

## Maximizing the Use of Evaluation Results

---

*Reginald Carter*

Evaluations are conducted primarily to provide decision makers with informed options for improving programs. Once an evaluation is completed there are ways to increase the likelihood that the results will ultimately be used to improve the program. This chapter provides examples of how evaluations are used and focuses on ways to maximize their use. The chapter is divided into two parts: how to use findings from (1) ad hoc evaluation studies and (2) client outcome monitoring systems.

A number of writers have identified important factors impacting the use of evaluation findings: the extent of stakeholder involvement (Patton, 1986), prioritization of studies (Muscatello, 1988; Wholey, 1983), organization characteristics, political circumstances, and evaluation techniques (Weiss, 1972, 1977; Caplan, 1977; Alkin, Daillak, and White, 1979; Rothman, 1980). This chapter supplements earlier research with practical guidelines for evaluators and managers interested in increasing the usefulness of evaluation results. The first section focuses on ad hoc evaluations, with five recommendations for improving the use of evaluation results. The second section concentrates on how performance monitoring data can be most effectively utilized to improve programs.

### **Ad Hoc Evaluations**

In some cases the evaluation question is clear, commitment to using information is strong, and the study results provide the basis for an acceptable recommendation that is immediately implemented. These cases are rare. Most evaluations do not have an immediate, concrete, and observable effect on specific decisions and program practices. Patton reviewed the use by key participants (project officers, decision makers, evaluators) of findings from twenty national health program evaluations (Patton, 1986). He concluded

that evaluation studies often have important impacts on programs, but these tend to be modest. However, "none of the impacts described was the type in which new findings from an evaluation led directly and immediately to the making of major, concrete program decisions. The more typical impact was one in which the evaluation findings provided additional pieces of information in the difficult puzzle of program action, permitting some reduction in the uncertainty within which any federal decision maker inevitably operates" (Patton, 1986, p. 34).

In addition, evaluation results are often absorbed quickly into an organization's culture. Immediately, old assumptions are no longer valid and a new definition of program reality is substituted as a result of the study. The new definition, however, seldom changes the operation of the program significantly. Rarely does *any* event significantly change the operations of a program.

Although most evaluations have modest impacts, there are five ways to increase the use of evaluation results: (1) develop realistic recommendations that focus on program improvement, (2) explore multiple uses of study data, (3) constantly remind decision makers of findings and recommendations, (4) share findings and recommendations with broad audiences, and (5) assign evaluation staff to assist in implementing recommendations.

#### ***Develop Realistic Recommendations That Focus on Program Improvement***

Decision makers want to improve programs. They appreciate focused evaluations that provide realistic options based on a systematic and independent assessment of programs. Too often evaluation staff focus on the methodology used to create the findings and devote only limited time and resources to developing realistic recommendations flowing from the findings. To maximize the adoption of recommended changes, evaluators need to change this distribution of resources so there is much more emphasis on the early identification and development of acceptable program improvements.

One way to obtain a preview of likely evaluation results is to complete a thorough analysis of the first 10 percent of the findings. Often this preliminary assessment will provide a valid basis for developing a set of potential recommendations for program changes. The preliminary recommendations should then be reviewed informally by as many of the stakeholders as possible, to obtain their perspectives on potential practical final recommendations. This approach was a routine practice at the Michigan Department of Social Services, Evaluation Division (1974-1984). In the majority of evaluations, this analysis of the first 10 percent of findings was highly predictive of the major results across 100 percent of the data collected. Chapter Twenty-two has further suggestions on how to develop effective recommendations.

*Explore Multiple Uses of Study Data*

Evaluators often limit the use of evaluation data to the questions of hypotheses under investigation. The information collected may, and usually does, have meaning and use to others in the organization for purposes well beyond the intent of the original evaluation study. Backup data should be available in summary tables at the end of the report for use by different audiences for different reasons. Customized data tables and analyses should be available to members of the organization to answer a wide range of other questions. Agencies who use such data for testing their own hypotheses greatly appreciate the information although it was collected for a different reason. The act of sharing the data creates goodwill and maximizes the use of the evaluation effort.

Some of the most widely used databases developed by the Michigan Department of Social Services were simple demographic program profiles of clients broken down by county. These simple databases were used to describe the program being evaluated (such as adult home help, day care). The demographic information included types of clients, number of clients, geographic distribution, growth rate over time, and expenditures. They were used extensively by program management, fiscal agency analysts, budget analysts within the organization, and client advocacy groups as the factual basis for resolution of many policy issues totally unrelated to the original evaluation questions. In short, the data were used extensively beyond the original evaluation questions because they were valid, available, complete, and widely accepted by other stakeholders. These various audiences had their own evaluation and policy concerns, and they wanted a valid, current database with which to test their own hypotheses and to support their own positions.

The recommendations may not be the most significant product of an evaluation study. The availability of the database can enable an unexpected use by a wide variety of users. Organizations can benefit from the distribution of databases for secondary use by a number of audiences. Sometimes evaluation recommendations are not accepted, but other changes are introduced because of the information provided by the study. These unintended changes can be very important.

A good example of unintended program changes from evaluation studies is the Staff-Caseload Studies of the Michigan Department of Social Services in 1980 (Carter, 1985). The intent of the four caseload studies was to develop valid caseload-to-staff ratios. This original intent was not achieved. However, the four evaluations showed no relationship between policy requirements and client outcomes, and this result helped lead to a streamlining project that reduced the number of program requirement manual pages by 56 percent (from 1,902 to 847 pages). Removed from the manual were requirements with no legal basis or proven relationship to program outcomes. The reduction in ineffective program requirements was positively accepted by first-line workers and supervisors.

*Constantly Remind Decision Makers of Findings and Recommendations*

Each organization has a unique history and culture. Each time an evaluation study is completed, there is an opportunity to alter the culture by changing perceptions held by the agency's members. When the evaluation report is initially released, there is focused scrutiny of the data, methodology, and recommendations. If the study results are widely accepted and the recommendations are implemented, then the study's *imprint* can be significant. This imprint can be reinforced with frequent reminders to the organization's members to pay attention to the study results. Evaluators and managers should

- Write agency newsletter articles describing the findings, the recommendations, and the successful implementation of changes in order to educate the members of the organization
- Prepare presentations for the agency director to ensure that the findings are being incorporated into the director's thinking and public statements
- Make recommendations for similar changes in other program areas so the organization's members begin to think beyond the one-time implications of a single evaluation
- Remind other managers of the evaluation results during critical executive committee meetings or in informal settings

In short, work through whatever formal and informal channels of communication are available to educate and remind agency members of the use of evaluation studies. When new agency managers join the organization, evaluators should brief them on prior agency evaluation findings still felt to be timely and send them copies of the studies. This action introduces them to the evaluation history of the agency.

*Share Findings and Recommendations with Broad Audiences*

Traditionally a formal evaluation report is prepared with a set of recommendations as to how the results should be interpreted and used to alter or reinforce current program operations. Stakeholders vary in their interest in the methodology and statistics used to arrive at the recommended changes. Most are primarily interested in how the program should change as a result of the new information provided by the study. Most will disagree with the methodology only when they also disagree with the recommended changes.

The evaluation findings and recommendations should be presented in a concise, factual executive summary with a technical appendix or report available for a complete understanding of the methodology and statistics used. Evaluators should identify the limitations of the design and findings, but highlight the recommended options available to the decision makers. Stakeholders are generally limited to those involved in particular program deci-

sions (such as agency director, program staff, fiscal or policy oversight organizations, advocate groups, legislators). These stakeholders need to be defined and the recommendations presented to them.

The agency, when appropriate, should share the evaluation results with a much broader audience than the immediately affected stakeholders. Ways to accomplish this are suggested in Table 24.1: providing interviews with the media, briefing oversight organizations, and sharing evaluations with universities and with those in other agencies.

Table 24.1. Sharing Results with Broad Audiences.

| <i>Audiences</i>         | <i>Suggested Strategy</i>   |
|--------------------------|---|
| General Public           | Agency staff should have interviews with local newspapers, radio and TV news shows, and talk shows to promote broad distribution of the findings to the general public. By portraying management as interested in systematically assessing programs and as committed to developing the most effective intervention possible, the staff can enhance the image of the organization. |
| Oversight Organizations  | Agency staff should schedule regular briefings for oversight organizations to share evaluation results with them and to answer their questions once the study findings are available. This openness to sharing information can reduce skepticism by oversight agencies and client advocacy groups.  |
| University               | Evaluators should regularly make a list of completed studies available to local universities and other academic groups and offer them copies of the studies and information describing how the results were used to improve the organization.   |
| Other Professional Staff | Evaluators should share the evaluation results with other agencies in other states. Evaluators and managers should publish the results in professional journals specializing in evaluation or program areas. It is often helpful for both program and evaluation staff jointly to write and present findings from evaluation projects at professional meetings.                   |

Source: Mobray, 1988.

### ***Assign Evaluation Staff to Assist in Implementing Recommendations***

Evaluation staff generally do not have experience in program management, and this limits their ability to propose practical recommendations to improve programs. In addition, program staff are often skeptical of advocates for change who have not operated a program. Evaluation staff can gain valuable program experience and future credibility by being assigned to assist program staff in implementing recommendations from evaluation findings.

Implementation of these five recommendations should enhance the use of ad hoc evaluations. The impact of ad hoc studies is often restricted to a relatively short period of time during which the results are initially released. Evaluators and managers need to be acutely aware of this time

limitation and seek maximum effective exposure and discussion of the evaluation findings and recommendations. Evaluation reports, like all other reports, need to be presented in a clear, concise, and interesting fashion in order to be read and understood by decision makers. Hendricks (Chapter Twenty-three of this volume) presents a very helpful set of recommendations on how best to present evaluation findings.

### Ongoing Performance (Outcome) Monitoring

One of the most important factors constraining the use of ad hoc evaluation studies is the limited opportunity that exists for the findings and recommendations to improve the organization. The findings receive greatest attention in the short period when the study's results are being released and assessed. Very soon afterward the results become dated and less acceptable as reflecting current practice.

One way to provide continuous evaluation data is to design a strategy for ongoing collection of client outcome information. With such data the organization might regularly develop ways to improve the program by assessing current outcome impact (Carter, 1983). This approach lacks the explanatory power of a formal evaluation design, but it provides increased opportunities to improve program policy and practice by stimulating routine review of factors impacting program performance. Affholter (in Chapter Five of this volume) shows how evaluators can design and implement outcome monitoring approaches.

Public organizations need to institutionalize the collection of outcome information so it is regularly assessed and released in management reports. Examples of outcome monitoring systems include the following:

- The Maxey Boys Training School in Michigan has been collecting information annually on the "graduates" of this delinquency training school six and twelve months after release. Data gathered includes police arrests and work, school, or training status. This client-specific information is reported quarterly to workers at the school (Residential Care Division, 1992).
- Pressley Ridge Schools privately operate seven programs located in four states and serving emotionally and/or socially disturbed youth. Funding for these programs includes both private and public sources. Five of the programs annually conduct follow-up surveys one to two years after youth leave the program. The programs include foster care, an alternative school and partial hospitalization program, a therapeutic wilderness camp, and a residential treatment center. The process of collecting the outcome information is described by Fabry, Hawkins, and Luster (forthcoming).
- The Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services has prepared an annual report to the legislature on the outcomes of all child

welfare programs since 1985 (see Affholter, Chapter Five of this volume). Beginning in 1992, the department was required to report outcomes across all programs.

- The Minnesota Trade Office (MTO) of the Minnesota Department of Trade and Economic Development provides assistance to over three hundred small to medium-sized corporations interested in exporting their products. In 1989, the office began to measure the satisfaction level of the companies using their services, which included publications, seminars, workshops, trade shows, overseas trade office services, library services, and trade leads. In addition, the office defined a set of positive quantitative outcomes: exporting to a new country, increasing export sales, increasing export-related employment, and initiating pre-export activities. Customers were first asked if they had achieved a desired outcome after they received MTO services. If they had, they were asked the extent to which they credited the MTO with helping them achieve the outcomes (Quillan and Jarvis, 1991).

Pressley Ridge Schools illustrate ways in which outcome monitoring can be used effectively by local agencies. The executive director has been collecting client specific outcome information since 1986. Some of the uses have included the following:

- Orienting new Board members to the impact of Pressley Ridge programs by sharing brief status reports on specific graduates contacted through outcome follow-up processes.
- Providing outcome data demonstrating the effectiveness of current programming to the staff, clients, and families to assure them that the interventions have a known success rate.
- Using outcome information as a marketing technique to demonstrate the success of Pressley Ridge Schools' programs. Outcome information, especially in new markets in which competitors do not have comparable data, provides an important advantage in attracting new purchasers of services.
- Using outcome information to identify program weaknesses and subsequently modifying the program to improve effectiveness. One program added a drug awareness training element because of the high incidence of drug use reported for discharged youth.

Other uses for program outcome data that have been suggested by Hatry and others (1992) are to demonstrate accountability, support resource allocation requests, justify budget requests, bolster employee motivation, support performance contracting, implement quality control checks on efficiency measurement, enhance management control, improve communication between citizens and local government officials, and improve services to customers.

The major advantage of outcome monitoring information is that it creates many routine opportunities to influence changes in a program be-

cause the information is obtained regularly. This situation is very different from the one-time release of evaluation study results. The factors impacting the utilization of ongoing outcome monitoring can be substantially different from one-time evaluation findings.

Some of the elements that will encourage greater utilization of outcome monitoring data are (a) providing timely performance data, (b) providing the data in sufficient detail that the responsible manager can identify the performance for his or her area of responsibility, (c) ensuring that program staff actively participate in selecting the outcome measures and the data collection process, (d) increasing confidence in the validity of the data, (e) demonstrating the usefulness of outcome data, (f) repeating the measurements on a regular basis, (g) mandating outcome reporting, and (h) developing appropriate information systems to track clients over time.

### *Timely Data*

Outcome data should be released as soon as possible after the follow-up period has ended. Pressley Ridge Schools collect outcome information annually on "graduates" who completed treatment one to two years earlier. Ideally, the outcome reports should be released more frequently; Maxey Boys Training School in Michigan released outcome reports every six months.

### *Detailed Breakouts*

Each outcome indicator should be disaggregated by such important program characteristics as work units, geographic location, client and worker demographics, and caseload of workers. Such breakouts should provide program managers with enough relevant information that they can begin to understand some of the factors potentially influencing different outcome levels. Year-to-year comparisons of outcome data should be limited to similar work units so that the major focus is on improvements within the work units.

### *Worker Participation*

Program staff should be encouraged to participate actively in both the selection of the outcome measures and the process by which the outcome information is collected. Their ownership of the data elements will enhance the likelihood that they will perceive the findings as an accurate reflection of their performance. Once articulated, outcome measures can help all workers to keep focused on better ways to improve their performance.

### *Perception that Data Are Valid*

In order to have credibility, the outcome data need to be perceived as reasonably accurate by the program staff and top management. Data validity can be assured in a variety of ways as reflected in Table 24.2: checking the



Table 24.2. Ways to Assure Data Validity.

| <i>Strategies</i>                 |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Check Accuracy                    | Agency staff should routinely check the correctness of the outcome information reported. This can be accomplished through conducting systematic checks on a random sample of cases. Known "skeptics" should be confronted with validity information to refute claims that the data are invalid. Certain members of the organization, especially analysts and first-line workers, are likely to be aware of what information is accurate, and which data elements within the system are suspect. A small advisory group comprising first-line workers, computer analysts, and evaluators should annually check the validity of data, the appropriateness of policy instructions on how to collect and record data, and the timeliness in training of first-line workers. |
| Publish Results of Validity Check | The results of the validity checks should be widely publicized so workers and managers know that the accuracy and completeness of specific data fields are being monitored. It is not uncommon to find that only 50 percent of required data is actually documented in case records. This finding suggests that frequently data are either never captured by workers or never placed in the client record.  |
| Cross-Check Outcomes              | Agencies should cross-check outcome measures whenever possible. Pressley Ridge Schools employs teachers during the summer to collect outcome information on recent "graduates." They attempt to interview several independent sources of outcome information. When they receive two believable sources providing the same answer they note the data as "verified." This checking helps to maintain data validity. Most outcome data used in their analysis are verified.  |
| Obtain High Response Rate         | Agencies should be able to collect outcome information on 60 percent to 80 percent of the clients completing a program. This is a realistic goal attained by several small agencies collecting outcome information. With large client populations a random sample is often used because of the cost involved in collecting outcome data. The longer the follow-up period, the lower the response level. However, Pressley Ridge Schools were able to locate 92 percent of the 1987-88 cohort (in the summer of 1989), 88 percent in the summer of 1990, 81 percent in the summer of 1991, and 78 percent in the summer of 1992.   |
| Ensure High Face Validity         | Outcome measures should have high face validity. They should be obvious results such as high job retention for employment and training programs, low re-arrest rates for delinquency intervention, low re-abuse rates for abuse and neglect treatment programs, and increased employment levels for economic development projects. Such objective measures are preferable to subjective indicators like client satisfaction surveys. A suggested list of outcome measures with face validity across a wide variety of programs can be found in Carter (1988) and Hatry and Fountain (1990).   |

accuracy of outcome data, publishing the results of validity checks, cross-checking outcome data, obtaining high response rates, and ensuring that outcome measures have high face validity.

### *Demonstrate the Usefulness of the Outcome Data*

Outcome information needs to be used visibly once it becomes available to an organization. For example, since 1986 the state of Florida has collected outcome

information on services for children and has used the data to (1) monitor the effectiveness of contracted services, (2) restructure programs, (3) improve service coordination, (4) target program monitoring efforts, and (5) improve the accuracy of the data presented in widely circulated outcome reports.

There are several ways to maximize the use and usefulness of outcome data:

- Encourage and train managers to seek information as to which program characteristics are impacting or explaining changes in the outcomes. Use by managers will also increase program staff interest in the outcome data.
- Similarly, encourage program managers to provide explanatory information along with the performance reports they provide to higher levels, particularly when the reported outcomes differ significantly from expected outcome levels.
- Publicize the outcomes for work units internally to create constructive competition between work groups directed at improving outcome results. Comparisons should include both changes in outcomes within a work group over time and a comparison of absolute outcome levels. To provide fair comparison, the comparisons should include work groups that have approximately the same workload difficulty (such as similar types of clients).
- Require program managers to estimate the impact of their budget requests on subsequent outcome levels. These estimations should lead not only to better resource allocation decisions but also to stronger justification for budget requests. Legislative oversight committees are often impressed positively with any systematic attempt to measure the results of programs. The collection of outcome data demonstrates the program's commitment to good management practices and thus provides another reason for refunding the program. That is, program managers should justify their budget proposals on the basis of the outcomes anticipated if the proposed level of resources is provided.
- Encourage program managers to use outcome information in their speeches, daily discussions, meetings, and press interviews. However, these presentations should also be clear about the limitations of the outcome data so that outcome findings are not misrepresented as reflection of a cause/effect relationship between the program and the outcome level. Such misrepresentation is a pitfall that the media and persons with opposing viewpoints will likely exploit.

### ***Repeat the Measurements***

Outcome measurements should be collected at least quarterly. A major advantage of continuous data reporting is that measurements are repeated

enough that (1) changes over time and time trends can be identified and (2) the agency gains more confidence in the data because of the consistency of the findings. The first time any new program performance data are released to agency staff there is skepticism about the information because of its uniqueness or other methodological factors involved with the data collection process. If the findings are repeated consistently over several periods, the results begin to be perceived as having reliability and will gain increasing acceptance by agency staff.

The results of ad hoc evaluations, on the other hand, are often viewed as reflecting the unique characteristics of the evaluation design and are not accepted as a basis for making program changes. The one-time nature of ad hoc evaluations severely limits its potential impact. Moreover, a one-time study quickly becomes forgotten by many of the members of the organization unless they were personally involved with the collection of data or experienced a negative or positive impact from the results of the evaluation. In short, the results of ongoing monitoring are more likely to be utilized because they are continuously being exposed to both old and new audiences each time they are released.

A major advantage of ongoing reporting, as contrasted to one-time studies, is the development of a historic database. The data allow managers to assess systematically the results of program innovations over time. The collection of comparable data from year to year enables managers to know whether their current program is able to remain effective even as client characteristics change.

### *Mandating Outcome Reporting*

There is a trend in federal as well as local government to require agencies to collect outcome information. For example, Florida has recently mandated outcome reporting for all services within the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. In 1993, Minnesota passed performance measurement legislation requiring all state agencies to develop outcome measures for their programs and to report these findings annually to the governor, legislature, legislative auditor, and other oversight agencies. On a smaller scale, Milwaukee County several years ago passed a law mandating the collection of client satisfaction information from social services department clients using purchase of services such as day care.

Program outcome reporting should be required as part of budget submissions so budget requests can be justified in terms of the outcomes expected for the resources sought. Traditionally, budget requests have been based on factors such as caseload estimates or inflation cost increases. In Sunnyvale, California, the city council determines budgets for each of its programs on the basis of expected outcomes (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992, pp. 142-145).

Mandating the collection of outcome data is effective if sufficient resources are available to produce the outcome information. Such a require-

ment has the advantage of being much more routinized, and thus, not subject to the varying priorities of individual agency managers. In addition, mandated requirements have a higher status in the eyes of the agency staff than optional or voluntary activities. However, its disadvantage is that it may be seen as undesirable by operating agencies, who then give only lip service to its implementation.

### *Develop Appropriate Information Systems*

Some outcome information has unique characteristics that require adaptations in order to track clients over time, especially after they leave the program. This applies whether the clients are in public health, social service, mental health, employment and training, corrections, or economic development programs. Maxey Boys Training School and Pressley Ridge Schools have had small enough populations each year (500) that all information on the clients can be stored manually or on a small personal computer. Florida has used a variety of approaches based on the available databases: the computer mainframe for client information, personal computers, manual reporting systems, contractor-provider reports, and specialized evaluation studies.

Most human service agencies have reporting systems designed to provide monthly counts of the types of clients served and the services received. These reporting systems are generally not designed to track specific individuals over time, across programs, or after clients leave the system. Outcome monitoring, thus, may require modification of current program data collection systems.

### **Conclusion**

This chapter describes a number of ways to increase the use and usefulness of both ad hoc evaluations and performance monitoring systems. Table 24.3 summarizes the chapter's key suggestions.

Fabry, Hawkins, and Luster (forthcoming) have outlined some of the important limitations of outcome monitoring systems. The main shortcoming is that the outcome data cannot identify specific program changes needed to increase effectiveness. However, once a consistent outcome pattern has been identified, a more thorough ad hoc evaluation study may be able to identify the key causal variables affecting the outcomes. In short, outcome monitoring results can be an initial filtering mechanism for identifying useful ad hoc evaluations.

These two approaches to assessing the performance of programs can be effectively used in tandem to reinforce the value of each. In most agencies it is too costly to conduct evaluation studies annually across all programs. However, outcome monitoring data disaggregated by potentially important causal factors can help define a larger investment in a highly focused evaluation effort. Both types of information can be extremely helpful in responding to the increasing interest in agencies, justifying their use of public and private funds.

Table 24.3. Ways to Increase Use of Evaluation and Outcome Monitoring.

| <i>Ad Hoc Evaluations</i>  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop realistic recommendations that focus on program improvement.</li> <li>2. Explore multiple uses of study data.</li> <li>3. Constantly remind decision makers of findings and recommendations.</li> <li>4. Share findings and recommendations with broad audiences.</li> <li>5. Assign evaluation staff to assist in implementing recommendations.</li> </ol>  |
| <i>Ongoing Performance (Outcome) Monitoring</i>  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Timely reports should be provided.</li> <li>7. Reports should include detailed breakouts by program, client, and worker characteristics.</li> <li>8. Program staff should actively participate in defining outcome measures and in the data collection process.</li> <li>9. Outcome data should have high face validity.</li> <li>10. The use of outcome information should be demonstrated.</li> <li>11. Outcome measurements should be repeated on a regular basis.</li> <li>12. Performance monitoring can be mandated to ensure the collection of data over time and different political administrations.</li> <li>13. Outcome information systems may need to be modified to reflect the unique needs of tracking clients over time.</li> </ol> |

### References

- Alkin, M., Daillak, R., and White, P. *Using Evaluations: Does Evaluation Make a Difference?* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1979.
- Caplan, N. "A Minimal Set of Conditions Necessary for the Utilization of Social Science Knowledge in Policy Formulation at the National Level." In C. Weiss (ed.), *Using Social Research in Public Policy Making*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977.
- Carter, R. *The Accountable Agency*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1983.
- Carter, R. "The Analyst Corner: Streamlining Policy." *New England Journal of Human Services*, 1985, 4, 29-30.
- Carter, R. "Success Measures for Public Administrators." *New England Journal of Human Services*, 1988, 1, 29-34.
- Fabry, B., Hawkins, R., and Luster, C. "Monitoring Outcomes of Services to Severely Disturbed Children and Youths: An Economical Follow-Up Procedure for Mental Health and Child Care Agencies." *Journal of Mental Health Administration* (forthcoming).
- Hatry, H., and Fountain, J. R. (eds.). *Service Efforts and Accomplishments Reporting: Its Time Has Come*. Norwalk, Conn.: Governmental Accounting Standards Board, 1990.
- Hatry, H., and others. *How Effective Are Your Community Services?* (2nd ed.) Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1992.
- Mobray, C. "Getting the System to Respond to Evaluation Findings." In J. A. McLaughlin, L. J. Weber, R. W. Covert, and R. B. Ingle (eds.), *Evaluation Utilization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

#29548503

HANDBOOK  
OF  
PRACTICAL  
PROGRAM  
EVALUATION

JOSEPH S. WHOLEY  
HARRY P. HATRY  
KATHRYN E. NEWCOMER

EDITORS

H  
97  
W48  
1994  
C.2



Jossey-Bass Publishers • San Francisco

OHIO UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

mc 5/9/00