
JOHNSON-SHOYAMA GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
GSPP 818 PROGRAM EVALUATION
FALL 2008

Instructor: Kathleen McNutt, PhD
Office: GSPP 110.5
Phone: 585-5467
Email: kathy.mcnutt@uregina.ca

Room: ED 420
Day: Wednesday
Time: 7-9:45
Office hours: By appointment only

CALENDAR DESCRIPTION

Through extensive use of examples from various fields, students will be exposed to the art and science of applying evaluation methodologies and techniques to policies and programs in both the public and nonprofit sectors.

CLASS DESCRIPTION

This class will introduce students to applied approaches to program evaluation and analytical techniques used to determine the validity, effectiveness and impact of policy decisions at various strategies of the program life cycle. Students will be introduced to various types, methods and tools of evaluation including formative and summative evaluation, impact assessment, needs assessment, and logic models. In addition, students will become proficient in developing a program evaluation research design and developing various criteria to measure outcomes and program effects.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Carol Weiss. 1998. *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies*. 2nd ed.
Prentice-Hall: Saddle River New Jersey

Other readings available online and on WebCT

COURSE EVALUATION

ASSIGNMENT	DUE DATE	LENGTH	% OF FINAL MARK
INDIVIDUAL MARKS			
Logic Model	Oct 1	Handout	15%
Participation	na	na	10%
GROUP MARKS			
Literature Review	Sept 24	10 pages	20%
Evaluation Proposal	Nov 5	3-5 pages	15%
Written Report	Nov 26	15 pages	30%
Presentation	Dec 3	20 minutes	10%
* All written work should be double spaced and use Times New Roman font 12 point			

CLASS PROJECT

The semester for the first times GSPP 818 will provide graduate students with an opportunity to conduct an evaluation of an existing program. The class will be undertaking a program evaluation of the Vehicle Impoundment against Sexual Exploitation (VISE) program which is housed in the Saskatchewan Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing. The Ministry provides the following description of the program on their website:

How VISE works

The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 2001, provides police with the authority to seize and impound vehicles that they have reasonable grounds to believe have been used in committing certain offences related to procuring sexual services and prostitution.

If any person in the vehicle at the time of seizure is convicted of one of these offences, a vehicle remaining on impound at the time of trial will automatically be forfeited to the Crown. If the owner of the vehicle has been charged with one of these offences, he will get it back only if no one in the vehicle is convicted, or if everyone in the vehicle attends an approved program, otherwise known as "john school." Because preying on children for sexual services is considered child abuse, those offenders who solicit children and youth are not eligible to obtain return of the vehicle by completing the "john school" program.

These "john school" programs educate offenders about their impact on prostitutes and their families, and the community. Offenders must accept responsibility for their offence before they are allowed into the programs. The offender will be responsible for all program fees, as well as the towing and impound costs associated with the seizure of the vehicle. Those who enroll in, but do not complete the approved "john school" program will have their driver's license suspended for one year. Those convicted of a prostitution-related offence involving a vehicle will face a license suspension of one year for a first offence, and two years for a subsequent offence.

<http://www.cpsp.gov.sk.ca/How-VISE-works>

As a class we will be conducting an outcome evaluation of the VISE program. Specifically students will be asked to participate in an impact analysis of the VISE program outcomes. The mandate of the program is to reduce the volume of street prostitution in Regina, Saskatoon, and Prince Albert and we will be evaluating the outcome of the program since its inception.

The program has been operational since May 2002 and is designed as an enforcement tool to support police services' efforts to enforce Part XV div3 of the Traffic Safety Act. Since it has begun the VISE program has impounded over 500 cars and had over 400 attendees at John's School.

The class will be divided into teams which each team responsible for evaluating a specific component of the program.

TEAM ASSIGNMENTS

Team One – Sex Trade Workers in Saskatchewan

Team Two – Community Leaders’ Perceptions of Social Impacts

Team Three – John’s School

Team Four – Operations and Organizational structure

Team Five – Law and Policy

Each Team will be expected to write 10 page literature review on the following topics

Team One – Historical Analysis of the Provincial Sex Trade

Team Two – Community-based Programs Focused on the Sex Trade

Team Three – Prostitution Intervention Programs

Team Four – Operations and Organizational structure

Team Five - Prosecuting the Sex-Trade Worker vs. Prosecuting the Sex-Trade Consumer

SEMINAR SCHEDULE

September 3

COURSE INTRODUCTION

- Course Overview, Assignments, and Introduction to Topics
- **Guest Speaker TBA**

September 10

INTRODUCTION to PROGRAM EVALUATION

- Lecture: “Planning an Evaluation: Consideration on Research Design”
- **Guest Speaker Mr. Rick Peach**

Required Readings:

deLeon, P. 1983. “Policy Evaluation and Program Termination.” *Policy Studies Review*. 2(4): 631-647.

Goldenberg, E. 1983. “The Three Faces of Evaluation.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 2(4): 515-525.

Geva-May, Iris and Leslie A. Pal. 1999. “Good Fences Make Good Neighbours: Policy Evaluation and Policy Analysis - Exploring the Differences.” *Evaluation*. 5(3): 259-277.

Weiss Chapter 1 “Setting the Scene”

Weiss Chapter 2 “Purposes of Evaluation”

Supplementary Reading

Geva-May, I. 2001. “When the Motto is ‘Till Death Do Us Part’: The Conceptualization and the Craft of Termination in the Public Policy Cycle.” *International Journal of Public Administration*. 24(3): 263-288.

Stein-Erik Kruse, S. Taut and E. Tenden. 2006. “Chasing a Ghost? An Essay on Participatory Evaluation and Capacity Development .” *Evaluation*. 12(1): 128-144.

Perrin, B. 1998. “Effective Use and Misuse of Performance Measurement.” *American Journal of Evaluation*. 19: 367-87.

Swindell, D. and J. Kelly. 2005. “Linking Citizen Satisfaction Data to Performance Measures: A Preliminary Evaluation.” *Public Performance & Management Review*. 24(1): 30-52.

Rivenbark, W. 2000. “The Role of Capital Cost in Performance Measurement and Benchmarking.” *Public Performance & Management Review*. 24(1): 22-29336 - 359.

September 17

PLANNING PROGRAM EVALUATION

- Lecture: “Planning an Evaluation: Consideration on Research Design”
- **Workshop – Learning to Use Logic Models**

Required Readings

Weiss Chapter 3 “Understanding the Program”

Weiss Chapter 4 “Planning the Evaluation”

Weiss Chapter 5 “Roles for the Evaluator”

Schalock, R. and G. Bonham. “Measuring Outcomes and Managing for Results.” *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 26(3): 229-235.

Toffolon-Weiss, J. Bertrand, and S. S. Terrell. 1999. “The Results Framework-An Innovative Tool for Program Planning and Evaluation” *Evaluation Review*. 23:

Supplementary Readings

Cramer, J., T. Dietz and R. Johnston. 1980. “Social Impact Assessment of Regional Plans: A Review of Methods and Issues and a Recommended Process.” *Policy Sciences*. 12(1): 61-82.

Dobrow, M., V. Goel, L. Lemieux-Charles and N. Black. 2006. “The Impact of Context

on Evidence Utilization: A Framework For Expert Groups Developing Health Policy Recommendations.” *Social Science & Medicine*. 63(7): 1811-1824.

Dunn, W, A Hegedus and B. Holzner. 1988. “Science Impact Assessment and Public Policy.” *Review of Policy Research*. 8(1): 146-154.

Gaber, J. 2000. “Meta-needs Assessment.” *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 23(2): 139-147.

Ratner, P. et al. 1997. “Setting the Stage for Health Impact Assessment.” *Journal of Public Health Policy*. 18(1): 67-79.

September 24

IMPACT ANALYSIS and OUTCOME EVALUATION

- **Group Literature Reviews due**
- Lecture: “Did the Program Work?: Analyzing the Impact of a Program on the Problem”
- **Workshop – Preparing Interview Questions**

Required Readings

In class handouts

Kempinen, C and M. Kurlychek. 2003. “An Outcome Evaluation of Pennsylvania’s Boot Camp: Does Rehabilitative Programming Within a Disciplinary Setting Reduce Recidivism.” *Crime & Delinquency*. 49(4): 581-602.

Mohr, B. 1999. “The Qualitative Method of Impact Analysis.” *American Journal of Evaluation*. 20: 69-84.

Wexler, H. G. Falkin and D. Lipton. 1990. “Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment.” *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 17(1): 71-92.

Supplementary Readings

Eser, T. and E. Nussmueller. 2006. “Mid-term evaluations of Community Initiatives under European Union Structural Funds: A process between accounting and common learning.” *Regional Studies*. 40(2): 249-258.

Schneider, A L. 1986. “The Evolution of a Policy Orientation for Evaluation Research: A Guide to Practice.” *Public Administration Review*. 46(4): 356-363.

Stein-Erik Kruse, S. Taut and E. Tenden. 2006. “Chasing a Ghost? An Essay on Participatory Evaluation and Capacity Development .” *Evaluation*. 12(1): 128-144.

Warburton, R. and W. Warburton. 2004. “Canada Needs Better Data for Evidence-Based Policy: Inconsistencies Between Administrative and Survey Data on Welfare Dependence and Education.” *Canadian Public Policy*. 30(3): 241-255.

October 1

MEASURING SUCCESS

- **Logic Models due**
- Lectures: Development Measurement and Establishing Criteria
- **Workshop – Criteria Selection**

Required Readings:

Schalock, R. and G. Bonham. “Measuring Outcomes and Managing for Results.”
Evaluation and Program Planning. 26(3): 229-235.

Weiss Chapter 6 “Developing Measures”

Weiss Chapter 7 “Collecting Data”

Weiss Chapter 12 “Analyzing and Interpreting the Data”

Kempinen, C and M. Kurlychek. 2003. “An Outcome Evaluation of Pennsylvania’s
Boot Camp: Does Rehabilitative Programming Within a Disciplinary Setting Reduce
Recidivism.” *Crime & Delinquency*. 49(4): 581-602.

Supplementary Readings

Miller, T. and M. Kobayashi, and P. Noble. 2006. “Insourcing, Not Capacity Building,
a Better Model for Sustained Program Evaluation.” *American Journal of
Evaluation*. 27: 83-94.

Treasury Board of Canada, Secretariat. (1998) *Program Evaluation Methods:
Measurement and Attribution of Program Results, Third Edition* downloadable
file: http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/eval/pubs/pub96_e.asp

Warburton, R. and W. Warburton. 2004. “Canada Needs Better Data for Evidence-Based
Policy: Inconsistencies Between Administrative and Survey Data on Welfare
Dependence and Education.” *Canadian Public Policy*. 30(3): 241-255.

October 8

THE VISE PROGRAM

- **Special panel of guest from police service, community organizations and the provincial government will discuss the design and implementation of the VISE program in Saskatchewan**

Required Readings:

Larsen, Nick. 1996. “The Effect of Different Police Enforcement Policies on the Control
of Prostitution.” *Canadian Public Policy*. 22(1): 40-55.

Monto, M. and S. Garcia. 2001. “Recidivism Among the Customers of Female Street Prostitutes:

Do Intervention Programs Help?" *Western Criminology Review* 3 (2). Available:
<http://wcr.sonoma.edu/v3n2/monto.html>.

Moyer Sharon, - Coming

Wortley, S., B. Fischer, and C. Webster. 2002. "Vice Lessons: A Survey of Prostitution Offenders Enrolled In the Toronto John School Diversion Program." *Canadian Journal of Criminology*. 44(4): 369-402.

Supplementary Readings

Beech, Anthony; Fordham, Ann Scott. 1997. "Therapeutic Climate of Sexual Offender Treatment Programs." *A Journal Of Research And Treatment* 9(3): 219-237.

Fischer, B., S Wortley, C. Webster and M Kirst, Maritt. 2002. "The Socio-Legal Dynamics And Implications Of `Diversion': The Case Study Of The Toronto `John School' Diversion Programme For Prostitution Offenders." *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 2(4): 385-410.

Lowman, J. 1991. "Punishing Prostitutes and Their Customers: The Legacy of the Badgley Committee, the Fraser Committee, and Bill C-49." In L. Samuelson and B. Schissel *Criminal Justice: Sentencing Issues and Reform*. Garamond Press and Social Research Unit, Dept. of Sociology, University of Saskatchewan,.

Monto, Martin A. 1998. "Holding Men Accountable for Prostitution: The Unique Approach of the Sexual Exploitation Education Project (SEEP)." *Violence Against Women* 4(4): 505-517.

November 5

PREPARING THE REPORT

- **Evaluation Proposals due**
- Lecture: "Writing an Evaluation and Sharing Information"
- **Guest Speaker TBA**

Required Readings:

Mazur, Beth. 2000. Revisiting Plain Language. *Technical Communication* 47(2): 205-211.

Musso, Juliet, Robert Biller, and Robert Myrtle. 2000. "Tradecraft: Professional Writing as Problem Solving." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 19(4): 635-646.

Weiss Chapter 13 "Writing the Report and Disseminating Results"

Supplementary Readings

Smith, Catherine F. *Writing Public Policy: A Practical Guide to Communicating in the Policy-Making Process*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Schwartz R. and J. Mayne. 2005. "Assuring the Quality of Evaluation Information Theory and Practice." *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 28(1):1-14

November 26

PREPARING the PRESENTATION

- **Written Report due**
- In Class discussion of Findings and Key Themes
- **Workshop – Doing the Formal Presentation**

December 3

PRESENTATION TO DEPUTY MINISTER AND PROGRAM DIRECTOR

FURTHER SUGGESTED READING

Alkin, Marvin C., Richard Daillak, and Peter White. 1979. *Using evaluations: does evaluation make a difference?* Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Bemelmans-Videc, Marie-Louise, Ray C. Rist, Evert Vedung, eds. 1998. *Carrots, sticks & sermons : policy instruments & their evaluation* New Brunswick, N.J., U.S.A. : Transaction Publishers.

Bernstein. Ilene N. ed. 1976. *Validity issues in evaluative research*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Brinkerhoff, Robert O. et al. 1983. *Program evaluation : a practitioner's guide for trainers and educators : sourcebook*. Boston : Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing,

Guess, George M. and Paul G. Farnham. 1989. *Cases in public policy analysis*. New York: Longman.

Judd, Charles M. and David A. Kenny. 1981. *Estimating the effects of social interventions*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nagel, Stuart, ed. 2002. *Contemporary policy evaluation*. Huntington, N.Y.: Nova Science Publishers.

Nagel, Stuart S., ed. 1990. *Policy theory and policy evaluation: concepts, knowledge, causes, and norms*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 1997. *Utilization-focused evaluation: the new century text*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.

Posavac, Emil J. and Raymond G. Carey. 1992. *Program evaluation: methods and case studies*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Schalock, Robert L. with Craig V.D. Thornton. 1988. *Program evaluation: a field guide for administrators*. New York: Plenum Press.

Thompson, Mark S. 1980. *Benefit-cost analysis for program evaluation*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Yanow, Dvora. 2000. *Conducting interpretive policy analysis* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.