

**PUBLIC POLICY 8630 - ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION**  
**SPRING 2008 –MONDAYS 3:00-6:00PM**  
**CLASSROOM: FRETWELL 445C**

PROFESSOR: **DR. KEN GODWIN**  
OFFICE: **Fretwell 450H**  
TELEPHONE: **(704)687-4522 (O) 704 995-6757**  
E-MAIL: **godwink@gmail.com**  
ICE HOURS: **MONDAY-WEDNESDAY 11-12am, 1:30-3pm**

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

*Over the next few years, the federal government will face powerful opposing pressures: the need, on the one hand, to reduce the federal deficit, and the demand, on the other, for a federal response to some potentially expensive domestic problems (expanding health insurance, restoring the economy, and the like). These pressures are likely to intensify concern with the effective management of federal programs and with the availability of objective information on the results of federal investments. In other words, are the federal officials who administer programs adequately informed about the implementation and the results of those investments? And can they, in turn, adequately inform the President, the Congress, and the nation about what has been accomplished? Program evaluations contribute systematic information to federal decision-making that has been useful in a variety of ways... It is important to recognize that an objective and systematic evaluation function not only serves to protect an agency against wasted resources in the form of inefficient or ineffective programs. There may also be elements of government programs that are in fact harmful to the well-being of some segments of society--unintended effects that a well-conducted program evaluation could prevent or detect.... If the nation is to have strong, well-managed federal programs that can deal efficiently and successfully with our domestic and international problems and if the President and the Congress are to be adequately informed of progress in meeting those challenges, the numbers and quality of the program evaluations conducted by executive branch agencies must be improved (General Accounting Office, OCG-93-6TR,1992).*

There are few practical functions more readily required of policy analysts today than the ability to design, implement, and assess the effectiveness of programs and services offered to the public. This is in part because of the enormous pressure to show some positive return on public dollars invested in the delivery of programs and services. In that context, program evaluation is emerging as an important function of management at all levels of government.

The importance of program evaluation is not relegated to government agencies however. Even in the private sector (particularly the nonprofit sector), the competition for resources requires practitioners to provide evidence of specific program impacts in order to obtain and maintain program funding. In fact, almost as a routine matter, funding agencies and institutional sponsors now require their grantees to include ongoing program evaluation as an integral part of program implementation.

As a result, some of the most important tools to be placed in your public policy toolbelt are: (1) conducting program evaluation; (2) assessing the efficacy of policies and programs based on evaluation research; (3) assessing the overall benefits and costs of programs; (4) developing and implementing research-based program improvement strategies; and (5) using program accountability systems for evaluation purposes. In addition to covering each of these skills, this course is designed to cover the major theoretical foundations of evaluation research, social science methodologies used to conduct evaluation research, and contemporary debates about

program evaluation procedures. *Although you will not become an expert in program evaluation in this course, you should be comfortable with basic applications of evaluation research tools and, most importantly, be an intelligent consumer of evaluations prepared by others.*

This course is meant to complement other courses in the public policy doctoral program. Although we will not focus on specific policy areas (except as examples), strong content knowledge of a particular program and policy area in terms of conducting successful program evaluations will be encouraged through particular course assignments. Additionally, the course will focus on the tools of program evaluation which should help you in your particular area of interest, e.g., health policy, social policy, environmental policy, etc.

Finally, the course has three major components which correspond with how the course is organized: types of program evaluation, evaluation methods, and the politics of evaluation.

**Program Evaluation:** In the first sessions of the course, we will focus on the rudiments of program evaluation. I have three major goals in this part of the course. First, I want to provide you with a background on the different types of program evaluation. Half the battle in program evaluation is matching the right kind of evaluation with a good research design that allows you to see a program impact (if one exists) and simultaneously eliminate as many potential validity threats as possible. Second, you will get practice evaluating evaluations, and designing your own program evaluation (although the latter will be done at the end of the course in the final examination). Third, you will examine process and implementation evaluation. This is not an implementation course, but it is very important that you understand process issues, and how to identify implementation problems. There is no substitute for experience in program evaluation. Ultimately, the utility of your evaluation will depend on the recommendations you make to improve the program (because major public programs are seldom eliminated).

**Evaluation Methods:** The second segment of the course will pick up where we left off by delving more substantively into research methods and advanced topics in statistics. The major focus of this part of the course will be on estimation methods with the express understanding that the determination of the counterfactual is at the core of all evaluation designs. Estimation methods will be examined across a wide variety of evaluation frameworks including experimental designs, non-experimental designs and mixed methods evaluations.

**The “Politics” of Program Evaluation:** The third segment of the course will cover the politics of program evaluation, research, and implementation. This part of the course will examine the political context in which the evaluation takes place, ethical considerations, and evaluator consulting skills (ie. writing a contract or scope of work, addressing data ownership and publication issues, etc.). This part of the course is focused on helping students learn to navigate the rancorous political terrain in which evaluation often occurs as well as to develop practices that allow them to function as effective evaluators in the field. As part of the final exam, students will be asked to develop an evaluation proposal that will be graded in part on the student’s ability to effectively address the political environment in which the evaluation occurs and to avoid common implementation pitfalls in conducting evaluation research.

### **INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD**

This course will be conducted as a combination lecture and seminar course with the expectation of significant and continuous student participation. Most sessions will include both required readings from several textbooks (covered in the lectures) and several case studies (for class discussion).

## **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

1. To acquaint public policy students with the theory and practice of program evaluation in a variety of public policy areas and institutional settings.
2. To provide a conceptual framework for understanding comprehensive program evaluation (including the need for the program, program design, program implementation, program impact, program cost, and overall program efficiency).
3. To help students develop an appreciation for the breadth of social science methodologies used to conduct program evaluations.
4. To introduce students to the theoretical literature on program evaluation that students will be asked to apply to a specific context and program.
5. To provide students with an opportunity to design a program evaluation consistent with the programs' purpose, available resources, and constraints.
6. To help students to become more comfortable with the basic application of evaluation methods so that they may become intelligent consumers of evaluations prepared by others.
7. To develop skills in oral and written critical analyses that will facilitate students' effective participation in broader academic contexts where evaluation research is discussed (such as academic conferences, workshops, and panel discussions).

## **REQUIRED TEXTS**

There are several required texts for the course. They are listed below. Additional readings for the course are listed in the course outline and will also be emailed to students during the course.

Peter Rossi, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey (2005). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (Sage Publications).

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2006). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). 4<sup>th</sup> Edition

## **GRADING AND STUDENT EVALUATION**

Take Home Midterm	40%
Take Home Final Examination: Evaluation Proposal	60%

**Group Discussion:** One of the most critical components of any seminar is significant and consistent participation from students. The seminar format is meant to give students an opportunity to discuss controversial or intriguing issues in program evaluation as well as policy specific issues. For each session, we will spend approximately half of the session discussing evaluation theories and the second half critiquing specific program evaluations. Participation in group discussion should consist of original observations and reflective commentary.

**Take Home Midterm Examination:** The likely format of this test is that you will receive 4 questions and asked to write a response to 3 of them. Questions on the midterm will be based on questions typically posed on the proficiency exams and will test students' understanding of basic program evaluation methodology.

**Take Home Final Examination - Evaluation Proposal:** All students will be given a take home final examination. Using course materials, students are expected to demonstrate their ability to select and apply an appropriate evaluation methodology; articulate a coherent rationale and cogent strategy for implementing the evaluation; and produce a well-written document suitable for a review committee. More specific guidelines for the evaluation proposal (including page limits) are detailed as an appendix to this syllabus.

**Note:**

1. Written work should follow the style standard to your discipline. I recommend the APA Style (*Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*).
2. All papers are to be submitted both in hard cover and on disk.
3. All papers should be doubled spaced with appropriate and consistent margins throughout.

**COURSE POLICIES**

**Appointments:** I am always happy to meet with students (individually or in a group) and I am particularly interested in making sure that students have a clear sense of direction in completing assignments. If you have any questions about the course, course assignments or other issues, please do not hesitate to send me an email or set up an appointment to talk.

**Late or Missed Assignments:** Late papers are greatly discouraged such that the grade on any late paper will be diminished by one-half letter grade for every day that it is late. (Exceptions may only be made in cases of serious medical emergencies that can be verified - although I certainly hope this does not happen to anyone.)

**Students with Special Needs/Disabilities:** If you have special needs such as a chronic medical condition or learning disability, please let me know at the beginning of the semester (by the second class of the semester). Special needs identified in the student handbook of the University will be accommodated, but you must inform me by the second class session of the semester and complete the appropriate forms with disability services. Any information you provide will be kept confidential.

**Academic Integrity:** Students have the responsibility to know and observe the requirements of the UNCC Code of Student Academic Integrity (<http://www.uncc.edu/polisci/handbook.html#58>). This code forbids cheating, fabrication or falsification of information, multiple submissions of academic work, plagiarism, abuse of academic materials, and complicity in academic dishonesty. Academic evaluations in this course include a judgment that the student's work is free from academic dishonesty of any type; and grades in this course therefore should be and will be adversely affected by academic dishonesty.

**All written papers are to be submitted in electronic and paper form.**

## COURSE OUTLINE

### SECTION I – THE RUDIMENTS OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

**January 14, 2008**

**INTRODUCTORY SESSION – A “GENTLE” INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE CONTENT. WHAT IS PROGRAM EVALUATION? WHY ARE WE STUDYING IT AND WHAT DOES IT HAVE TO DO WITH PUBLIC POLICYMAKING?**

New Directions for Program Evaluation at the U.S. Department of Education – Press Release. U.S. Department of Education. <http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2002/04/evaluation.html>

Fairfax County School System Program Accountability Reporting  
[http://www.fcps.edu/DEA/program\\_evaluation/pro\\_accountability/carnegie\\_2001-2002.pdf](http://www.fcps.edu/DEA/program_evaluation/pro_accountability/carnegie_2001-2002.pdf)

**SESSION ONE – WHAT ARE THE BASIC CONCEPTS IN PROGRAM EVALUATION?**

***Required Readings:***

Peter Rossi, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (Sage Publications). Chapters 1 & 2.

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). Chapter 1.

***Case Study:***

Program Evaluation: Strategies for Assessing How Information Dissemination Contributes to Agency Goals. GAO. <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02923.pdf> (skim entire report)

**January 28, 2008**

**SESSION TWO – CONDUCTING A NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINING PROGRAM THEORY**

***Required Readings:***

Peter Rossi, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (Sage Publications). Chapters 3, 4 & 5.

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). Chapter 3.

***Case Studies:***

MECKLENBURG COUNTY LATINO COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT  
[http://www.ui.uncc.edu/images/AdminPDF-Files/LACNAP\\_Report\\_Final7-11-06.pdf](http://www.ui.uncc.edu/images/AdminPDF-Files/LACNAP_Report_Final7-11-06.pdf)

A Community Needs Assessment of Lower Manhattan Following the World Trade Center Attack [http://www.mipt.org/pdf/communityneedsassess\\_wtc.pdf](http://www.mipt.org/pdf/communityneedsassess_wtc.pdf)

Evaluation of Program Implementation of ILAB's Child Labor Projects  
<http://www.oig.dol.gov/public/reports/oa/2000/2E-01-070-0001.pdf>

**February 4, 2008**

**SESSION THREE – MONITORING PROGRAM PROCESS AND PERFORMANCE**

***Required Readings:***

Peter Rossi, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (Sage Publications). Chapters 6 & 7.

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). Chapter 5.

***Case Studies:***

Evaluation of Dept. of Labor Travel Card Program

<http://www.oig.dol.gov/public/reports/oace/fy2002/2E070010001.PDF>

**February 11, 2008 and February 18, 2008**

**SESSIONS FOUR – QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL AND EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH DESIGNS**

***Required Readings:***

Peter Rossi, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (Sage Publications). Chapters 7, 8, & 9.

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). Chapters 9 & 11.

***Case Study:***

Paying for Persistence: Early Results of a Louisiana Scholarship Program for Low-Income Parents Attending Community College

<http://www.mdrc.org/publications/429/full.pdf>

**February 25, 2008**

**SESSION FIVE AND SIX - ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM DESIGNS INCLUDING QUALITATIVE APPROACHES**

***Required Readings:***

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). Chapters 4, 6, & 8.

The Evaluation Center. Checklists (**skim each one**)

<http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/checklistmenu.htm>

Guba, Egun & Yvonna S. Lincoln (2001). GUIDELINES AND CHECKLIST FOR CONSTRUCTIVIST (a.k.a. FOURTH GENERATION) EVALUATION.

House, Ernest and Kenneth Howe (2000). DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRATIC EVALUATION CHECKLIST.

Stufflebeam, Daniel (1999). PROGRAM EVALUATION MODELS METAEVALUATION CHECKLIST.

***Case Study:***

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2004). Officer Next Door (OND) And Teachers Next Door (TND) Program Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: HUD.  
[http://www.huduser.org/publications/COMMDEVL/OND\\_TNDProgEval.html](http://www.huduser.org/publications/COMMDEVL/OND_TNDProgEval.html)

**SECTION II – METHODS, ECONOMETRIC EQUATION MODELING, AND FUNCTIONAL FORM  
MARCH 3, 2008**

**SESSION SEVEN AND EIGHT – USING DATA TO MEASURE PROGRAM IMPACT**

***Required Readings:***

Peter Rossi, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (Sage Publications). Chapter 10 .

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). Chapter 13.

***Case Studies:***

Community Programs and Women's Participation: The Chinese Experience  
[http://econ.worldbank.org/files/2227\\_wps2622.pdf](http://econ.worldbank.org/files/2227_wps2622.pdf)

Hidden Impact? Ex-Post Evaluation of an Anti-Poverty Program  
<http://poverty2.forumone.com/library/view/14038>

**\*\*\*MIDTERM EXAMINATIONS GIVEN OUT MARCH 10, 2008 AND DUE MARCH , 2008 AT 5 PM**

***March 17, 2008***

**SESSION NINE – EVALUATING YOUR MIDTERM**

***March 24, 2008 and March 31, 2008***

**SESSION TEN – USING DATA TO MEASURE PROGRAM COST AND EFFICIENCY**

***Required Readings:***

Peter Rossi, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (Sage Publications). Chapter 11.

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). Chapter 10.

**Case Studies:**

Pricing the Priceless: Cost Benefit Analysis of Environmental Protection  
<http://ase.tufts.edu/gdae/publications/C-B%20pamphlet%20final.pdf>

CMS (2004). Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Bright Beginnings Program Cost-Benefit Analysis Project Report.  
[http://www.cms.k12.nc.us/departments/publicInformation/BB\\_CostBenefit.pdf](http://www.cms.k12.nc.us/departments/publicInformation/BB_CostBenefit.pdf)

**April 7, 2008**

**SESSION ELEVEN – THE “REAL STORY” ....USING DATA TO MEASURE PROGRAM IMPACT, COST, AND EFFICIENCY**

**Required Readings:**

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). Chapter 14.

**Case Study:**

Schweinhart, Ph.D., Lawrence. The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40 Summary, Conclusions, and Frequently Asked Questions.  
<http://www.highscope.org/productDetail.asp?intproductID=2164>

**SECTION III – THE POLITICS OF PROGRAM EVALUATION, RESEARCH, AND IMPLEMENTATION**

**April 14, 2008**

**SESSION TWELVE - MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES IN EVALUATION RESEARCH**

**Required Readings:**

Maynard, Rebecca. “Whether a Sociologist, Psychologist or Simply a Skilled Evaluator: Learning Evaluation Practice in the U.S.” *Evaluation*, Vol. 6, number 4, pp. 471-480.

Moffitt, Robert (2004). “The Idea of the Negative Income Tax: Past, Present and Future.” *Focus* 23 (2): 1-8.

**April 21, 2008**

**SESSION THIRTEEN – MAKING SENSE OF EVALUATION DATA, WRITING UP EVALUATION REPORTS, AND UTILIZING EVALUATION RESULTS IN A LARGER POLITICAL CONTEXT**

***Required Readings:***

Peter Rossi, Howard Freeman and Mark Lipsey (1999). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* (Sage Publications). Chapter 12.

David Royse, Bruce Thyer, Deborah Padgett and T.K. Logan (2001). *Program Evaluation: An Introduction* (Brooks/Cole, Thomson Learning). 15.

Mary Jo Bane (2001). "Expertise, Advocacy and Deliberation: Welfare Reform." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 20(2), pp. 191-197.

Charles Metcalf (1998). "Research Ownership, Communication of Results, and Threats to Objectivity in Client-Driven Research." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 17(2), pp. 153-163.

The Evaluation Center. Checklists (**skim**)

<http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/checklistmenu.htm>

Stufflebeam, Daniel (1999a). EVALUATION PLANS AND OPERATIONS CHECKLIST.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1999b). EVALUATION CONTRACTS CHECKLIST.

Horn, Jerry (2001). A CHECKLIST FOR DEVELOPING AND EVALUATING EVALUATION BUDGETS.

Stake, Robert (1999). CHECKLIST FOR NEGOTIATING AN AGREEMENT TO EVALUATE AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.

Gullickson, Arlen and Daniel Stufflebeam (2001). FEEDBACK WORKSHOP CHECKLIST.

**\*\*\*FINAL EXAMINATION IS EMAILED APRIL 27<sup>TH</sup> AT NOON  
IT IS DUE APRIL 28<sup>TH</sup> AT CLASS TIME\*\*\***

**April 28, 2008**

**SESSION FOURTEEN - DISCUSSION OF FINAL EXAMS AND REVIEW OF REQUIREMENTS FOR PROFICIENCY EXAMS**

## Guidelines for the Final Exam - Program Evaluation Proposal

- Title page
- Executive summary (200 words or less)
- Brief background on program (2 pages or less)
- Proposed Evaluation Design (12 pages or less)
  - Evaluation questions
  - Data collection methods and procedures
  - Efforts to control for threats to validity
  - Variables or measures of success
  - Instruments for data collection
  - Sampling procedures
  - Planned data analysis procedures and statistics
  - Timetable or activity chart
- Plans for Presenting and Dissemination of Results (3 pages or less)
  - Planned manner of presentation
    - List of tables, figures and appendices
  - Planned dissemination
    - Publication in trade or professional journal
    - Publication on the internet
    - Distribution to stakeholders
  - Potential use by stakeholders

## KEY JOURNALS DEDICATED TO EVALUATION RESEARCH

*Evaluation Review*

*Journal of Multi Disciplinary Evaluation*

*American Journal Evaluation Review*

*Evaluation: The International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*

*Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*

*Evaluation and Program Planning*

*Evaluation and the Health Professions*

*New Directions for Evaluation*

## OTHER HELPFUL EVALUATION TEXTBOOKS AND JOURNAL ARTICLES

Annie Casey Foundation (1999). "Evaluating Initiatives that Strengthen Families and Build Communities" in *Transforming Neighborhoods into Family-Supporting Environment: Evaluation Issues and Challenges*.

Babbie, Earl *The Practice of Social Research*, Seventh Edition. (Wadsworth Publishing Company).

Baker, Joan (2000). "[Evaluating the Impact of Development Projects on Poverty: A Handbook for Practitioners](http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/library/impact.htm)". <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/library/impact.htm>

Bamberger, Michael, Jim Rugh, and Linda Mabry (2006). *RealWorld Evaluation: Working Under Budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints*. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press)

Besharov, Douglas, Peter Germanis and Peter Rossi (1997). "Experimental Vs. Quasi Experimental Designs" In *Evaluating Welfare Reform* (College Park, MD: University of Maryland), pp. 41-52.

Brodkin, Evelyn (1997). "Inside the Welfare Contract: Discretion and Accountability in State Welfare Administration." *Social Service Review*, pp. 1-33.

Burtless, Gary (1986). The Case for Randomized Field Trials in Economic and Policy Research. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2), pp. 63-84.

Burtless, Gary and Larry Orr (1986). Are Classical Experiments Needed for Manpower Policy? *The Journal of Human Resources*, pp. 606-639.

Churchill, Nancy (1995). "Ending Welfare As We Know It: A Case Study in Urban Anthropology and Public Policy." *Urban Anthropology*, pp.5-35.

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

Covey, Herbert (1982). Basic Problems of Applying Experiments to Social Programs. *Social Service Review*, pp. 424-437.

Dobkin Hall, Peter (2003). A solution is a product in search of a problem: A history of foundations and evaluation research.  
<http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~.phall.hauser.ksg/EVALUATION%20ESSAY.pdf>

Federalism Research Group (1997). *State Capacity Field Research Report Form*. Albany, New York: The Nelson Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Goodbarn, Nancy (1985). "The Psychological Impact of Being on Welfare." *Social Service Review*, pp. 403-422.

Gueron, Judith (1999). *The Politics of Random Assignment: Implementing Studies and Impacting Policy*. Paper presented at the Harvard Faculty Seminar on Experiments in Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Hagen, Jan and Liane Davis (1995). "The Participants' Perspective on the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program." *Social Service Review*, pp. 656-677.

Heckman, Gary and Jeffrey Smith (1995). Assessing the Case for Social Experiments. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2), pp. 85-110.

Hollister, Robinson and Jennifer Hill (1995). "Problems in the Evaluation of Community-Wide Initiatives," in *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives*, James P. Connell, et. Al., ed. (Washington, DC: Aspen Institute).

W.K. Kellogg Foundation (1998). *W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook*.

- King, Gary, Robert Keohane and Sidney Verba (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (NJ: Princeton Univ. Press).
- Langbein, Laura (2006). *Public Program Evaluation: A Guide to Statistical Methods*. (New York: M.E. Sharpe Press)
- Lewis, Dan (2000). "Some Thoughts on Qualitative Methods and Welfare Research" in *Quarterly Newsletter of the Joint Center for Poverty Research*, Vol. 4, No. 1.
- Moffitt, Robert (2000). "Perspectives on the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide" in *Quarterly Newsletter of the Joint Center for Poverty Research*, Vol. 4, No. 1.
- \_\_\_\_ (1985). "Evaluating the Effects of Changes in AFDC Methodological Issues and Challenges." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 4(4), pp. 537-553.
- Nathan, Richard (2000). *Social Science in Government: The Role of Policy Researchers* (Albany, NY: The Rockefeller Institute Press).
- O'Connor, Alice (1995). "Evaluating Comprehensive Community Initiatives: A View from History," in *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives*, James P. Connell, et. Al., ed. (Washington, DC: Aspen Institute), pp. 33-63.
- Orr, Larry (1997). *Social Experimentation: Evaluating Public Programs with Experimental Methods*.
- Patton, Michael (1987). *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*. (Sage Publications).
- Reichardt, Charles and Sharon Rallis (1994). The Relationship Between the Qualitative and Quantitative Traditions. In *The Qualitative-Quantitative Debate*, ed. Charles Reichardt, et al. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers), pp. 5-11.
- Rosener, Judy (1978). "Citizen Participation: Can We Measure Its Effectiveness?" *Public Administration Review*, pp. 457-463.
- Peter Rossi (1987). The Iron Law of Evaluation and Other Metallic Roles." In *Research in Social Problems & Public Policy*, ed. Joan H. Miller and Michael Lewis, vol. 4, pp. 3-20. (Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press).
- U.S. General Accounting Office (1991) *Designing Evaluations*. GAO/PEMD-10.1.4. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office)
- U.S. General Accounting Office (1990) *Case Study Evaluations*. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office).
- Weiss, Carol (1972). *Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness*. (NJ: Prentice-Hall).
- Wolcott, Harry (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis and Interpretation*. (SAGE Publications), pp.9-54.