

JSGS 824 HEALTH PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY OF REGINA CAMPUS	
INSTRUCTOR:	Cynthia Bojkovsky
PHONE:	(306) 585 - 5460
E-MAIL:	cynthia.bojkovsky@uregina.ca
OFFICE HOURS:	By appointment, for phone or video meetings
OFFICE LOCATION:	College Ave Campus, University of Regina
TERM:	Winter 2022
ROOM:	N/A - Online
DATE AND TIME:	N/A - Online

This is a draft form of the syllabus. Revisions may be possible until the start date of the course.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to extend my appreciation to Dr. Tarun Katapally for sharing his previous version of this course, some of which has been used as foundational material for this delivery of JSGS 824. The content of the current syllabus is the intellectual property of the current instructor, Cynthia Bojkovsky.

CALENDAR DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to provide the key principles of health program planning and evaluation. The areas of focus for this course include program planning models; design of evaluation plans; program theory; mixed-methods data collection; indicators and measures of program outcomes; policy evaluation and evaluation reporting.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Understand program theory and how it applies to health program planning
- Explore different models of health program planning
- Understand health program evaluation and utilize techniques applicable to different contexts
- Recognize the role of mixed methods research in program evaluation
- Learn how to communicate and report program evaluations
- Apply ethical and cultural considerations to health program planning and evaluation

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The University of Saskatchewan campus of the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy is situated on Treaty 6 Territory and the Homeland of the Métis, while the University of Regina campus is situated on Treaty 4 Territory and the Homeland of the Métis. We pay our respect to the First Nation and Métis ancestors of this place and reaffirm our relationship with one another. As we engage in Remote Teaching and Learning, we would also like to recognize that others will be attending this course from other traditional Indigenous lands. I ask that you take a moment to make your own Land Acknowledgement to the peoples of those lands. In doing so, we are actively participating in reconciliation as we navigate our time in this course, learning and supporting each other.

HONOUR CODE

At the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy (JSGS), we believe honesty and integrity are fundamental in a community dedicated to learning, personal development, and a search for understanding. We revere these values and hold them essential in promoting personal responsibility, moral and intellectual leadership, and pride in ourselves and our University.

As JSGS students, we will represent ourselves truthfully, claim only work that is our own, and engage honestly in all academic assignments.

Since articulated standards and expectations can influence attitudes, and because each of us shares the responsibility for maintaining academic integrity (see below for details on academic integrity at the JSGS), we are committed to upholding the Academic Honor Code.

Academic Honour Pledge

As a member of the JSGS community, I pledge to live by and to support the letter and spirit of JSGS's Academic Honour Code.

ATTRIBUTES OF JSGS GRADUATES

Through the development of the following competencies, JSGS MPA graduates will be prepared to meet the policy challenges of a rapidly changing world:

- Analysis and Use of Evidence – how to use evidence and develop the necessary analytical skills to succeed in a public administration career;
- Politics and Democracy – ensuring that students have a deep understanding of the role of politics and democracy in public policy development including the roles of the various institutions and policy actors; and
- Policy Delivery – the importance of effective service delivery and the ongoing management and evaluation of public policy.

MHA PROGRAM COMPETENCIES

1. Health Services and Health Status - Ability to analyze health services and other factors that impact health status and demonstrate a commitment to improving the health status of individuals, families, and communities.
2. Management, Governance, and Leadership - Ability to inspire support for a vision or course of action and successfully direct the teams, processes, and changes required to accomplish it.
3. Communication and Interpersonal Skills - Ability to communicate effectively and build enduring, trust-based professional relationships.
4. Systems Thinking and Creative Analysis - Ability to identify key issues and problems, analyze them systematically, and reach sound, innovative conclusions.
5. Public Policy and Community Engagement - Ability to understand how organizational and public policies are formulated, their impact on healthcare organizations and communities, and how to influence their development.
6. Continuous Evaluation and Improvement - Commitment to on-going evaluation for continuous organizational and personal improvement.

COURSE CONTENT AND APPROACH

This course is divided into modules. Each module focuses on a particular topic and involves a set of readings, content with associated activities, and a discussion forum. Reviewing course materials in a thoughtful, analytical manner is an essential part of this course. Students will be expected to incorporate these materials in their discussion forum participation. Participation in the discussion forums is an important aspect of the course and will be addressed in greater detail below.

This is a graduate level course prepared for professional students. Each of you brings unique expertise and experience to the class which you are encouraged and expected to share. The success of this course and the quality of your experience will depend largely on your own level of engagement. The course is designed to be a joint learning experience for which we all share responsibility.

REMOTE LEARNING CONTEXT

We acknowledge the complex circumstances in which learning at the JSGS is taking place. Since a remote teaching and learning context is new to both instructors and students, all participations should interact with empathy, patience and care. Links to online learning resources are provided below.

USE OF VIDEO AND RECORDING THE COURSE

Some of our Zoom class sessions will be recorded to support students who may not be able to attend live due to work or family conflicts, connectivity challenges, or other restrictions. As a result, the University of Regina may collect students' images, voices, names, personal views and opinions, and course work under the legal authority of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. Recordings will be posted only in our URCourses site, which is a password protected learning management system, and made available only to registered students in the course.

Students who participate in a Zoom session with their video on or utilize a profile image are consenting to have their video or image recorded (including anything visible in the background). If you have concerns with such recording, be sure to keep your video off and do not use a profile image. In addition, students who un-mute their microphone during class and participate orally are consenting to have their

voices, and personal views and opinions recorded. If you are unwilling to consent to this recording, please do not un-mute your microphone during class. If you have any questions about the collection or use of your personal information, please contact your instructor.

REQUIRED READINGS

This course does not have a required text book. All required readings are from academic journals and online sources and are listed within the applicable module. If a URL has not been provided for a particular source, you will need to locate it from the UofR library.

SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS

Supplementary materials will also be suggested for each module. These materials are not required but will provide additional background and introduce different perspectives on the topics being considered. You are advised to pick and choose which of the supplementary materials to review depending on your areas of interest and/or challenge. Please do not feel obligated to review all supplementary materials on this syllabus.

Additional supplemental text books that you may find helpful for this field of study include:

Issel L., Wells, R. and Williams, M. 2021. *Health program planning and evaluation: A practical systemic approach to community health*. 5th edition. Toronto: Jones and Bartlett.

Green LW and Kreuter MW. 2004. *Health Program Planning: An Educational and Ecological Approach*. 4th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rossi, P., Lipsey, M. and Henry, G. *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. 8th edition. California: SAGE Publications Inc.

COURSE OUTLINE

Module 1: Introductions & Orientation	Jan 5 - 9*
--	-------------------

The first module will facilitate group introductions and include an overview of the course structure, content, expectations and methods of evaluation. It will also present an opportunity for students to become familiar with navigating and using the different features associated with this URCourses site.

There will be a **live webinar** scheduled in this module during which the instructor will review the syllabus and key expectations for the course. It will also be an opportunity for students to seek clarification on any points of confusion. This webinar will be recorded and a link subsequently made available on our URCourses site. Any students who are unable to attend are welcome to send questions to the instructor in advance by email. The date and time for the webinar will be posted in our URCourses site along with access information.

****Please note: this is a shortened module.***

No required readings for this module.

This module introduces basic concepts related to how program theory and health program planning connect to health policy. During this module we will explore how to determine the need for change and where to start. Topics will include but not be limited to concepts such as identifying target audiences, developing stakeholder relationships and contextual considerations in planning.

Required materials:

Centre for Community Health and Development. 1994-2021. *The Community Tool Box*. University of Kansas.

Section 1.3 Our model of practice: Building capacity for community and system change. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/overview/model-for-community-change-and-improvement/building-capacity/main>

Section 3.1 Developing a plan for assessing local needs and resources. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-resources/develop-a-plan/main>

Section 25.1 Changing policies: An overview. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/implement/changing-policies/overview/main>

Davidoff, F., Dixon-Woods, M., Leviton, L. and Michie, S. 2015. "Demystifying theory and its use in improvement." *British Medical Journal Quality and Safety* 24:228-238. DOI:10.1136/bmjqs-2014-003627

Jansen, M., Baltussen, R. and Baeroc, K. 2018. "Stakeholder participation for legitimate priority setting: A checklist." *International Journal of Health Policy Management* 7(11): 973-976. DOI: 10.15171/IJHPM.2018.57

Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). 2018. *Planning health promotion programs: introductory workbook*. 5th ed. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario. **p. 3-11**

Supplementary materials:

Pennel, C., Burdine, J., Prochaska, J. and McLeroy, K. 2017. "Common and critical components among community health assessment and community health improvement planning models." *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 23(4): S14-S21.

Quality Innovation and Innovation Partnership. 2009. *Needs Assessment Resource Guide*. Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care. <http://www.hqontario.ca/portals/0/documents/qi/qi-rg-needs-assessment-0901-en.pdf>

Tonelli, M., Tang, K. and Forest, P. 2020. "Canada needs a "Health in All Policies" action plan now." *Canadian Medical Journal* 192(3): E61-E67. <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/cmaj/192/3/E61.full.pdf>

This module looks different conceptual models and frameworks to guide program planning. Recognizing that there are an abundance of models and frameworks available for this type of work, the following will be explored in more detail: “Logic Models”, “Plan Do Study Act”, “PRECEDE/PROCEED” and “Intervention Mapping”.

Required materials:

Centre for Community Health and Development. 1994-2021. *The Community Tool Box*. University of Kansas.

Section 2.1 Developing a logic model or theory of change. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/overview/models-for-community-health-and-development/logic-model-development/main>

Section 2.2 PRECEDE/PROCEED. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-contents/overview/other-models-promoting-community-health-and-development/preceder-proceder/main>

Christoff, P., 2018. “Running PDSA cycles.” *Current problems in pediatric and adolescent healthcare* 48(8): 198-201.

Crosby, R., Noar, S. 2011. “What is a planning model? An introduction to PRECEDE-PROCEED.” *Journal of Public Health Dentistry* 71: S7-S15.

Fernandez, M., Ruiters, R., Markham, C. and Kok, G. 2019. “Intervention mapping: Theory and evidence based health promotion program planning: Perspective and examples.” *Frontiers in Public Health* 7. DOI: 00209.

Health Quality Ontario. N.A. *PDSA Cycles*. <http://www.hqontario.ca/portals/0/documents/qi/rf-document-pdsa-cycles-en.pdf>

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. N.A. *Introduction to Logic Models*. https://www.esu.edu/ospr/documents/15-16/Introduction_Logic_Models.pdf

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. 2004. *Logic Model Development Guide*. Available for download at: <https://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resources/2004/01/logic-model-development-guide>

Supplementary materials:

Calano, B., Cacal, M., Cal, C., Calletor, K., Guce, F., Bongar, M. and Macindo, J. 2019. “Effectiveness of a community-based health programme on the blood pressure control, adherence and knowledge of adults with hypertension: A PRECEDE PROCEED model approach.” *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 28(9-10): 1879 – 1888.

Centre for Community Health and Development. 1994-2021. *The Community Tool Box*. University of Kansas.

Section 2.3 Healthy cities/Healthy communities. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/overview/models-for-community-health-and-development/healthy-cities-healthy-communities/main>

Emond, T., Guillaumie, L. and de Montigny, F. 2021. "Using a logic model to develop an intervention for improving miscarriage care in the emergency department." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 85. DOI: 101910.

Hudon, C., Chouinar, MC., Brouselle, A., Bisson, M. and Danish, A. "Evaluating complex interventions in real context: Logic analysis of a case management program for frequent users of healthcare services." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 79. DOI: 101753.

Jones, N., Azzam, T., Wanzer, D., Skousen, D., Knight, C. and Sabarre, N. 2020. "Enhancing the effectiveness of logic models." *American Journal of Evaluation* 41(3): 452-470.

McNicholas, C., Lennox, L., Woodcock, T., Bell, D. and Reed, J. 2019. "Strategies to improve Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle fidelity: A retrospective mixed methods study." *British Medical Journal Quality and Safety* 28(5): 356-365.

Module 4: Indicators, Outcomes and Evaluations	Feb. 7 – 20*
---	---------------------

This module further explores the concept of program evaluation. Students can anticipate learning about how to discern the differences between indicators, outcomes and evaluations. Within this module, we will compare the merits of several commonly utilized evaluation strategies and methodologies for programs and policies.

*Note: Reading week runs Feb. 21 – 27. No course work is expected during this time.

Required materials:

Adamchuck, S., Bond, K., MacLaren, L., Magnani, R., Nelson, K. and Seltzer, J. *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluating Adolescent Reproductive Health Programs*. Focus on Young Adults. **Chapter 4: Indicators.** <https://www.fhi360.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/A%20Guide%20to%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluating%20Adolescent%20Reproductive%20Health%20Programs%20-%20Part%201.pdf>

Canadian Evaluation Society. 2014. *What is evaluation?* <https://evaluationcanada.ca/what-is-evaluation>

Centre for Community Health and Development. 1994-2021. *The Community Tool Box*. University of Kansas.

Section 1.5 Our Evaluation Model: Evaluating Comprehensive Community Initiatives
<https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/overview/model-for-community-change-and-improvement/evaluation-model/main>

Section 1.11 Participatory Evaluation <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/overview/model-for-community-change-and-improvement/participatory-evaluation/main>

Centre for Disease Control. N.A. *Types of Evaluation*.

<https://www.cdc.gov/std/program/pupestd/types%20of%20evaluation.pdf>

Fraser Health. 2009. *A guide to planning and conducting program evaluation*. Pages 3-11, 16-35.

https://www.fraserhealth.ca/-/media/Project/FraserHealth/FraserHealth/Health-Professionals/Research-and-Evaluation-Services/20170601_guide_to_planning_conducting_program_evaluation.pdf?la=en&hash=2B8872111BE43B9DE9E413B8E6E46094544E9987

Persaud, N. 2021. "Expanding the repertoire of evaluation tools so that evaluation recommendations can assist nonprofits to enhance strategic planning and design of program operations." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 89. DOI: 101985.

Saunders, R., Evans, M. and Joshi, P. 2005. "Developing a process-evaluation plan for assessing health promotion program implementation: A how-to guide." *Health Promotion Practice* 6(2): 134-147.

Scott, V., Alia, K., Scaccia, J., Ramaswamy, R., Saha, S., Leviton, L. and Wandersman, A. 2020. "Formative evaluation and complex health improvement initiatives: A learning system to improve theory, implementation, support and evaluation." *American Journal of Evaluation* 41(1):89-106.

Supplementary materials:

Badanta, B., Acebedo-Aguilera, R., Lucchetti, G. and de Diego-Cordero, R. 2021. "'A picture is worth a thousand words' – A photovoice study exploring health professionals' experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic." *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. 1-13. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8242762/>

Mayne, J. 2020. "Building an evaluative culture in community services: Caring for evidence." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 80. DOI: 101450.

Quinn, D., Jacobson, J., Wong, S., Wollins, D., Gilmore, T and Cunningham, G. 2020. "Cancer care in medically underserved communities: A formative evaluation method." *Quality Management in Health Care* 30(4): 251-258. DOI: 10.1097/QMH.0000000000000313

Science Buddies. N.A. *Designing a Survey*. <https://www.sciencebuddies.org/science-fair-projects/references/how-to-design-a-survey>

Taggart, L., Doherty, A., Chauhan, U. and Hassiotis, A. 2020. "An exploration of lifestyle/obesity programmes for adults with intellectual disabilities through a realist lens: Impact of 'context, mechanism and outcome' evaluation." *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities* 34(2): 578-593.

The purpose of this module is to consider how research tools, techniques and evidence can be used in evaluation. Several different quantitative and qualitative research techniques will be examined.

Required materials:

Centre for Community Health and Development. 1994-2021. *The Community Tool Box*. University of Kansas.

Section 3.6 Conducting focus groups. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-resources/conduct-focus-groups/main>

Section 3.12 Conducting interviews. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-resources/conduct-interviews/main>

Section 3.13 Conducting surveys. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-resources/conduct-surveys/main>

Section 3.15 Using qualitative methods to assess community issues. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-resources/qualitative-methods/main>

Section 36.2 Community based participatory research. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/evaluate/evaluation/intervention-research/main>

Queiros, A., Faria, D. and Almeida, F. 2017. "Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods." *European Journal of Education Studies* 3(9): 369-387. <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/1017/2934>

Wanzer, D. 2021. "What is evaluation? Perspectives of how evaluation differs (or not) from research." *American Journal of Evaluation* 42(1): 28-46. DOI: 10.1177/1098214020920710.

Woolcock, M. and Rao, V. 2011. *Integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches in program evaluation*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/253431574_Integrating_Qualitative_and_Quantitative_Approaches_in_Program_Evaluation

Supplementary materials:

Hayward, A., Wodtke, L, Craft, A., Robin (Martens), T., Smylie, J., McConkey, S., Nychuk, A., Healy, C., Star, L. and Cidro, J. 2021. "Addressing the need for indigenous and decolonized quantitative research methods in Canada." *Population Health* 15. DOI: 100899

Office of Data, Analysis, Research & Evaluation. May 2016. *Qualitative Research Methods in Program Evaluation: Considerations for Federal Staff*.

https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/acyf/qualitative_research_methods_in_program_evaluation.pdf

Module 6: Communicating and Reporting	Mar. 14 - 27
--	---------------------

In this module we will consider how to effectively share program evaluations with different audiences.

Required materials:

Azzam, T., Wanzer, DL., Knight, C. And Codd, H. 2021. "The manifestations of politics in evaluation: An exploratory study across the evaluation process." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 8. Doi: 101947.

Centre for Community Health and Development. 1994-2021. *The Community Tool Box*. University of Kansas.

Section 4.2 Communicating information about community health and development issues. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/getting-issues-on-the-public-agenda/communicate-information/main>

Section 6.1 Developing a plan for communication. <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/participation/promoting-interest/communication-plan/main>

Mirambeau, A., Elmi, J., Losby, J. and Gervin, D. 2013. *Evaluation reporting: A guide to help ensure use of evaluation findings*. National Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. https://www.cdc.gov/dhdsp/docs/Evaluation_Reporting_Guide.pdf

Mueller, N., Burke, R., Luke, D. And Kinne Harris, J. 2008. "Getting the word out: Multiple methods for disseminating evaluation findings." *Journal of public health management and practice* 14(2): 170-176.

Supplementary materials:

Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. 2013. *Developing an effective evaluation report: Setting the course for effective program evaluation*. Atlanta, Georgia. https://www.cdc.gov/eval/materials/Developing-An-Effective-Evaluation-Report_TAG508.pdf

Irwin, R. 2020. "Misinformation and de-contextualization: international media reporting on Sweden and COVID-19." *Globalization and Health* (16) 1: 62. <https://globalizationandhealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12992-020-00588-x>

Module 7: Ethical and Cultural Considerations for Program Planning**Mar. 28 – Apr. 3*****and Evaluation**

***Please note: This is shortened module. The week of April 4 -11 is designated work time for your final assignment.**

This module will encourage a deeper understanding of overall ethics and unique issues for program planning and evaluation such as culture, class and trauma.

Required materials:

Canadian Evaluation Society. 2014. *Ethics*. <https://evaluationcanada.ca/ethics>

Elliot, D., Bjelajac, P., Fallot, R., Markoff, L. and Glover Reed, B. 2005. Principles and implementation of trauma informed services for women. *Journal of Community Psychology* 33(4): 461-477.

Forman, L. 2017. What do human rights bring to discussions of power and politics in health policy and systems? *Global Public Health* 14(4): 489-502.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17441692.2017.1405457>

Gillespie, J., Albert, J., Grant, S. And MacKeigan, T. 2020. Missing in action: Indigenous knowledge systems in evaluation of comprehensive community initiatives. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation* 35. https://evaluationcanada.ca/sites/default/files/004_gillespie.pdf

Gullickson, A. 2020. The whole elephant: Defining evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 79. DOI: 101787.

Maddox, R., Blais, G., Mashford-Pringle, A., Monchalín, R., Firestone, M., Ziegler, C., Ninomiya, M. and Smylie, J. 2021. Reviewing health service and program evaluations in Indigenous contexts: A systematic review. *American Journal of Evaluation* 42(3): 332-353.

Supplementary materials:

Blaser Mapitsa, C. and Polzer Ngwato, T. 2020. Rooting evaluation guidelines in relational ethics: Lessons from Africa. *American Journal of Evaluation* 41(3): 404-419.

Isobel, S. 2021. Trauma informed research: Some methodological and practical considerations. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 30(S1): 1456-1469. DOI: 10.1111/inm.12914

EVALUATION

Assignment	% of Total Course Grade	Time-frame/Due Date
Discussion Forum Engagement	15%	ongoing
Module Introduction	5%	As assigned (Day after module complete)
Part One: Program Plan	20%	January 31, 2022 (8:00 a.m. SK time)
Part Two: Logic Model	20%	February 28, 2022 (8:00 a.m. SK time)
Research Technique Paper	20%	March 21, 2022 (8:00 a.m. SK time)
Evaluation Report Critique	20%	April 11, 2022 (8:00 a.m. SK time)

Information regarding each assignment is provided below and additional details will be available on the course homepage.

Please see the JSGS Grade Descriptions in the relevant student handbook (available at: <http://www.schoolofpublicpolicy.sk.ca/students/resources/useful-links-and-documents.php#JSGSdocuments>) for information about expectations and associated marking ranges.

Submitting Assignments: All assignments must be submitted using the Assignments upload tool in our URCourses site. Marks and feedback will be returned using the same tool. Please ensure you keep a copy of all work submitted for evaluation in this course, at minimum until you have received your final grade.

**Please note that URCourses operates on Saskatchewan time, and Saskatchewan does not observe daylight savings. You will need to adjust accordingly for submission deadlines.

Turnitin: This course uses a version of Turnitin that is integrated into URCourses. There are a few specific things to note about our use of Turnitin:

Naming of Assignment Documents: Please use the following format when naming your assignments (i.e. for the file name when you save the document before uploading it):

Last name_assignment name

For example: Bojkovsky_briefing note

Referencing: As discussed further below, academic integrity is of paramount importance and is taken very seriously. Anytime you use material (e.g., ideas, data, etc) from someone or somewhere else, you **must** reference your source. A wide variety of citation styles exist. For consistency, the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy uses the Chicago Manual of Style's in-text, author date system. Please note the in-text, author date system does not use footnotes or endnotes. There is a quick referencing guide that provides helpful examples of this referencing style available on our course homepage. Students can also access the full online version of the Chicago Manual of Style through the University of Regina library.

- Turnitin is a tool for online submission and grading and that will be its primary function in this course. It also offers an originality checking function which can provide an opportunity for

students to improve their assignments (e.g., by making sure citations are complete and accurate, etc.) before a final submission.

- Students can choose to view an “originality report” for their assignment. Originality reports are not designed to identify plagiarism but identify high degrees of similarity. Similarities can occur for a variety of reasons (e.g., improperly formatted citations, common phrases or expressions, etc.). If, for example, your originality report identifies improperly formatted citations, you can fix the problem with your assignment and resubmit any time before the due date.
- Student papers will NOT be stored on Turnitin.
- Students are NOT required to create or use a personal Turnitin account. All assignment submissions and viewing of marks and feedback are accessed through our URCourses site.

ASSIGNMENTS

◆ **DISCUSSION FORUM ENGAGEMENT (15% of total grade) – Ongoing until end of term**

Active, meaningful participation is essential to success in an online course, particularly at the graduate level. The discussion forums are where students are expected to engage critically with the course material and to contribute their own thoughts, insights and questions. They also provide an opportunity for students to exchange ideas as well as share personal experiences and expertise. Although the discussion forums will be monitored by the instructor, they are intended to primarily be an **opportunity for peer-to-peer discussion** and debate.

Discussion forums will be available only during the indicated timeline (see dates in the course outline above, and note that modules open at 8 a.m. and close at midnight). It is important to be timely and engage throughout every module. The class will be divided into groups for the discussion forums to facilitate a more coherent discussion.

Expectations & Evaluation Criteria:

Criteria for evaluation include assessment of the following:

- *Level of engagement:* To what extent do the contributions reflect thoughtful, respectful engagement with the ideas of others, and reflect efforts to engage in a discussion as opposed to postings of isolated individual thoughts?
- *Quality of content contributions:* To what extent do the contributions demonstrate an accurate understanding of the content and an analytical/critical approach?
- *Participation level:* Does the student contribute within the first few days of the module? Does the student contribute regularly throughout the module?
- *References and support:* To what extent are the ideas presented appropriately supported or justified with reference to course materials and/or other relevant sources (vs. consisting solely of an individual’s own opinion or experiences)?

Throughout the course we will engage with a large volume of material and associated discussions, so it is important to keep postings concise and on-point. **Please limit each posting to no more than 200 words.**

◆ **MODULE INTRODUCTION (5% - AS ASSIGNED)**

Each student will be required to provide a brief introduction and one or two opening questions for an assigned module (similar to a seminar leader). Students will be notified which is their assigned module during Module 2 and student led modules will begin in Module 3. Students are free to switch modules with one another as long as notice of the change is provided to the instructor in advance of the start of the module. Students are expected to continue participation in the module discussion either following up on their own questions or on questions from peers.

Details for module introductions:

- maximum **300 words** (excluding references)
- evidence-based
- include full reference information for new references
- use author-date system for course references
- include a brief introduction and one or two questions for discussion
- content demonstrates thoughtful analysis, relevance and the opportunity for an interesting discussion
- professional writing style, including proper grammar and spelling

**** Note:** moderators must submit a word document with their module introduction and question(s) using the assignment submission tool. Please follow the file naming approach outlined in the syllabus and make sure your name is on the submission. This submission is due by noon (SK time) the day after your module closes but it may be submitted at any point throughout the module. This should be a direct copy and paste from your post.

Please note: There may be more than one module introduction leader assigned per group for a given module. In that case, students are encouraged to communicate with each other to ensure minimal overlapping content and promote complementary approaches. Students will be graded separately.

◆ **PART ONE: PROGRAM PLAN (20% – DUE MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 2022 8:00 A.M., SK TIME)**

Each student will develop an initial program plan for a service area of their choosing. Part one of this assignment will be used to develop a logic model for part two. More details regarding the assignment expectations and grading rubric are available on the course homepage.

◆ **PART TWO: LOGIC MODEL (20% – DUE MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2022 8:00 A.M., SK TIME)**

Students will develop a logic model for their program plan from part one (above). Part two should give consideration to any feedback received during grading for part one. More details regarding the assignment expectations and grading rubric are available on the course homepage.

◆ **RESEARCH TECHNIQUE PAPER (20% - DUE MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2022 8:00 A.M., SK TIME)**

Each student selects one quantitative or qualitative research technique that is commonly used for evaluation purposes. The paper will describe the technique, discuss the applications to evaluation and explore the evidence. More details regarding the assignment expectations and grading rubric are available on the course homepage.

◆ **EVALUATION REPORT CRITIQUE (20% - DUE MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2022 8:00 A.M. SK TIME)**

Students will analyze a publicly available program evaluation report or research article using an evidence-based approach with the skills learned during the course. This paper will not focus on the specifics of the evaluation strategy but rather how it has been communicated. More details regarding the assignment expectations and grading rubric are available on the course homepage.

LATE ASSIGNMENTS

Late assignments will be assigned a penalty of 5%; assignments more than a week late will lose a full grade of 10%; special circumstances will be considered upon application by the student (e.g., illness, family emergency). If such a situation should arise, please contact the professor as soon as possible.

COPYRIGHT

Course materials are provided to you based on your registration in a class, and anything created by your professors and instructors is their intellectual property, unless materials are designated as open education resources. This includes exams, PowerPoint/PDF slides and other course notes. Additionally, other copyright-protected materials created by textbook publishers and authors may be provided to you based on license terms and educational exceptions in the Canadian Copyright Act (see <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-42/index.html>).

University of Regina Copyright information: <https://www.uregina.ca/copyright/guidelines/fair-dealing.html>

For example, posting others' copyright-protected materials on the open web is not covered under the University's Fair Dealing Copyright Guidelines, and doing so requires permission from the copyright holder. Do not download, copy, or share any course recordings or other content without the explicit permission of the instructor.

STUDENT RESOURCES

Remote learning information page for students. This resource engages students in learning about the skills associated with remote learning success. <https://www.uregina.ca/remote-learning/>

Rights and Responsibilities of Graduate Students <https://www.uregina.ca/gradstudies/current-students/Rights%20/index.html> Rights & Responsibilities of graduate students

Using Inclusive Language. These three videos by Martin Boucher and Heather McWhinney address issues of diversity and inclusion in research and language. The first one is general; the second is on conventions for writing about Indigenous Peoples; and the third is on Indigenous expressions.

<https://usask.cloud.panopto.eu/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=3612d5de-1f72-4573-a3c6-ac24003b3fd3>

<https://usask.cloud.panopto.eu/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=f1e308cb-eb9c-4c89-9df6-ac8d001d9de0>

<https://usask.cloud.panopto.eu/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=3c38d24e-2a9b-4b97-ad52-ac43003a1176>

ENROLLMENT LIMIT

Class enrollment will generally be limited to 30 students.

STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

University of Regina (U of R): Students in this course who, because of a disability, may have a need for accommodations are encouraged to discuss this need with the instructor and to contact the Coordinator of Special Needs Services at (306) 585-4631.

STUDENTS EXPERIENCING STRESS

University of Regina (U of R) Counselling Services:

<http://www.uregina.ca/student/counselling/contact.html> or call (306) 585-4491 between 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Saskatchewan time Monday to Friday.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND CONDUCT

Understanding and following the principles of academic integrity and conduct is vital to your success in graduate school. Ensuring that your work is your own and reflects both your own ideas and those of others incorporated in your work is important: ensuring that you acknowledge the ideas, words, and phrases of others that you use is a vital part of the scholarly endeavour. The JSGS has developed an Honour Code (see above) that encapsulates these values.

If you have any questions at all about academic integrity in general or about specific issues, contact any faculty member and we can discuss your questions. For more information, please see:

U of R: Academic Misconduct – <https://www.uregina.ca/president/executive-team/ed-governance-univ-secretary/student-appeals/student-behaviour.html>

ADDITIONAL EVALUATION INFORMATION

More information on the Academic Courses Policy on course delivery, examinations and assessment of student learning can be found at: <https://www.uregina.ca/student/registrar/resources-for-students/academic-calendars-and-schedule/undergraduate-calendar/assets/pdf/2018-2019/2018-19-UG-Calendar-05b-Academic-Regulations.pdf>

JSGS GRADE DESCRIPTIONS

85+ excellent

A superior performance with consistent strong evidence of:

- a comprehensive, incisive grasp of the subject matter;
- an ability to make insightful critical evaluation of the material given;
- an exceptional capacity for original, creative and/or logical thinking;
- an excellent ability to organize, to analyze, to synthesize, to integrate ideas, and to express thoughts fluently; and
- an excellent ability to apply theories to real-world problems and intersect with related disciplines.

80-85 very good

An excellent performance with strong evidence of:

- a comprehensive grasp of the subject matter;
- an ability to make sound critical evaluation of the material given;
- a very good capacity for original, creative and/or logical thinking;
- an excellent ability to organize, to analyze, to synthesize, to integrate ideas, and to express thoughts fluently; and
- a strong ability to apply theories to real-world problems and intersect with related disciplines.

75-80 good

A good performance with evidence of:

- a substantial knowledge of the subject matter;
- a good understanding of the relevant issues and a good familiarity with the relevant literature and techniques;
- some capacity for original, creative and/or logical thinking;
- a good ability to organize, to analyze, and to examine the subject material in a critical and constructive manner; and
- some ability to apply theories to real-world problems and intersect with related disciplines.

70-75 satisfactory

A generally satisfactory and intellectually adequate performance with evidence of:

- an acceptable basic grasp of the subject material;
- a fair understanding of the relevant issues;
- a general familiarity with the relevant literature and techniques;
- an ability to develop solutions to moderately difficult problems related to the subject material; and
- a moderate ability to examine the material in a critical and analytical manner.