

## Poster 498—Front-end-Evaluation Planning: Articulating Purpose and Key Questions

### I. Evaluation standards

1. Yarbrough, D. B., Shulha, L. M., Hopson, R. K., & Caruthers, F. A. (2011). *Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation [JCSEE]; The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

### II. Websites

1. American Evaluation Association [AEA]

**Note:** This website has general information about the association, its conferences and journals, Guiding Principles for Evaluators, Career Center and Find an Evaluator function: <http://www.eval.org/>

2. BetterEvaluation: <http://betterevaluation.org>

3. The Research Methods Knowledge Base: <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/>

4. Online Evaluation Resource Library: <http://oerl.sri.com/home.html>.

**Note:** The Online Evaluation Resource Library was developed for professionals seeking to design, conduct, document, or review project evaluations. Evaluation plans, instruments, and reports for NSF projects are available that can be used as examples by Principal Investigators, project evaluators, and others outside the NSF community as they design proposals and projects. Professional development modules are available.

5. Basic Guides to Evaluation: <http://gsociology.icaap.org/methods/basicguides.html>

6. Beginner Guides to Program Evaluation:  
<http://gsociology.icaap.org/methods/BasicguidesHandouts.html>

7. University of Wisconsin – Extension Program Development and Evaluation:  
<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/>

8. The Evaluation Center University of Western Michigan:  
<http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/>

9. The Evaluation Exchange:  
<http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange>

10. My Environmental Education and Evaluation Resources Assistant (MEERA).  
Retrieved from <http://meera.snre.umich.edu>

**Note:** MEERA is online “evaluation consultant” designed by the University of Michigan. It points to a wide range of resources ranging from beginners to advanced and applicable across disciplines and contexts.

### III. Guides, handbooks, tip sheets, and evaluation encyclopedia

1. Mathison, S. (2005). *Encyclopedia of evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

**Note:** *The Encyclopedia of Evaluation* addresses the “who, what, where, how, and why of evaluation as a profession, a practice, and discipline that continues to develop through the ideas and work evaluators and evaluation theorists (Mathison, 2005).

2. *Evaluation Flash Cards: Embedding Evaluative Thinking in Organizational Culture*. St. Paul, MN: Otto Bremer Foundation, [ottobremer.org](http://www.ottobremer.org); Patton, Michael Quinn (2014). Retrieved from [http://www.ottobremer.org/sites/default/files/fact-sheets/OBF\\_flashcards\\_201402.pdf](http://www.ottobremer.org/sites/default/files/fact-sheets/OBF_flashcards_201402.pdf)

3. *A Practical Guide for Engaging Stakeholders in Developing Evaluation Questions*; Preskill, H. & Jones, N. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.fsg.org/tools-and-resources/practical-guide-engaging-stakeholders-developing-evaluation-questions-0>

4. Cornell University Cooperative Extension (2012). *The Guide to the Systems Evaluation Protocol*. Retrieved from [https://core.human.cornell.edu/documents/SEPGuide2\\_small.pdf](https://core.human.cornell.edu/documents/SEPGuide2_small.pdf)

5. University of Wisconsin Extension Program Development and Evaluation; *Evaluation logic model bibliography*. Retrieved from <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicbiblio.html>.

6. University of Wisconsin Extension; *Program Development and Evaluation- Logic Model*; Retrieved from <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html>

7. W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2004). *W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook*. Retrieved from <http://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2010/w-k-kellogg-foundation-evaluation-handbook>

8. W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2004). *Logic Model Development Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide>

9. Wilder.org; Amherst H. Wilder Foundation (2016). *Tips for conducting program evaluation*. Retrieved Program Evaluation and Research Tips; **Note:** Fact Sheets and Presentations providing tips on evaluation and research, including data collection and analysis, surveys, logic models, return on investment studies, and more. Retrieved from <http://www.wilder.org/Wilder-Research/Publications/Studies/Forms/Study/docsethomepage.aspx?ID=514&FolderCTID=0x0120D52000F239CA0ED16F9A49B139AA1402664580003333A21DCC750948AD7DA120396FC83C&List=5ffe87fb-8c61-4035-86cc-db1b1907fa0a&RootFolder=%2FWilder-Research%2FPublications%2FStudies%2FProgram%20Evaluation%20and%20Research%20Tips>

10. Wilder Research (2006). *Choosing the right questions* Retrieved from: [https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ojp/forms-documents/Documents/Wilder\\_Program\\_Evaluation\\_7.pdf](https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ojp/forms-documents/Documents/Wilder_Program_Evaluation_7.pdf)

11. Radhakrishna, R. B., & Relado, R. Z. (2009). A framework to link evaluation questions to program outcomes. *Journal of Extension* [On-line], 47(3) Article 3TOT2. Retrieved from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2009june/tt2.php>
12. Watkins, R., West Meiers, M. & Visser, Y. L. (2012). *A guide to assessing needs: Essential tools for collecting information, making decisions, and achieving development results*. Washington, DC: The World Bank; DOI: 10. 1596/978-0-8213- 8868-6 Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2231>

#### IV. Resources on practical evaluation approaches and design

1. Bamberger, M., & Rugh, J. (2012). *Real world evaluation: Working under budget, time, data, and political constraints* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
2. Government Accountability Office (2012). *Designing evaluations: 2012 Revision* GAO-12-208G: Published: Jan 31, 2012. Publicly Released: Feb 1, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-208G>
3. Patton, M. Q. (2012). *Essentials of utilization-focused evaluation*. Los Angeles: Sage.
4. Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. New York: Guilford Press.
5. Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization focused evaluation (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
6. Stufflebeam, D., Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (2000). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. Norwell: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

#### V. References

1. AEA, (2013). *An Evaluation Roadmap for a More Effective Government*. Retrieved from <http://comm.eval.org/resources/viewdocument/?DocumentKey=f5bea5e6-3ff9-4367-a323-0bf9f25ca08b>
2. Alkin, M. (2011). *Evaluation essentials from a to z*. New York: Guilford Press.
3. Altschuld, J. W. & Kumar, D. D. (2010). *Needs assessment: An overview*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
4. Bernholz, E., et al. (2006). *Evaluation Dialogue Between OMB Staff and Federal Evaluators: Digging a Bit Deeper into Evaluation Science*. Washington, D.C. July. <http://www.fedeval.net/presen/ombbriefing.pdf>
5. Bickman, L. (2005). Evaluation Research. In L. Bickman, *Encyclopedia of Evaluation* (p. 141). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
6. Bickman, L. (ed.). (1987). Using program theory in evaluation. *New directions for program evaluation*, No. 33. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

7. Brandon, P. R. (Editor-in-Chief); Cousins, J. B. & Bourgeois, I (Eds.). (2014). *New Directions for Evaluation. Organizational Capacity To Do and Use Evaluation*, (141)
8. Campbell, D., & Stanley, J. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
9. Chen, H. T. (2005). *Practical program evaluation: Assessing and improving planning, implementation, and effectiveness*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
10. Christie, C. A. (2003). Understanding evaluation theory and its role in guiding practice: Formal, folk, and otherwise. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 91-93.
11. Cousins, J. B., Goh, S. C., Elliott, C. J., & Bourgeois, I. (2014). Framing the capacity to do and use evaluation. In J. B. Cousins & I. Bourgeois (Eds.), *Organizational capacity to do and use evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*, 141, 7–23.
12. Davies, R. (2012, November). *A bibliography on evaluability assessment*. Retrieved from <http://mande.co.uk/2012/lists/evaluability-assessments-bibliography/a-bibliography-on-evaluability-assessment/>
13. Davis, B. G. (2009). *Tools for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
14. Funnell, S. C., & Rogers, P. J. (2011). *Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
15. Government Accountability Office [GAO]. (2011). *Performance measurement and evaluation: Definitions and relationships GAO-11-646SP* Retrieved from <https://www.ise.gov/gao-11-646sp-performance-measurement-and-evaluation-definitions-and-relationships>
16. Government Accountability Office [GAO] (2012). *Designing evaluations: 2012 Revision GAO-12-208G*: Published: Jan 31, 2012. Publicly Released: Feb 1, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-208G>
17. Jaccard, J. & Jacoby, J. (2010). *Theory construction and model-building: A practical guide for social scientists*. New York: The Guilford Press.
18. Knowlton, L. W. & Phillips, C. C. (2013). *The logic model guidebook: Better strategies for great results*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
19. Mayne, J. (2008). ILAC Brief: 16 *Contribution analysis: An approach to exploring cause and effect*. UK: Institutional Learning and Change Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.innonet.org/resources/node/437>
20. McDavid, J. C., & Huse, I. (2013). *Program evaluation and performance measurement: an introduction to practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
21. Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology*. Thousands Oaks: Sage Publications.
22. Office of Management and Budget (OMB), *Evidence and Evaluation*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/evidence>
23. Phillips, P. P., & Phillips, J. J. (2007). *The Value of Learning*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

24. Preskill, H., & Boyle, S. (2008). A multidisciplinary model of evaluation capacity building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 443-459.
25. Rog, D. J. (2012). When background becomes foreground: Toward context-sensitive evaluation practice. In D. J. Rog, J. L. Fitzpatrick, & R. F. Conner (Eds.), *Context: A framework for its influence on evaluation practice*. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 135, 25-40
26. Radhakrishna, R. B. & Relado, R. Z. (2009). A framework to link evaluation questions to program outcomes. *Journal of Extension*, 47(3).
27. Rutman, L. (1980). *Planning useful evaluations*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
28. Shadish, W., Cook, T. & Campbell, D (2002) *Experimental & Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
29. Shakman, K., & Rodriguez, S. M. (2015). *Logic models for program design, implementation, and evaluation: Workshop toolkit* (REL 2015-057). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.
30. Singh, J. H. (2011). *Navigational map*. Retrieved from <http://comm.eval.org/communities/community-home/librarydocuments/viewdocument?DocumentKey=77a55f44-d544-4c68-862e-431a6cdee993&CommunityKey=00000000-0000-0000-0000-000000000000&tab=librarydocuments>
31. Singh, J. H. (2016). *Front-end evaluation Planning framework*. Retrieved from <http://comm.eval.org/communities/community-home/librarydocuments/viewdocument?DocumentKey=c0bacdc8-ba66-49eb-a406-26919078da0e&CommunityKey=00000000-0000-0000-0000-000000000000&tab=librarydocuments>
32. Singh, J. H. (2014). *Front-end evaluation Planning framework*. Retrieved from [http://www.myacpa.org/sites/default/files/2014%20ACPA%20Conference%20Handouts\\_SinghJH.pdf](http://www.myacpa.org/sites/default/files/2014%20ACPA%20Conference%20Handouts_SinghJH.pdf)
33. Singh, J. H. (2014). *2014 NCAA Accelerating Academic Success Program Conference*. Retrieved from [http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/12.12.2014\\_AASP\\_JSingh\\_IntroEval\\_PostedSlides.pdf](http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/12.12.2014_AASP_JSingh_IntroEval_PostedSlides.pdf)
34. Singh, J. H. (2014). *2014 NCAA Accelerating Academic Success Program Conference. Overview: Key Grant and Evaluation Considerations*. Retrieved from [http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/Grant%20and%20Evaluation%20Considerations\\_0.pdf](http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/Grant%20and%20Evaluation%20Considerations_0.pdf)
35. Smith, M. F. (1989). *Evaluability assessment: A practical approach*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
36. Stufflebeam, D. L. (Ed.) (2001). Evaluation models. *New Directions for Evaluation*, No. 89. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

37. Stufflebeam, D., Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (2000). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. Norwell: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
38. Trochim, W. M. (2006). *Conceptualization for planning and evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/pecycle.htm>
39. Trochim, W. M. (2006). *Conceptualizing. The Center for Social Research Methods*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/resprob.php>.
40. Trochim, W. M. (2006). *Deductive & inductive thinking. The Center for Social Research Methods*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/dedind.php>.
41. Trochim, W. M. (2006). *Definitions of evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/intreval.php>.
42. Watkins, R., West Meiers, M. & Visser, Y. L. (2012). *A guide to assessing needs: Essential tools for collecting information, making decisions, and achieving development results*. Washington, DC: The World Bank; DOI: 10. 1596/978-0-8213- 8868-6 Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2231>
43. Wholey, J. S. (2015). Exploratory evaluation. In Newcomer, K. E, Hatry, H. P., Wholey, J. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation (4th Ed.)*. (pp. 88-107). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**Contact information:**

Jacqueline H. Singh, MPP, PhD  
 qualadvant@gmail.com