and evaluation: Foundations of evidence-based practice, 10<sup>th</sup> Ed.</i> Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8.	McDavid, J. C. & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (2006) <i>Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement.</i> Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
9.	Nugent, W. R., Sieppert, J. D. and Hudson, W. W. (2001) <i>Practice Evaluation for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.</i> USA: Wadsworth.
10.	Posavac, E. J. & Carey, R. G. (2010) <i>Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies, 8<sup>th</sup> Ed.</i> NJ: Prentice Hall.
11.	Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Wright, S. R. (2004) <i>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed.</i> London: Sage Publications.
12.	Royse, D., Bruce, A. T. & Padgett, D. K. (2010) <i>Program Evaluation: An Introduction, 5<sup>th</sup> Ed.</i> Belmont, C. A.: Wadsworth.
13.	Schallock, R. L. (2001) <i>Outcome-based Evaluation, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.</i> NY: Kluwer Academic, Plenum Publishers.
14.	Stufflebeam, D. L. & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007) <i>Evaluation theory, models, and applications.</i> San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.
15.	Unrau, Y. A., Gabor, P. A., & Grinnell, R. M. Jr. (2001) <i>Evaluation in the Human Services.</i> UK: Brooks.
16.	Unrau, Y. A., Gabor, P. A. & Grinnell, Jr., R. M. (2007) <i>Evaluation in social work: The art and science of practice(4<sup>th</sup> Ed) [electronic resource].</i> Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.