

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK**

SW547 - Evaluation Research

Course Outline

Fall 2007

Fall Semester 2007-2008 Academic Years
Class time: 9:00AM-11:50AM Mondays
Office: E605B
Office Hours: Mon 12:00 – 1:00 and 4:00-5:30
Other times available by appointment

Instructor: Catherine Simmons, PhD
Office Phone: (901) 448-4430
Email: cathysimmons@utk.edu

Readings

The following books are **required** of the course and may be purchased from the usual book sellers:

Rossi, Peter H., Freeman, Howard E., & Lipsey, Mark W. (2004). *Evaluation: a Systematic Approach*, 7th edition. California: Sage Publications.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work* (5th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Press.

There are also other **required** readings that are listed in the syllabus and made available at the UTK on-line Library Course Reserves site.

In addition to the required texts the following text books are **optional**.

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th Ed.). Washington DC: Author.

Posavac, Emile, & Carey, Raymond. (2006). *Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies*, 6th edition, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Many other books on evaluation and methodology are available in the library and on line. Students are encouraged to read extensively from professional journals and texts. A bibliography is included at the end of this syllabus that includes some of these resources.

Evaluation

The course grade is based on a combination of quizzes, papers and projects which will be computed on the following parts.

20%	(200 points)	Quizzes and exercises
10%	(100 points)	Article Critique
20%	(200 points)	Evaluation proposal
20%	(200 points)	Evaluation presentation
30%	(300 points)	Evaluation report

The grading scale is as follows:

A	900-1000 points	C	700-769 points
B+	870-899 points	D+	670-699 points
B	800-869 points	D	600-669 points
C+	770-799 points	F	<599 points

Assignments

Along with the reading assignments listed on the course outline, there are some written and oral assignments. Evaluation research is designed to prepare you for professional social work practice. Therefore, you will be held to professional standards in deadlines and product quality.

Quizzes and exercises (20%) – Up to six quizzes and exercises will be given throughout the semester on dates and times determined by the professor. Not all quizzes and exercises will be announced prior to their administration. The format for quizzes will include objective and short answer questions covering content from the week's reading and lecture notes. The format for exercises will include activities performed in class related to the content of the lecture. The lowest quiz/exercise score will be deleted. The grade will be calculated averaging the remaining scores. Make up quizzes and exercises will not be given, unless due to **documented emergencies**.

Evaluation Article Critique (10%) – Students will analyze one of the example evaluations by answering the questions listed in this syllabus. We will go over these analyses in class the day the reading is due. **This assignment may not be turned in late.**

Field Evaluation proposal (20%), presentation (20%), and final report (30%) – The key component of this course is a program evaluation project. You need to choose a program to use as the basis of your evaluation. This may be a program with which you have had contact currently or in the past. It may even be a program with which you have never had contact, but which you wish to learn more about. The important thing is to choose a program early in the semester (no later than week 3) so that you can begin to develop your evaluation ideas as we go along in class. The evaluation proposal, presentation, and final report must conform to the outline in this syllabus.

Deadlines – It is your responsibility to turn in all work by the scheduled deadline. Schedule your time to prepare for problems. Remember, **problems always happen at the worst possible times**. It is also good to always make backup files for your work. Late assignments are defined as any work not handed in when called for by the professor and are accepted **ONLY when prior arrangements have been made**. **When allowed**, late assignments will be penalized by 15% of the total points for the assignment per calendar day including weekends.

Product quality – All written assignments are to be turned in APA style (latest edition). Take care with your writing. REWRITE and PROOFREAD your work. Be concerned with the professional impression of what you turn in. Deductions will be made for non-use of APA-style, sloppy grammar, inordinate numbers of misspellings, incomplete work. When preparing to turn in your assignments, ask yourself if the work you are about to present is of the quality you are proud to demonstrate. What you present to the world is what you become. It is your responsibility to become the professional you know you can be. Reflect this professionalism in the work you do for this class.

Inclement weather or other emergency cancellation

If your class session is canceled due to inclement weather or other unexpected circumstance please, continue to read and complete assignments as you are responsible for knowing all course material for

quizzes and exercises. If you have a due date for a written assignment, all deadlines are deferred until the next course session unless otherwise specified on this course's web page. That means; that you are expect to turn in your assignments for the week missed and the current session and/or be ready to present your "past due" presentation.

Attendance, participation and class rules

1. Students are expected to be on time, attend all class sessions, and stay until the completion of the class.
2. Students are to complete reading assignments and be prepared to participate in class discussions, exercises and small group activities.
3. All written assignments are due at the beginning of class period of the date specified on the course outline.
4. Assignments are to be completed correctly at the time of submission.
5. Any disruption of the classroom-learning environment (through actions in or out of class) will result in the identified student(s) being required to leave the class, without possibility of being readmitted.
6. All graduate students are responsible for adhering to standards of professional conduct with colleagues/faculty and elsewhere in the graduate program.

Dropping the class

If you chose to drop the class, you have the responsibility to complete the paperwork according to the University's schedule. Not doing so may result in a failing grade.

Student retention

The University of Tennessee supports a variety of student success programs to help you connect with the University and achieve academic success. They include learning assistance, developmental education, advising and mentoring, admission and transition, and federally funded programs. Students requiring assistance academically, personally, or socially should contact the Student Academic Support Services in the General Education Building (located at the corner of Dunlap and Madison) in the basement Room BB9, 448-5056 for more information and referrals.

Email Inquiries

Please allow 48 hours for responses to course related email questions before re-submitting an email question. Please do NOT wait until the last minute to forward a course relevant question or concern (e.g., the day prior to an assignment due date).

Course Outline and Readings:

Week 1 Course overview, Introduction, Assignments and Expectation
Aug. 27, 07 Introduction to Evaluative Research
Purposes of Evaluative Research
History and Theories of Evaluation
Issues of Evaluation Research in Human Service Organizations

Readings: (okay to read after class)

Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey: Chapter 1

- Dziegielewska, S., Wodarski, J. & Feit, M. (2005). Social Service research: Efficacy necessity and effectiveness. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 32(1), 1-15.
- Poertner, J. (2005) Social Service Administration and outcomes for consumers: What do we know? *Administration in Social Work*, 30(2), 11-24.
- Wuenschel, P. (2006). The diminishing role of social work administrators in social service agencies: Issues for consideration. *Administration in Social Work*, 30(4), 5-18.

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 1

Week 2 **LABOR DAY**
Sep. 3, 07 **Class will not meet**

Week 3: Starting the Evaluation / Evaluation Plan
Sep. 10, 07 Who should do the evaluation???

Identifying Stakeholders
Assessing Program Theory

Readings:

Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey (2003) Chapter 2

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 3

PROGRAM THEORY EXERCISE
CLASS WILL MEET IN COMPUTER LAB
SEPTEMBER 10, 2007

Week 4: Expressing Program Theory
Sep. 17, 07 Logic Models

Readings:

Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey (2003) Chapter 5

Bickman, L. (1987). The functions of program theory. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, No. 33 (pp. 5-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, December 2001. *Logic Model Development Guide*. Battle Creek, MI: Author. [this reading can be found on line at

<http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub3669.pdf>]

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 3

LOGIC MODEL EXERCISE
CLASS WILL MEET IN COMPUTER LAB
SEPTEMBER 17, 2007

- Week 5:** Formulating and assessing need
Sep. 24, 07 a) What services are needed
b) Is there a program already in place? / What would one look like?
Formulating Research Questions for Evaluation
a) Identifying issues to explore / What is a programmatic problem?
b) What is the purpose of the evaluation?

Readings:

Rossi Freeman & Lipsey, (2003) Chapter 3 and 4

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 6

- Week 6:** Planning an Evaluation
Oct. 1, 07 Literature Review
What type of evaluation will you use to study this problem?
a) Process evaluations verses outcome evaluations
b) Why choose different types of evaluations?

Readings:

Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey (2003) Chapter 6 and 7

Hoefer, R. (1994). A good story well told: Rules for evaluating human service programs, *Social Work*, 39(2), 233-236

Harachi, T.W., Abbott, R.D., Catalano, R.F., Haggerty, KP & Fleming, C.B. (1999).

Opening the black box: Using process evaluation measures to assess implementation and theory building. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 27(5), 711-731.

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 2 & 7

- Week 7:** Evaluation designs: (part 1)
Oct. 8, 07 Experimental design
Quasi-Experimental design

Readings:

Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey (2003) Chapter 8 & 9

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work* (5th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Press. – Chapters 10 & 11 (These chapters should be a review from SW 506 Social Work Research)

Dennis, M. (1990). Assessing the validity of randomized field experiments: an example from drug abuse treatment research. *Evaluation Review*, 14(4), 347-373.

Resnick, B., Bellg A.J., Borrelli, B., DeFrancesco, C., Breger, R., Hecht, J., Sharp, D.L., Levesque, C., Orwig, D., Ernst, D., Ogedegbe, G., Czajkowski, S. (2005). Examples of implementation and evaluation of treatment fidelity in the BCC studies: Where we are and where we need to go. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 29(Special Supplication)? 46-54

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 10 & 11

EVALUATION PROPOSAL DUE OCTOBER 8, 2007

Week 8: Evaluation designs: (part 2)
Oct. 15, 07 Data collection - Secondary and primary data – Interviews & surveys
Quantitative vs. Qualitative Research
Meta-Analysis

Readings:

Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey (2003) Chapter 9 (review) and 10
Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work* (5th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Press. – Chapters 14, 15 & 17 (These chapters should be a review from SW 506 Social Work Research)
Campbell, D. (1996). Regression artifacts in time-series and longitudinal data. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 19(4), 377-389
Nich, C. & Carroll, K. (1997). Now you see it, now you don't: A comparison of traditional versus random-effects regression models in the analysis of longitudinal follow-up data from a clinical trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65(2), 252-261

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 8 & 9

Week 9: Measurement Issues
Oct. 22, 07 Standardized scales and survey questionnaires
Reliability and measurement validity
Significance / Error / Variables

Readings:

Review Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey – Chapter 7 (review) and 10 (review)
Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work* (5th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Press. – Chapters 6, 7, 8 & 9 (These chapters should be a review from SW 506 Social Work Research)

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 4

Week 10: Analyzing your data
Oct. 29, 07 Graphic and tabular presentation of evaluative research findings
Reporting and disseminating evaluation results
Descriptive statistics
Understanding Chi Square, correlation, T-tests

Readings:

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work* (5th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Press. – Chapters 18, 19, 20, 21 and Appendix E (These reading should be a review from SW 506 Social Work Research)

Newcomer, K., (1994). Using statistics appropriately. In Joseph S. Wholey et al., *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, (San Francisco: Josey-Bass), pp. 389-416.

**CLASS TO MEET IN COMPUTER LAB
OCTOBER 29, 2007**

Week 11: No Lecture on this day
Nov. 5, 07 Students are responsible for using this time to work on their Program Evaluation projects

Week 12: Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis
Nov. 12, 07

Readings:

Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey (2003), Chapter 11

Foster, E.M., Dodge, K.A., & Jones, D., (2003). Issues in the economic evaluation of prevention programs. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7(2), 74-84.

Drummond, M. F., & McGuire, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Economic Evaluation in Health Care: Merging Theory with Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haddix, A. C., Teutsch, S. M., & Corso, P. S. (Eds.). (2003). *Prevention effectiveness: A Guide to decision analysis and economic evaluation* (2nd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 12

Week 13: Preparing your presentation & Executive Summaries
Nov. 19, 07 Recommendations from Evaluations
Article Critique Discussion

Readings:

Hendricks, M. (1994). Making a splash: Reporting evaluation results effectively. In Joseph S. Wholey, et al. *Handbook of practical Program Evaluation*, (San Francisco: Jose Bass), pp. 549-575

Torres, R., Preskill, H.S., & Piontek, M.E. (1997). Communicating and reporting: Practices and concerns of internal and external evaluators. *Evaluation Practice*, 18(2), 105-125.

Chen, H.T., Bersani, C. Myers, S.C., & Denton, R. (1989). Evaluating the effectiveness of a court sponsored abuse treatment program. *Journal of Family Violence*, 4(4), 309-322.

Marsh, J.D., & Wirick, M.A. (1991). Evaluation of Hull House teen pregnancy and parenting program. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 14, 49-61.

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 13 & 14

**ARTICLE CRITIQUE DUE
NOVEMBER 12, 2007**

Week 14: Ethical Issues in Evaluative Research

Nov. 26, 07 Political and organizational factors involved in the planning, conduct, and interpretation of evaluation research
Professional guidelines for the ethical conduct of evaluation research
Human subjects protection and informed consent
Avoiding bias and understanding the perspectives of minority and disadvantaged groups in the conduct and interpretation of evaluation research

Readings:

Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey – Chapter 12

Madison, A. (Ed.) (1992). Minority issues in program evaluation. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

NASW Code of Ethics in Research (<http://www.socialworkers.org/pubs/code/default.asp>)

Morris, M., & Cohn, R. (1993). Program evaluators and ethical challenges. *Evaluation Review*, 17(6), 621-642.

Supplemental Readings:

Posavac, & Carey (2003) Chapter 5

**FINAL PAPERS DUE
NOVEMBER 26, 2007**

Class 15: Project Presentations
Dec. 3, 07

**CLASS TO MEET IN ROOM E206
DECEMBER 3, 2007**

Evaluation Article Critique

Directions: Write a critique for either of the following articles using the outline provided below. Papers should be typed, double spaced, using 1 inch margins, 12 point Times New Roman font and be no less than 2 pages of text but no more than 4 pages of text. References and title page are required but do not count toward the page requirements.

Chen, H.T., Bersani, C. Myers, S.C., & Denton, R. (1989). Evaluating the effectiveness of a court sponsored abuse treatment program. *Journal of Family Violence*, 4(4), 309-322.

Marsh, J.D., & Wirick, M.A. (1991). Evaluation of Hull House teen pregnancy and parenting program. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 14, 49-61.

1. Purpose of the evaluation (10pts)

Type of evaluation

What are the research questions or hypotheses?

2. Theory or program driven (10 pts)

Is the evaluation theory driven?

What are the underlying assumptions?

Is the evaluation driven by the objectives of the program? If so, what are the objectives?

3. Methods (20 pts)

Sample

Units of analysis / Sample size / Representative of population studied

Data collection techniques

Design

Type of design / Method of collection / Internal, external validity issues

4. Measurement (20 pts)

Level of measurement (may want to create a table for this section)

Variables

What are the independent/experimental/treatment variables?

What are the dependant/outcome variables?

Do they have controls?

How are variables operationalized? (create table for major variables only)

Any discussion of measurement reliability/validity?

5. Type of analysis (10 pts)

Statistical tests employed?

6. Outcomes (20 pts)

Results of study

Problems they saw with study

Problems you see that they did not

Discrepancies, things that didn't make sense

Are there any ethical issues? If so, what are they?

7. Technical aspects of your paper (10 pts)

APA style, Spelling, Grammar, Headings, Page Numbers

Evaluation Proposal

Directions: After selecting a program evaluation research problem which is of interest or concern, you will complete an evaluation proposal. Papers should be typed, double spaced, using 1 inch margins, 12 point Times New Roman font. Title page, reference page, and logic model are required.

1. Research Problem (20 points)

Select a program evaluation research problem which is of interest and concern to you. You may choose community needs assessment, Monitoring of program implementation, outcome assessment, or other programmatic or managerial issues to address the problem.

What is the programmatic problem?

What type of evaluation will you use to study this problem?

Explain why the type of evaluation method you chose is the best to study the problem?

2. Describe the agency (10 pts)

Briefly describe the setting in which the study will take place.

The problem addressed by the program

Target Population

Services provided

Evaluation context-general social and economic context in community

Expected outcomes

3. Logic Model (15 pts)

Include a logic model following the directions discussed during class 4.

4. Justify the need to conduct this study with appropriate literature review (25 pts)

Your literature review should assist you in developing your research questions

What has been done in the past?

What is known and not known?

What will drive your study?

Program goals and objectives

Theoretical or conceptual assumptions of program

Why the program thinks their intervention will be successful

4. Develop a set of evaluation hypotheses or research questions which you will use to guide and/or test in your study (20 pts)

Base this either on your program objectives and/or on the literature

5. Technical aspects of the paper (10 pts)

APA style

Headings, page numbers, spelling, Grammar

Evaluation Report

Directions: Based on the evaluation proposal turned in mid semester, you will be expected to carry out and report on the proposed evaluation study during the course of the semester. Incorporate revised proposal into final paper. Papers should be typed, double spaced, using 1 inch margins, 12 point Times New Roman font. Title page, reference page, and logic model are required.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, including recommendations for improving the program (15 pts)

II. Introductions and Background (5 pts)

Statement of the problem / What questions are being answered?

III. Literature Review (5 pts)

What else has been done in terms of researching similar programs? AND / OR

Where else has your methodology been used

What can we learn from what others have done that will make your evaluation better? (That is what are you doing better than others and what are you just shamelessly stealing because it was done so well?)

IV. Program Description including outcome line (5 pts)

What are the program's goal(s) and objective(s)?

What is the theory behind the program? (provide an outcome line)

What are the program activities?

How often are activities performed? Etc.

Who are the clients?

V. Evaluation Design and Discussion (15 pts)

A. Process Evaluation (Implementation Monitoring)

What are the program elements? How many clients got what amount of the program?

What other concepts and measures were used in this part of the evaluation?

What are your conclusions about the implementation of the program?

Why do you think so?

B. Outcome Evaluation

What type of design?

What measures were used?

How do these measures relate to the outcome of interest and other points shown on the outcome line? Are there any problems with the measures that make them less than ideal?

What internal validity threats are controlled for and which are not? How serious are the remaining threats?

VI. Results (these may be fictitious) (15 pts)

What statistical procedures were used to analyze the data you collected?

What are the results?

What conclusions do you draw from the data and its analysis?

What about external validity? Strong? Weak? Etc.

VII. Recommendations (for the program directors and stakeholders) (15 pts)

Appendices:

Appendix A: Detailed Evaluation Budget (10 pts)

Appendix B: Survey forms, descriptions of other information gathering devices (10 pts)

Appendix C: Logic Model (5 pts)

Evaluation Presentation

Directions: Based on the evaluation paper, you will be expected to present your work to the class. This presentation should be conducted in a professional manner. Therefore, behave professionally, use power point, include the executive summary and practice your presentation multiple times before you give the presentation.

Grading: Human relationships always color our perceptions, but critical judgment must be used, even when it is our colleagues who we are assessing. You must be willing to provide accurate feedback which will improve your colleagues' next performance. Provide accurate and constructive feedback to your colleague on this form.

Substantive Components of Presentation

	Rating A= Excellent B – Okay to good C= Just Acceptable D = Needs Work	Comments
Description of problem addressed by program		
Clarity of question asked		
Description of Program (including logic model)		
Review of literature: Do we know why this type of evaluation was chosen?		
Description of process evaluation design, measures and results		
Description of design measures and threats to internal validity		
Description of external validity		
Strengths and weaknesses of evaluation		
Recommendations		
Question handling		
Recommended Grade....		

Non-Substantive Components of Presentation

	Rating	Comments
Confidence level		
Kept my attention		
Professional Attire		
Professional Demeanor		

Add any additional comments on back;

Some Recommended Readings

Abt, Clark (Editor), (1976) *The evaluation of social programs*, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

American Evaluation Association. (1995). Guiding principles for evaluators, *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, No. 66, 19-26.

Anderson, Scarvia B. & Samuel Ball. (1978) *The profession and practice of program evaluation*. Jossey-Bass.

Benbenishty, R. & Ben-Zaken, A. (1988). Computer aided process of monitoring task-centered family interventions. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 24, 7-9.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1979). *Experimental & quasi-experimental design for research* (Chapters 2-5). Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Cook, T.D. & Campbell, D.T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Fowler, F. J. Jr. (1988). *Survey research methods*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Gabor, P. & Grinnell, Jr., R. M. (1994). Should program decisions be based on empirical evidence of effectiveness? Yes. In W. W. Hudson & Nurius, P. S. (Eds.), *Controversial issues in social work research*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Garfinkel, I., Meyer, D. R., & Sandefur, G. D. (1992). The effects of alternative child support systems on blacks, Hispanics, and non-Hispanic whites. *Social Service Review*, 66, 505-523.

Greene, Jennifer C. & Valerie J. Caracelli, (Eds.). (1997). *Advances in mixed-method evaluation: The challenges and benefits of integrating diverse paradigms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Isaac, S. & Michael, W. B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation* (3rd Ed.). San Diego, CA: EdITS/Educational and Industrial Testing Services.

Johnson, A. K. (1989). Measurement and methodology: Problems and issues in research on homelessness. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 25, 12-20.

Kirkhart, K.E. (1995). Seeking multicultural validity: A postcard from the road. *Evaluation Practice*, 16(1), 1-12

Madison, A. (Ed.) (1992). *Minority issues in program evaluation*, *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 53. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Mohr, L. B. (1995). *Impact analysis for program evaluation* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nasuti, J. P. & Pecora, P. J. (1993). Risk assessment scales in child protection: A test of the internal consistency and interrater reliability of one statewide system. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 29, 28-34.
- Nurius, P. S., & Hudson, W. W. (1993). *Human services practice, evaluation and computers*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks-Cole Publishing Company.
- Reichardt, C. S. & Rallis, S. F. (Eds.) (1994). *The qualitative-quantitative debate: New Perspectives, New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 61. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shadish, W. (1998). Evaluation theory is who we are. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19(1), 1-19
- Shields, J. J. (1992). Evaluating community organization projects: The development of an empirically based measure. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 28, 15-20.
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Taber, M. (1994). Should program decisions be based on empirical evidence of effectiveness? No. In W. W. Hudson & Nurius, P. S. (Eds.), *Controversial issues in social work research*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Taylor-Powell, E. (1998). *Program development and evaluation: Sampling*. College Station, TX: Texas A & M Agricultural Extension Service. (Accessible on-line at: http://cf.uwex.edu/ces/pubs/pdf/G3658_3.PDF)
- Toomey, B. G., First, R. J., Rife, J. C., & Belcher, J. R. (1989). Evaluating community care for homeless mentally ill people. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 25, 21-26.
- Tracy, E. M., Green, R. K., & Bremseth, M. D. (1993). Meeting the environmental needs of abused and neglected children: Implications from a statewide survey of supportive services. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 29, 21-27.
- Videka-Sherman, L. (1986). *Studies of research on social work practice: A bibliography*. Silver Springs, MD: NASW.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R.K. (1993). *Applications of case study research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.