

	<p align="center">THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA School of Social Work Course Outline - SOWK 554C (003): Qualitative Methods in Social Work Research: Research and Evaluation in Child, Youth and Family Services</p>
---	--

The UBC School of Social Work acknowledges that we are located on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the x^wməθk^wəyəm (Musqueam) people.

School Vision: Building upon a foundation of social justice and an ethic of care, we are a community of learners actively engaged in the development of critical, transformative knowledge for social work practice.

MSW Mission: The MSW program offers an accessible, advanced professional degree focused on social work practice in the fields of child and family welfare, health and social care, and international and social development, using a social justice lens. The purpose of this MSW program is to prepare our graduates to be competent social work professionals, equipped with state-of-the-art knowledge and skills, a critical analytic lens, and a social justice orientation.

Year/Term	2019 - 20 / Fall and Winter
Course Title	SOWK 554C (003): Qualitative Methods in Social Work Research: Research and Evaluation in Child, Youth and Family Services
Credit Value	6
Course Schedule	Fridays, 9:00am – 12:00pm
Course Location	Jack Bell Building, ROOM 224

Instructor	Office Location	Office Phone	e-mail address
Dr. Barbara Lee	Jack Bell, Room 339	604-822-9647	b.lee@ubc.ca
Office Hours	Fridays, 1-2pm		

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

There is a growing demand in the health and human services for professionals to evaluate intervention and program outcomes. This demand is driven in part by the ethical requirements of professions to provide the best services possible. It is also driven by the demands of funders and policymakers for accountability. Increasingly, service providers must describe explicitly how an intervention or program meets the needs of those whom it is intended to serve. Service users also expect and deserve predictable results and identifiable outcomes. Carefully designed and implemented evaluation research can answer critical questions such as: What group of intended service users does a program actually reach? Did the intervention accomplish its short-term and long-term goals? How can interventions or programs be improved to better reach their intended audience and to better meet the needs of those being served? This course will introduce students to the art and science of intervention and program evaluation research, with attention to the structural and sociocultural contexts within which evaluation research takes place. In most cases, students will be working collaboratively with Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD) staff, and will develop skill in assessing the conceptualization, implementation, and

effectiveness of human service interventions, programs, and policies. The course will provide meaningful opportunities to engage in real world evaluation activities such as conducting literature and jurisdictional reviews, and evaluating existing interventions and programs. Students will develop an understanding of the role played by evaluation frameworks, formative and summative evaluation, and data collection strategies used to evaluate knowledge and practice at the client, program, community, and provincial levels. Depending on the project, students may use qualitative or survey approaches, or mixed methods. This course will expand upon introductory, undergraduate research courses, and provide students with a more advanced understanding of research methods and epistemologies, primarily through the hands-on experience of carrying out an evaluation project. Students will be exposed to data collection and analysis techniques currently employed by professional social work researchers. As noted, most students will be doing projects evaluating MCFD programs, this related to a contractual relationship between UBC and our Ministry partners. However, students may contact the instructor if considering evaluations of other human service organizations.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

By the end of this course, students will be able to

- Explain epistemological, theoretical, methodological, and ethical issues associated with program evaluation.
 - Critically assess the utility of evaluation frameworks and processes.
 - Appraise the existing research literature.
 - Conceptualize evaluation questions and develop/use appropriate measurement instruments/indicators to answer the evaluation questions.
 - Collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data.
 - Disseminate research results to a variety of audiences including academic, government, and service users.
-

UNIVERSITY POLICIES:

Support: UBC provides resources to support student learning and to maintain healthy lifestyles but recognizes that sometimes crises arise and so there are additional resources to access including those for survivors of sexual violence. UBC values respect for the person and ideas of all members of the academic community. Harassment and discrimination are not tolerated nor is suppression of academic freedom. UBC provides appropriate accommodation for students with disabilities and for religious observances. UBC values academic honesty and students are expected to acknowledge the ideas generated by others and to uphold the highest academic standards in all of their actions.

Details of the policies and how to access support are available on [the UBC Senate website](#).

“Regular attendance is expected of students in all their classes (including lectures, laboratories, tutorials, seminars, etc.). Students who neglect their academic work and assignments may be excluded from the final examinations. Students who are unavoidably absent because of illness or disability should report to their instructors on return to classes.” (UBC Calendar)

Academic Dishonesty: Please review the UBC Calendar “Academic regulations” for the university policy on cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic dishonesty. Also visit www.arts.ubc.ca and go to the students’ section for useful information on avoiding plagiarism and on correct documentation.

Retaining Assignments: Students should retain a copy of all submitted assignments (in case of loss) and should also retain all their marked assignments in case they wish to apply for a Review of Assigned Standing. Students have the right to view their marked examinations with their instructor, providing they apply to do so within a month of receiving their final grades. This review is for pedagogic purposes. The examination remains the property of the university.

COURSE POLICIES:

Attendance

The attendance policy is in the student handbook on page 11:
<https://socialwork.ubc.ca/current-students/>.

The School considers class attendance to be an essential component of integrated learning in professional social work education. Therefore, regular attendance is required in all social work courses. Instructors may count repeated late arrivals or early departures as an absence, and a meeting should be setup to discuss this with the student.

The University accommodates students with disabilities who have registered with Access and Diversity. Students, who will require accommodation for attendance due to disability, are encouraged to inform the instructor, and if necessary, to contact Access and Diversity preferably not later than the first week of class. The School will also accommodate religious observance, according to University Policy 65, and students are expected to inform the instructor. Students who wish to be accommodated for unavoidable absences due to varsity athletics, family obligations, or other similar commitments, must notify their instructors in writing at least two weeks in advance, and preferably earlier. This reflects expectations for professional social workers in their place of employment.

If students miss three or more classes, they may be considered to have not met the requirements of the course. If students have valid reasons, they could be withdrawn from the course with the approval of the instructor – otherwise, they would fail the course.

COPYRIGHT:

All materials of this course (course handouts, lecture slides, assessments, course readings, etc.) are the intellectual property of the Course Instructor or licensed to be used in this course by the copyright owner. Redistribution of these materials by any means without permission of the copyright holder(s) constitutes a breach of copyright and may lead to academic discipline.

LEARNING ANALYTICS:

Learning analytics includes the collection and analysis of data about learners to improve teaching and learning. No learning analytics are being used in this course.

SUBMITTING ASSIGNMENTS:

Assignments are due as noted in this course outline, unless otherwise informed by the instructor.

RETURN OF MARKED STUDENT ASSIGNMENTS:

All assignments are to be submitted via the UBC Canvas course site. Assignments will be marked with track changes and comments provided in the same manner.

LATE ASSIGNMENTS:

Generally, late assignments will not be accepted. In emergency situations, students must discuss any potential lateness with their instructor and be prepared to have a medical certificate available. Assignments submitted after the deadline with no documentation will be penalized by one percentage point per day.

FORMAT OF THE COURSE:

This course is structured as a problem-based learning and participatory seminar. The course will include various teaching and learning modalities such as lectures, experiential workshops, group discussions and activities. Students will also participate in site visits/telephone meetings/video conferences with MCFD sponsors to coordinate the research activities.

During the first term, students will have the opportunity to be matched with a MCFD sponsored project. Working in pairs, students will be required to prepare a literature review, outline of the scope of the work, ethics application to MCFD and an evaluation proposal.

During the second term, students will be expected to implement the research and evaluation project by collecting and analyzing data. At the end of the course, students will produce a final report and disseminate the research findings.

REQUIRED TEXTBOOK(S):

None

Required readings will be posted on UBC Canvas

COURSE SCHEDULE:

Please note that there may need to be some flexibility in the scheduling of topics – depending on timetables of visitors and guest speakers. Students will be updated regularly

SESSION 1:	September 6, 2019
TOPIC:	Introduction to course Evaluation research
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Brun, C. F. (2016). Purpose of evaluation. In <i>A practical guide to evaluation</i> (2nd ed., pp. 3-32). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.• Brun, C. F. (2016). Scope of evaluation. In <i>A practical guide to evaluation</i> (2nd ed., pp. 33-54). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
SESSION 2:	September 13, 2019 Guest: MCFD projects overview
TOPIC:	Evaluation projects and research questions
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grinnell, R. M. Jr., Williams, M., Unrau, Y. A., Bozalek, V., & Bak, N. (2014). Problems, questions, and hypotheses. In R. M. Grinnell, Jr., & Y. Unrau (Eds.), <i>Social work research and evaluation: Foundations of evidence-based practice</i> (10th ed., pp. 31-55). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
SESSION 3:	September 20, 2019
TOPIC:	Working with stakeholders; Project management techniques
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2012). Working with stakeholders: Establishing the context and the evaluand. In <i>Program evaluation theory and practice : A comprehensive guide</i>, pp. 223-260. New York, NY: Guilford Publication.• Owen, J. M., & Rogers, P. J. (2011). Negotiating an evaluation plan: The importance of negotiation and planning. In <i>Program Evaluation</i>, pp. 63-85. London, UK: SAGE Publications, Ltd
SESSION 4:	September 27, 2019
TOPIC:	Literature review Workshop: Susan Paterson (Social work librarian)
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Brun, C. F. (2016). Conducting literature reviews. In <i>A practical guide to evaluation</i> (2nd ed., pp. 177-196). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
SESSION 5:	October 4, 2019 Due: Scope of Work and Research Question(s)
TOPIC:	Evaluation frameworks
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• McLaughlin, J. A., Jordan, G. B. (2015). Using logic models. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer (Eds.). <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> (4th ed., pp. 62-87). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
SESSION 6:	October 11, 2019
TOPIC:	Research designs

READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bakken, L. L. (2018). Designing a program evaluation. In <i>Evaluation practice for collaborative growth : A guide to program evaluation with stakeholders and communities</i> (pp. 79-110). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. • Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2012). Evaluation designs. In <i>Program evaluation theory and practice : A comprehensive guide</i>, pp. 303-352. New York, NY: Guilford Publication.
SESSION 7:	October 18, 2019 Due: Literature Review Guest: MCFD Research Protocol
TOPIC:	Evaluation practices
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2015). Pitfalls in evaluations. . In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer (Eds.). <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> (4th ed., pp. 701-724). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. • James W. Drisko (1997) Strengthening qualitative studies and reports. <i>Journal of Social Work Education</i>, 33(1), 185-197. doi: 10.1080/10437797.1997.10778862 • True, G., Alexander, L. B., & Richman, K. A. (2011). Misbehaviors of front-line research personnel and the integrity of community-based research. <i>Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics</i>, 6(2), pp. 3–12. doi: 10.1525/jer.2011.6.2.3
SESSION 8:	October 25, 2019 *Instructor is away. No class this week. Students are encouraged to use this class to complete the TCPS2 Course on Research Ethics (CORE Tutorial) (approx. 3 hours to complete online).
TOPIC:	Research ethics
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boilevin, L., Chapman, J., Deane, L., Doerksen, C., Fresz, G., Joe, D. J., ... Winter, P. (2018). Research 101: A manifesto for ethical research in the downtown eastside. Retrieved from: http://bit.ly/R101Manifesto • The First Nations Information Governance Centre. (2014). <i>Ownership, Control, Access and Possession (OCAP™): The Path to First Nations Information Governance</i>. Ottawa, ON: The First Nations Information Governance Centre. Retrieved from: https://fnigc.ca/sites/default/files/docs/ocap_path_to_fn_information_governance_en_final.pdf • Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS-2, 2014) http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/education/tutorial-didacticiel/
SESSION 9:	November 1, 2019
TOPIC:	Sampling
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schutt, R. K. (2014). Sampling. In R. M. Grinnell, Jr., & Y. Unrau (Eds.), <i>Social work research and evaluation: Foundations of evidence-based practice</i> (10th ed., pp. 291-312). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

SESSION 10:	November 8, 2019
TOPIC:	Measurement
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engel, R. J., & Schutt, R. K. (2017). Measurement. In <i>The practice of research in social work</i> (pp.71-102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
SESSION 11:	November 15, 2019
TOPIC:	Surveys Workshop: Online survey
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newcomer, K. E., & Triplett, T. (2015). Using surveys. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer (Eds.). <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> (4th ed., pp. 344-382). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Engel, R. J., & Schutt, R. K. (2017). Survey research. In <i>The practice of research in social work</i> (pp. 219-256). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
SESSION 12:	November 22, 2019 Due: Evaluation Proposal & Ethics Application to MCFD
TOPIC:	Knowledge translation and mobilization
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Johnson, L. R. (2017). Write-up, dissemination, and transformation: Building partnerships, developing reciprocal research relationships, and enacting change. In <i>Community-based qualitative research: Approaches for education and the social sciences</i>, pp. 139-153. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
SESSION 13:	November 29, 2019 Due: Research Process Reflection
TOPIC:	Reflections on the Research Process
READING:	-

Winter Term: (Readings in this semester are assigned depending on project need)

SESSION 1:	January 10, 2020
TOPIC:	Qualitative research methods (Collecting qualitative data)
READING:	<p><u>Interviews:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adams, W. C. (2015). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer (Eds.). <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> (4th ed., pp. 492-505). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Brouneus, K. (2011). In-depth Interviewing: The process, skill and ethics of interviews in peace research. In K Höglund & M. Öberg (Eds.), <i>Understanding peace research: Methods and challenges</i> (pp. 130- 145). New York, NY: Routledge. <p><u>Focus groups:</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dallas Allen, M. (2014). Telephone focus groups: Strengths, challenges, and strategies for success. <i>Qualitative Social Work</i>, 13(4), 571-583. doi: 10.1177/1473325013499060 • Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2002). Focus group interviewing on the telephone. Retrieved from: https://www.shadac.org/sites/default/files/publications/FocGrp_KruegerCasey_Aug02.pdf • Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). Focus group interviewing. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer (Eds.). <i>Handbook of practical program evaluation</i> (4th ed., pp. 506-534). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. • Zuckerman-Parker, M, & Shank, G. (2008). The town hall focus group: A new format for qualitative research methods. <i>Qualitative Report</i>, 13(4), 630-635.
SESSION 2:	January 17, 2020
TOPIC:	Qualitative research methods (Analyzing qualitative data) Workshop on NVivo; Computer lab tutorial (TBC)
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Braun, V., Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. <i>Qualitative Research in Psychology</i>, 3, 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa • Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i>, 13, 3-21. • Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. <i>International journal of qualitative methods</i>, 16, 1-13. doi: 10.1177/1609406917733847 • Saldaña, J. (2013). <i>The coding manual for qualitative researchers</i>. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
SESSION 3:	January 24, 2020
TOPIC:	Quantitative research methods (Collecting quantitative data)
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Williams, M., Tutty, L., & Grinnel, R. M. Jr. (2014). Quantitative data analysis. In R. M. Grinnell, Jr., & Y. Unrau (Eds.), <i>Social work research and evaluation: Foundations of evidence-based practice</i> (10th ed., pp. 509-525). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
SESSION 4:	January 31, 2020
TOPIC:	Quantitative research methods (Analyzing quantitative data) Workshop on SPSS; Computer lab tutorial (TBC)
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abbott, M. L. (2017). Descriptive statistics: Central tendency. In <i>Using statistics in the social and health sciences with SPSS and Excel</i> (pp. 13-54). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Son, Inc. • Abbott, M. L. (2017). Chi-square and contingency table analysis. In <i>Using statistics in the social and health sciences with SPSS and Excel</i> (pp. 455-488). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Son, Inc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abbott, M. L. (2017). Independent sample T test. In <i>Using statistics in the social and health sciences with SPSS and Excel</i> (207-254). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Son, Inc.
SESSION 5:	February 7, 2020
TOPIC:	Mixed methods
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greene, J. C., Benjamin, L., & Goodyear, L. (2001). The merits of mixing methods in evaluation. <i>Evaluation: The International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice</i>, 7(1), 25-44. doi: 10.1177/13563890122209504
SESSION 6:	February 14, 2020 Due: Interim Report
TOPIC:	Research integrity
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member checking: A tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation? <i>Qualitative Health Research</i>, 26(13), 1802-1811. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870 Nicols-casebolt, A. (2012). Data management: Acquisition, sharing, and ownership. In <i>Research integrity and responsible conduct of research: Building social work research capacity</i> (pp. 95-112). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Nicols-casebolt, A. (2012). Publication practices and responsible authorship. In <i>Research integrity and responsible conduct of research: Building social work research capacity</i> (pp. 113-132). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
SESSION 7:	February 21, 2020
TOPIC:	Reading Week (No Class)
READING:	-
SESSION 8:	February 28, 2020
TOPIC:	Data visualization
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Henderson, S., & Segal, E. H. (2013). Visualizing qualitative data in evaluation research. In T. Azzam & S. Evergreen (Eds.), <i>Data visualization, part 1. New Directions for Evaluation</i>, 139, 53–71. doi: 10.1002/ev.20067 Morgan, S., & Reichert, T., & Harrison, T. R. (2016). Presenting results visually. In <i>From numbers to words: Reporting statistical results for the social sciences</i> (pp. 77-99). New York, NY: Routledge.
SESSION 9:	March 6, 2020
TOPIC:	Select research topics (TBD)
READING:	
SESSION 10:	March 13, 2020 Due: Research Results
TOPIC:	How to conduct an academic and professional presentation

READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lortie, C. J. (2017) Ten simple rules for short and swift presentations. <i>PLoS Computational Biology</i>, 13(3): e1005373. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005373
SESSION 11:	March 20, 2020
TOPIC:	Report writing & publications
READING:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bronstein, L. R., & Kovacs, P. J. (2013). Writing a mixed methods report in social work research. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>. 23(3), 354-360. doi: 10.1177/1049731512471564 Holliday, A. (2013). Writing about data. In <i>Doing and writing qualitative research</i> (pp. 89-113). London, UK: Sage Publications. Morgan, S., & Reichert, T., & Harrison, T. R. (2016). Frequently asked questions about reporting statistics. In <i>From numbers to words: Reporting statistical results for the social sciences</i> (pp. 5-22). New York, NY: Routledge.
SESSION 12:	March 27, 2020 Due (TBC): Research Presentation
TOPIC:	Research dissemination
READING:	-
SESSION 13:	April 3, 2020 Due: Final Report Due (April 9, 2020): Participation and Performance Feedback
TOPIC:	Course review & Lessons learned in program evaluation
READING:	-

ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Scope of Work and Research Question(s)

Due: Friday October 4, 2019 by 8:59am.

Format: Use the template provided

Value: 5% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas. MCFD sign-off required. ^[1]_{SEP}

Based on conversations/negotiations with MCFD sponsors, students are to work in their teams to complete the Scope of Work form provided by MCFD in which you describe the work you will undertake throughout the course. The following information should be included in the Scope of Work:

- 1) Date of initial contact with MCFD sponsors
- 2) Background of the project
- 3) Project purpose and research objectives
- 4) Research questions
- 5) Roles and responsibilities
- 6) Agreed upon deliverables
- 7) Scope of deliverables
- 8) Communication plan

- 9) Project timelines for activities and outputs
- 10) Proposed project budget

2. Literature Review

Due: Friday October 18, 2019 by 8:59am.

Format: Max. 5 pages, APA, double spaced, excluding references.

Value: 10% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas

Students will independently complete a review of the theoretical and empirical literature for your research project. Review a minimum of 8 sources. Use these to outline the conceptual context that provides a rationale for your study. The purpose of this assignment is to help you begin to synthesize the literature and prepare for the evaluation proposal and ethics application.

3. Evaluation Proposal & Ethics Application to MCFD

Due: Friday November 22, 2019, by 8:59am.

Value: 25% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas. MCFD sign-off required.

Evaluation Proposal

Format: Max. 15 pages, APA, double spaced, excluding references and appendices.

Write a full evaluation proposal. The proposal will comprise of the following parts:

Part 1. Introduction

The introduction should provide a brief description of the topic under investigation, a discussion of its relevance to social work, and a clear statement of the research question.

Part 2: Literature Review

The literature review should provide a summary of the literature related to the topic under investigation. Particular focus should be given to recent studies on the topic. It should conclude with a brief description of the gaps in knowledge and how the study addresses these gaps.

Part 3: Methodology

The methodology section should cover the following items:

- i) The sampling procedures (sample selection; recruitment plan; inclusion/exclusion criteria)
- ii) Data collection methods (measures to ensure validity; measures to ensure reflexivity)
- iii) The method of analysis

Part 4: Appendices

Participant recruitment letter

Study information letter

Consent forms

Data collection instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaire, survey)

Other relevant materials for inclusion.

Ethics Application to MCFD

Format: Use the template provided

In this course students are not responsible for individual project submissions for UBC BREB approval; rather, there is an expedited class approval process through the instructor. However, students are required to submit an ethics application, based on the UBC template, to MCFD for internal review and approval. Students must submit a certificate of successful completion of the UBC Behavioural Ethics Review Board (BREB) online ethics tutorial to engage in any research activities for the course.

4. Research Process Reflection

Due: Friday November 29, 2019

Format: Team meeting with the instructor

Value: 5% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas

This is an opportunity for students to process the relational dynamics within the research team and revisit their expectations, roles, responsibilities, communication plans, and project timelines for the next term.

5. Interim Report

Due: Friday February 14, 2020 by 8:59am.

Format: Max. 4 pages, APA, double spaced, excluding references and appendices.

Value: 10% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas. Sponsor acknowledgement of receipt required.

The assignment will comprise of the following parts:

Part 1: Interim Report

To be accountable to the sponsors and stakeholders, students are to provide an interim report of their research progress. This is an opportunity to provide an update of successes and areas of challenge in the research process thus far. The interim report will be shared with the sponsors.

Part 2: Data Analysis

Students are not expected to submit completed products but in-progress materials and/or completed materials will be reviewed for the purpose of providing feedback and guidance as students work towards the final research report. Students are to clearly identify which components can be shared with sponsors, and which components are for instructor feedback only. Some data analysis materials that should be included for submission include:

- Transcription and line by line coding for qualitative data
- Dataset construction, data entry, and statistical analysis for quantitative data

6. Research Results

Due: Friday March 13, 2020 by 8:59am.

Format: APA formatting

Value: 5% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas

Students are to complete and share their research findings for review and feedback from the instructor. This will ensure the research results are accurate for the final report and presentation to MCFD. Quantitative data needs to be presented in APA formatted tables and figures. Qualitative

data needs to be presented in APA formatted quotes and citations.

7. Presentation of Research to MCFD Sponsors

Due: Friday March 27, 2020 (date subject to change)

Value: 10% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas

The purpose of this presentation is to give students the opportunity to present their final research report to the class and MCFD sponsors during a research roundtable. The presentations will be video recorded and shared on the MCFD Research Portal and with the UBC School of Social Work. Presentations should include:

- 1) Introduction - What you studied and why
- 2) Methodology - Sampling, data collection, and method of analysis
- 3) Results and implications - Including graphs, charts, or direct quotes
- 4) Conclusion

8. Final Report

Due: Friday April 3, 2020 by 8:59am.

Format: Max. 30 pages, APA, double spaced, excluding references.

Value: 25% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas

Students are to complete a final report by the end of the course. The report will incorporate all aspects of the research project including the following:

Part 1: Executive Summary

A brief 1-2 page overview of the research.

Part 2: Introduction, literature review, and research methods

This can be the same or an abbreviated version of the evaluation proposal.

Part 3: Findings

While the finding and discussion section are normally combined in qualitative studies, there is typically a separate section for finding in quantitative studies that include tables and graphs and any statistically significant results and whether these supports the research hypotheses.

Part 4: Discussion and Limitations

In the discussion section, you should relate the results of your investigation back to the literature review. Do your results support or contradict the literature? What new knowledge has your study generated? The discussion section should also include a sub-section on the limitations of the study.

Part 5: Implications for policy and/or practice.

What are the implications of your research for social work practice and policy? In light of the results, what recommendations would you propose?

Part 6: Conclusion

The conclusion provides you with space to answer the original research questions and describe what you believe to be the most significant aspects of the study.

Part 7: Appendices

The appendices can include the data collection instruments and any supplemental tables and graphs.

To meet full expectation of this assignment, students must submit a finalized research report to MCFD by **April 24, 2020, 5pm**. The finalized research report must integrate MCFD sponsor and instructor feedback as best as possible. The final research report will be shared on the MCFD Research Portal and UBC School of Social Work for dissemination.

9. Participation and Performance Feedback

Due: Thursday April 9, 2020, by 5:00pm.

Format: Evaluation framework will be provided.

Value: 5% of final mark

Evaluation Criteria: Rubric will be available on Canvas

This is an opportunity for you to reflect upon your overall participation and contribution in the research project. You will also be able to evaluate your peers/research team member's individual participation and contribution in the research project. This is an individual assignment and student responses will only be reviewed by the instructors.

UBC GRADING CRITERIA:

UBC GRADING CRITERIA			
Letter Grade	Percent Range	Mid-Point	
A+	90-100	95	Represents work of exceptional quality. Content, organization and style are all at a high level. Student demonstrates excellent research and reference to literature where appropriate. Also, student uses sound critical thinking, has innovative ideas on the subject and shows personal engagement with the topic.
A	85-89	87	
A-	80-84	82	
B+	76-79	77.5	Represents work of good quality with no major weaknesses. Writing is clear and explicit and topic coverage and comprehension is more than adequate. Shows some degree of critical thinking and personal involvement in the work. Good use of existing knowledge on the subject.
B	72-75	73.5	
B-	68-71	69.5	
C+	64-67	65.5	Adequate and average work. Shows fair comprehension of the subject, but has some weaknesses in content, style and/or organization of the paper. Minimal critical awareness or personal involvement in the work. Adequate use of literature.
C	60-63	62.5	
C-	55-59	57	
D	50-54	52	Minimally adequate work, barely at a passing level. Serious flaws in content, organization and/or style. Poor comprehension of the subject, and minimal involvement in the paper. Poor use of research and existing literature.
F	0-49		Failing work. Inadequate for successful completion of the course or submitted beyond final date of acceptance for paper.