

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION: MINIMIZING PITFALLS AND MAXIMIZING OPPORTUNITIES

Catalina Herrerías, University of Oklahoma

ABSTRACT

Program development and evaluation in any setting constitutes no simple task, particularly when faced with problems that could have been anticipated and perhaps averted with better initial planning and administrative support. This article discusses potential obstacles in program development and evaluation and makes suggestions concerning how they might be avoided. Circumstances surrounding the design, implementation, and evaluation of a child sexual abuse prevention/education program in a private non-profit social service organization in a Midwestern metropolitan city are used for contextual and illustrative purposes. Recommendations for future programmatic efforts are also provided.

Program development and evaluation in any setting constitutes no simple task, particularly when faced with problems which could have been anticipated and perhaps averted with better initial planning and administrative support. The development of a new program entails the ability to secure sufficient resources, obtain access to designated clients, and provide a service to these clients (Tripodi, Fellin & Epstein 1978). One legitimate expectation of program development is program effectiveness. Program effectiveness depends upon numerous other factors, such as specific delineation of program objectives, clear conceptualization of program elements, and establishment of criteria for assessing quality and/or quantity of services provided, and possession of the necessary resources with which to carry out a specified program (Sylvia & Sylvia 2004). During the process of program development if obstacles emerge, yet fail to be resolved, they can serve to complicate development, undermine implementation, and ultimately negatively influence program effectiveness overall (Schram 1997).

Research evaluations are also an essential component of program development (Caputo 1988; Weiss 1998). Without concrete evidence of a program's impact or its outcomes, continuation of the effort may range from difficult to nearly impossible to justify. Moreover, funding sources or other stakeholders increasingly require evidence that monies awarded have been spent effectively (Grinnell 2001; Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey 2003; Royse, Thyer, Padgett & Logan 2001; Unrau, Gabor & Grinnell 2001).

Many standard texts on evaluation research tend to ignore the developmental aspects of evaluation strategies (Tripodi

1983; Weiss 1998). This paper lends support for an evaluation framework that parallels the stages of program development. Such a framework assists in identifying obstacles that preclude effective and efficient programs and evaluations and affords an opportunity to suggest what administrators and evaluators can do to ensure a more harmonious parallel process of program and evaluation development.

Early on, Leviton and Boruch (1983) indicated that evaluations could be helpful in influencing and perhaps even motivating decisions. In any event, without greater openness and cooperation between program administrators, evaluators and other decision makers, it is likely that evaluations will continue to have a secondary role in programs overall (Berg & Theado 1981). More importantly, if program evaluations are not conducted, there will be no information concerning a program's effectiveness or efficiency (Fink & McCloskey 1990; Krause 1998; Rossi et al 2003).

Circumstances surrounding the design, implementation, and evaluation of a child sexual abuse prevention program in a private nonprofit social service organization in a midwestern metropolitan city are used for contextual and illustrative purposes. The program's exact location is unidentified and the time frame of the program has been changed in order to avoid any potential hard feelings and ensure the confidentiality and privacy of everyone involved. Recommendations for future program planning, development, implementation, and evaluation are provided.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

A child sexual abuse education program (CSAEP) was conceptualized to aid in the

prevention of the sexual victimization of children through an extensive education effort provided through the public elementary school system in an urban city. A multi-pronged approach, CSAEP targeted three groups: children, parents, and teachers. The public school system's cooperation and support were critical in maximizing the number of program participants. While the actual details of the CSAEP had not been shared with the school's administration until funding was actually obtained, the administration's verbal commitment in terms of access to the target groups was contingent upon final approval of all program materials.

The primary goal of the CSAEP was to empower third through sixth graders with skills in self-protection since this group was cited at the highest risk for intrafamilial abuse, with child victims being between 8 and 12 years (Alter-Reid, Gibbs, Lachenmeyer, Sigal & Massoth 1986; Brassard, Tyler & Kehle 1983; Finkelhor & Baron 1986; Herrerias 2002). The children's program component consisted of presentations that lasted one hour each on four consecutive school days. Children were taught basic decision-making and assertiveness skills to employ in potentially abusive situations, emphasizing that children report all problematic incidents to adults until the child's report is believed. The message of "say no, get away, and tell someone" was continuously reinforced with children (Herrerias 1989). Due to the nature of the curriculum content, parental consent was required preceding program participation for every child.

Two-hour separate parent and teacher presentations were also developed. The goal of these presentations was familiarization with the common elements of child sexual abuse (e.g., the likely victims and perpetrators, examples of sexual abuse, and general incidence and prevalence statistics); teaching what behaviors exhibited by children might be more indicative of sexual victimization (e.g., early sexual activity or acting-out); where parents and teachers might be able to obtain other than medical care for victims; and the importance of reporting and where to report potentially abusive incidents. Participants in all three program components would be administered pre- and post-test questionnaires to evaluate one aspect of program effectiveness as measured by increases in learning. Moreover, the adults'

questionnaire would contain a series of questions on the quality of the program.

PARALLEL PROCESS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION STRATEGIES

Social programs tend to progress through comparable stages of development (Tripodi et al 1978). Although the CSAEP may not reflect a *typical* social program, its developmental stages of program initiation, contact, and implementation are relatively similar. As programs are being developed, evaluation strategies ideally should follow corresponding paths to allow for concurrent exchange of information and necessary modifications in program or evaluation frameworks.

During the initiation phase, the necessary program materials and resources must be acquired. Beyond establishing a compelling need for the program, stipulating objectives, and targeting appropriate recipients, the overall planning effort could stand to benefit considerably with the inclusion of a stakeholder survey (Lawrence & Cook 1982; Rubin & Babbie 1997). Primarily directed toward the design and implementation of more useful evaluations, the stakeholder survey gathers valuable information from individuals and organizations directly or indirectly involved with a program (e.g., program administrators, staff, and clients). A stakeholder survey can contribute suggestions from several different perspectives, help to minimize or prevent possible problems, and facilitate program implementation.

The contact phase includes communication with potential clients while ineligible individuals are screened out. During the final stage of development—program implementation—clients are engaged, goals are met, and outcomes are measured (Tripodi et al 1978).

Each stage of program development made its own demands on evaluation strategies. They presented formidable obstacles about which administrators and evaluators need to be aware. Initial problems arose when the originator of the program concept, who also authored the grant proposal, would be unable to oversee the project as a consequence of other work commitments. The author would be responsible for the program's evaluation; however, someone else would coordinate the overall effort. Throughout the remainder of this paper, these two individu-

als will be identified as the *Evaluator* and *Coordinator*.

The organization that received the nearly half-million dollar grant for the CSAEP abdicated significant responsibility up front. Rather than encourage or help facilitate the collaboration of the Evaluator and Coordinator, the agency's administrator simply gave each authority over their respective areas. First and foremost, a decision maker with responsibility for overseeing the program and its evaluation needed to be delineated (Maher 1979). In this particular case, divided authority with minimal to no guidance from administration significantly precluded the harmonious parallel process of program development and evaluation strategies. As a result, obstacles emerged both in and out of the organization aside from every level of program development.

OBSTRUCTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM INITIATION AND EVALUATION STRATEGIES

The Coordinator was responsible for identifying appropriate program materials, writing a parents' brochure about sexual abuse which would elaborate on the group presentations, and develop the presentation structure and content. This program effort commenced January 2001; however, the Evaluator was not included in any of the program planning until the third week of March. Weiss (1998) states that an Evaluator should be involved in planning from the outset as a means of acquiring valuable knowledge about the program that will subsequently inform the evaluation. She indicates that first-hand programmatic knowledge is important in helping the evaluator formulate questions, better understand the data, and make recommendations. This was not the case. Few of the Evaluator's program concerns were taken seriously. Rather, suggestions or constructive criticism by the Evaluator further alienated the Coordinator, subsequently deteriorating communication. The Evaluator was also excluded from essential contacts with the school system's administrators, who would ultimately furnish access to the target groups and be responsible for giving final approval on all program materials and content to be used during presentations.

Pilot testing of the various program components found that mean scores on children's, parents', and teachers' pre- and post-

test measures yielded minimal, if any, increases in learning. The Coordinator argued that there was too much program material to be covered overall to be concerned with any specific items on the questionnaires. The Evaluator countered that if the items on the questionnaires were not addressed in terms of program content, there would be a lack of information on which to assess program viability. When the agency administration was approached, the response was that the Coordinator and Evaluator needed to "work things out" for themselves.

Questionnaire items were expected to tap knowledge gains on significant points. For example, one of the CSAEP objectives of teaching parents and teachers how to identify children's behavior that might indicate sexual abuse was not accomplished. The power struggle escalated, particularly without constructive guidance or direction from the agency administration. The details of some of the more critical obstacles in design, implementation, and evaluation follow.

Problems in the Initiation of the Program

The Evaluator was not included in the preliminary program planning phase of the CSAEP. This is contrary to the recommendations found in the program evaluation literature (King, Morris & Fitz-Gibbon 1987; Schram 1997; Sylvia & Sylvia 2004). No input was made in terms of curriculum, structure, content, or presentation of material at the level of children's, parents', or teachers' programs. Hence, the Evaluator was in the position of reacting to existing mechanisms. Another conflict arose when the Evaluator made a suggestion to the Coordinator that the language employed in writing the brochure for dissemination to parents be more easily understood, clear, and free of jargon. Although most parents would likely comprehend the written material and verbally presented content, a large percentage was from working poor households or homes reliant on public assistance. In particular, many Spanish-monolingual or bilingual/Spanish-dominant families in the organization's service area averaged a fifth grade education.

The Evaluator was also excluded from the preliminary contact with the public school system's administration. This caused the Evaluator's role to be perceived as a peripheral, perhaps even frivolous one, in relation to the CSAEP. When the Evaluator finally at-

tended a school system meeting, the sole purpose was to review the instruments that had been developed for use in the pre- and post-test time period. Since the Evaluator had not been afforded the opportunity of meeting or even knowing who the responsible school system administrators were no networking or establishing trust and rapport was possible.

In revising the proposed pre- and post-test questionnaires, the school system's administrators indicated they saw many problems with the instruments. First, they did not want questions which reinforced stereotypes for the children (e.g., "Only girls are sexually abused" or "Most abusers are strange, funny looking people.") School system administrators were resistant to the fact that measured changes in children's perceptions were expected to reflect increased knowledge about sexual abuse, in addition to *dispelling* rather than reinforcing stereotypes. A significant amount of meeting time was devoted on two occasions toward explaining and persuading school system officials to agree to the questionnaire content. Ultimately, some items were omitted and others reworded.

Second, school system administrators did not want children asked the question: "Have you ever been sexually abused?" It was feared that children might be left unduly vulnerable if they were to affirmatively respond to that query. It was explained that if more children responded positively on the post-test than on the pre-test, they may likely respond to the question in light of having learned added information during program participation. A number of professional resources were identified for those children that may need further assistance.

Third, under no circumstances were the pre- and post-test questionnaires to obtain demographic information (e.g., gender, age, education, ethnic origin, or marital status) from any of the program participants—clearly not all questions were intended for every level of participant. This point was convincingly argued by the Evaluator, and the school system conceded with allowing age, gender and grade for children; age, gender, and educational achievement for parents; and age, gender, and number of years teaching for teachers. The question pertaining to educational achievement was conditionally allowed for parents' questionnaires, pending negative feedback from parents taking part in the pilot

test. None of the pilot group parents (N=34) objected to the education question, and it was retained for wider use. However, the school system was adamant that should ethnic background/racial data be collected that *all* support for the CSAEP would be withdrawn immediately. Both the Coordinator and Agency administration were silent on this issue.

Problems in the Contact/Implementation Phase

The Evaluator established written criteria for administration of the pre- and post-test questionnaires, with responsibility for training the newly hired sexual abuse specialists who would function as program presenters to the various target groups. Miscommunication between the Coordinator, Agency Administration, and the Evaluator resulted in the Evaluator attempting to train the Presenters without having had the opportunity to review the finalized program materials. The program materials had already been provided to and discussed with the Presenters by the Coordinator. Further, the Evaluator was not given the opportunity of seeing copies of the final pre- and post-test questionnaires, which were printed in large quantity.

The Coordinator declined to attend the Evaluator's training session, even though she would be making some of the program presentations and would need to administer pre- and post-test questionnaires in the process. Consequently, some of the questionnaires were haphazardly administered and appropriate procedures could neither be reliably monitored nor controlled. At one point during the Evaluator's training session on questionnaire administration, all eight of the sexual abuse specialists complained about the fragmentation of program materials and expressed their disappointment with overall program administration due to "disorganization" and "inconsistent procedural guidelines."

Regarding pre- and post-test questionnaires, the process for participants' completion encompassed several tasks. Program participants that arrived pursuant to pre-test completion were asked to write an "X" on the bottom of the last page of the post-test questionnaire in order to distinguish between those completing pre- and post-tests from those completing post-tests only. This protocol was often not followed.

Program presenters were also to place completed questionnaires collected from their respective groups in separate brown envelopes noted with their name, elementary school, and date of presentation. All questionnaire responses were kept confidential, but occasionally children would report that they had been sexually abused and provide their names on the questionnaires themselves. When a child discloses any kind of sexual victimization, it is imperative to follow through with timely assistance as well as mandatory reporting. There were times that children disclosed sexual abuse on questionnaires, but the presenters had failed to record the school's name and date of presentation. Trying to identify abuse victims after the fact was very complicated, if not impossible, without the pertinent information. More than 9,000 children from 102 elementary and middle schools participated in the CSAEP during a four-month period.

Problems also surfaced on the part of the school system. The school system's administrators virtually handpicked the elementary and middle schools for participation, thereby excluding random selection. Since none of the schools were given the option to participate in the child sexual abuse prevention program, resistance from some of the principals, teachers, and school staff was intense.

In order for children to be admitted into the program, a consent form signed by either a parent or legal guardian was required. Many children never returned consent forms, and it was never clear how many children actually received the forms to take home. An example of the suggested letter to parents had been provided all school principals as a way of informing families about the CSAEP. Few of the schools used the recommended example. Others never apprised families about the parent's program and simply sent notes home indicating that a parent's meeting was to take place at a given date and time. Many of these parents were not happy for being "summoned" without a clear understanding or explanation of the meeting's purpose. The logistical problems were sufficiently complex, and it was unfair to expect overburdened, understaffed schools to write, duplicate, and disseminate letters announcing the CSAEP. Instead, standard letters on school system letterhead should have been provided for distribution to each elementary and middle school involved in this program.

Problems in the Evaluation Phase

It was expected that at the point of the program evaluation, most of the obstacles and conflicts would have been abated. Not so. Initial miscommunication and subsequent unreliable data collection that necessitated the elimination of hundreds of questionnaires resulted in growing resentment that confounded the evaluation as well. The omitted questionnaires were not included in the evaluation as program participants responded to questionnaire items without needed information. Consequently, these questionnaires contained missing data (e.g., demographics, prior sexual abuse history, site of the program presentation, and distinction between pre- and post-test takers and post-test takers only). Moreover, a couple of the presenters had skipped pertinent information due to time constraints.

The Evaluator was to identify five individuals who would be responsible for numbering, pre-coding, and entering data from approximately 38,000 completed pre-and post-test questionnaires. Blank employee applications were mailed to the Evaluator who resided an hour's drive from the community served by the program agency. Once prospective data coders were obtained from the Evaluator's area of residence, employee applications were completed and mailed along with pre-screening interview information to the employing agency. The agreement with the agency was that data coders would be paid by check mailed from the agency twice monthly for work accomplished and verified by the Evaluator. As contract employees, individuals were to be responsible for their own tax liability and receive no fringe benefits. This plan was unexpectedly changed *after* five eligible employees had filled out the necessary forms, passed pre-screening interviews, and were in the process of being trained by the Evaluator.

Agency administration communicated a requirement for additional documentation from data coders through a newly hired personnel manager. Further, data coders were asked to: 1) obtain a medical examination; 2) provide a copy of educational transcripts, diploma/GED, or other certificates; and 3) participate in an in-agency employment interview. Individuals would, moreover, be required to personally pick up their paychecks twice monthly at the agency, a two-hour round trip drive for everyone involved. Needless to

say, the five prospective data coders—some graduate students and other gainfully employed individuals—declined to complete the additional agency requirements and withdrew their applications for employment.

The renewed search for data coders took place through word-of-mouth in the metropolitan city where the agency was located to facilitate access to the agency for pay purposes. The change of plan involved significantly more time for the Evaluator. This involved the Evaluator making the trip to the agency to pick up the completed questionnaires, returning home to review the paperwork for completeness, assigning identification numbers on each document, and making a return trip to distribute the questionnaires among five data coders. The geographic factor substantially hampered the timely resolution of coding questions, as well as impacted quality control. This was more conducive to a reactive rather than proactive approach to working with data coders.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAM EFFORTS

Multiple issues emerged from the circumstances surrounding the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of the CSAEP. A number of recommendations are offered toward helping others avoid some of the obstacles experienced with the CSAEP in the hopes of: 1) heightening awareness of multiple complications that may arise during programmatic initiatives; 2) encouraging open dialog with funding sources, agency administrators, program coordinators, and evaluators; and 3) helping to enhance the success of future programs.

With the exception of program participants, all individuals involved with any aspect of a prospective program should be engaged in its planning and design to the extent possible (King et al 1987; Schram 1997; Sylvia & Sylvia 2004; Weiss 1998). Maximum involvement will help facilitate an understanding of how, when, and where everyone's expected contribution to the program effort will fit in. Knowing who is to be involved and the nature of that involvement will ensure time for the various tasks necessary to be included in the design and planning. This represents the most appropriate time for individuals' roles to be identified, discussed, and delineated.

Program participants play a critical role in

design and planning as well, particularly when they are the intended recipients of the benefits to be derived from the initiative itself. Admittedly, every potential participant could not be involved—many are as yet unidentified and the scope of the process would be impractical. Nevertheless, a small number of representatives from each of the groups targeted by a program will provide useful information and should be included (Herrerias, Mata, & Ramos 2002).

A constructive working relationship should be established within program staff, as well as between individuals and other systems involved in the program effort. Respecting one another's viewpoints will help to enhance rapport and trust among staff invested in the overall planning and also help in working toward a collective goal. This is greatly enhanced when individuals' contributions are understood and accepted by those involved.

Program materials to be considered for use should be discussed by all program staff. While the Coordinator (e.g., program director, team leader, etc.) may have approval authority concerning what materials are actually utilized, staff will benefit by both learning about core content and raising essential questions during the program's formative stages. It is more productive and less threatening to explore questions during the planning period than after the fact.

In order to maximize any and all available personal resources, a stakeholder survey is recommended (Rossi et al 2003; Grinnell 2001; Unrau et al 2001). It is likely that cooperation and quality of communication will increase when individuals' views and suggestions are thoughtfully considered. While a stakeholder survey may take additional time, the range of perspectives reflected may help strengthen and afford greater clarity to the program generally, as well as acknowledge and avert potential obstacles.

Available literature, prior reports and research in the program area should be shared with all interested individuals as a way of sensitizing and educating program staff, and any other supportive personnel to relevant issues. Sharing information is a way of providing answers to questions as yet not asked. Providing this kind of initial data may also serve to explain, for example, why particular demographic or other information is desired from participants.

When pre- and post-test measures are planned, sufficient time must be allotted for their administration. The evaluation component is an integral part of program planning and should be included in the structure of the program. It is no easy task to accommodate an evaluation once the program is in place, and might even necessitate the elimination of pre-test measures.

All program staff should participate in training sessions containing curriculum content, including any program evaluators, if feasible. Similarly, all staff should participate in training sessions, which explain program evaluation methods. When pre- and post-tests are employed, it is best for administration procedures to be clearly specified. It is also necessary for program staff to understand the importance of a standardized method of administering questionnaires, rather than attempting to establish a unique one.

If a program is being provided by one agency through the auspices of another, the staff from the provider agency should furnish as much assistance to the sponsoring agency as possible. For example, as in the case of the CSAEP, explanatory letters and mailings announcing the program to prospective participants would have helped facilitate implementation by fostering goodwill instead of engendering resistance. This would have also helped avoid last-minute mailings or other more desperate measures to generate one or more participant groups at each targeted site.

Program pilot testing is an important first step in determining whether the structure and content are compatible and consistent. In the event presentations are made by more than one presenter, video or audio recording can be used to help staff work on a more standard format. Pilot testing is also useful in assessing the existence of problems with any measuring instruments and further simplifying and clarifying questionnaire items.

Reading or reciting a common instruction note to participants is a substantial help toward standardizing administration procedures of any measuring instruments employed (e.g., pre- or post-tests or other assessments). Although most child and adult program participants may be able to work autonomously on questionnaires, consideration should be given to staff reading each question out loud to facilitate understanding

for those that may have more limited English proficiency. When participants' ask questions, those responses must be standardized as well as a way of minimizing biased, inconsistent, or irrelevant responses.

A concerted effort should be made to standardize program content and length of presentations across participant groups. Differences in questionnaire responses between participants exposed to shorter and longer program presentations are generally due to not having received the benefit of the same content. This can influence reliability and validity of the measuring instruments. Also, when multiple program presenters are involved, the name of the presenting individual, identification of participant group (e.g., name of school or location where program was held), date and time of day should be noted for questionnaires or other materials collected from participants. This information will allow for better control of situational factors and help maintain the integrity of the data gathered.

Guidelines for hiring consultants to assist with any aspect of the program effort should be clearly spelled out to avoid misunderstandings, valuable time wasted, and work backlogs. At the same time, some flexibility for engaging short-term contractual employees may help expedite the hiring process. All manner or category of potential hires should be considered and clearly described in an agency's human resources' policy.

When program content is of a sensitive nature, such as child sexual abuse prevention education, the involvement of a social worker, counselor, or psychologist may provide necessary support for children who disclose victimization resulting from their program participation. Similarly, program staff should anticipate disclosures from adult participants and be able to provide referral information as needed (Herrerías 1989). Written pamphlets are another valuable resource for dissemination to participants.

As a professional courtesy to the sponsoring agency, the provider agency should ensure that copies of preliminary, interim, and final reports are shared with their stakeholders. It enhances feelings of collegiality, encourages future collaborative efforts, and helps avert unpleasant or unexpected surprises. The Evaluator presented findings from the CSAEP at a regional conference pursuant to having completed the evaluation and

submitted the results to the provider agency for which she did the work. Agency administration did not share the findings with the school system (sponsoring agency) unbeknownst to the Evaluator. A newspaper journalist in the conference audience reported some of the findings in the next morning's edition relative to the percentage of school children ages 8-12 that disclosed they had been sexually abused. The school system was put in a highly awkward position as they attempted to respond to the media's report without corroborating data. The sensationalism surrounding the evaluation findings even involved the funding source who was displeased with how the entire matter was handled.

Finally, appreciation should be expressed to program participants at the end of each session. Their participation and feedback are critical to program success and certainly warrants acknowledgement and appreciation. If possible, brief evaluation findings might also be provided to the participants in some form.

REFERENCES

- Alter-Reid K, MS Gibbs, JR Lachenmeyer, J Sigal & NA Massoth. 1986. Sexual abuse of children: a review of the empirical findings. *Clinical Psychology Review* 6 249-266.
- Berg WE & R Theado. 1981. The utilization of evaluative research in social welfare programs. *Social Service Review* 55 2 183-192.
- Brassard MR, AH Tyler, & TJ Kehle. 1983. School programs to prevent intrafamilial child sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 7 241-245.
- Caputo RK. 1988. The Tao of evaluation: deriving good from flawed methodology. *Administration in Social Work* 12 3 61-70.
- Fink A & L McCloskey. 1990. Moving child abuse and neglect prevention programs forward: improving program evaluations. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 14 187-206.
- Finkelhor D & L Baron. 1986. High-risk children. Pp. 60-88 in D Finkelhor, AP Cardarelli, S Araji, & JM Horowitz eds *A Sourcebook on Child Sexual Abuse*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Grinnell RM Jr. 2001. *Social Work Research and Evaluation*. 6th ed. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Herrerias C. 1989. *EMPOWER Child Sexual Abuse Education and Prevention Program*. Philadelphia: Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America.
- _____. 2002. *Parent's Guide to Prevent Child Sexual Abuse*. Indianapolis, IN: JIST Publications.
- Herrerias C, AG Mata Jr., & RL Ramos. 2002. The face of violence against women in Mexico and the United States. *J Border Health* 7: 3-20.
- King JA, LL Morris, & CT Fitz-Gibbon. 1987. *How to Assess Program Implementation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krause D. 1998. *Effective Program Evaluation*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Lawrence JES & TJ Cook. 1982. Designing useful evaluations: the stakeholder survey. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 5 327-336.
- Leviton LC & RF Boruch. 1983. Contributions of evaluation to education programs and policy. *Evaluation Rev* 7 5 563-598.
- Maher CA. 1979. The 6 D's of management oriented program evaluation in child and youth service settings. *Residential & Community Child Care Administration* 1 299-311.
- Rossi PH, HE Freeman, & MW Lipsey. 2003. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*. 7th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Royse D, BA Thyer, DK Padgett, & TK Logan. 2001. *Program Evaluation*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Rubin A & E Babbie. 1997. *Research Methods for Social Work*. 3rd ed. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Schram B. 1997. *Creating Small Scale Social Programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sylvia RD & KM Sylvia. 2004. *Program Planning and Evaluation for the Public Manager*. 3rd ed. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Tripodi T, P Fellin, & I Epstein. 1978. *Differential Social Program Evaluation*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Tripodi T. 1983. *Evaluation Research for Social Workers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Unrau YA, PA Gabor, & RM Grinnell Jr. 2001. *Evaluation in the Human Services*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Weiss CH. 1998. *Evaluation*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.