

+Psychology 978: Research Skills

Fall 2026

Instructor: Wendy Craig

Office: Craine 221

Phone: 533-6014

Email: wendy.craig@queensu.ca

Office Hours: By appointment, please feel free to contact me

Land Acknowledgement

We are situated on the traditional Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee Territory. I am grateful to the generations of Indigenous settlers who have taken care of these lands. We all have different relationships to the land- I am here as a 4th generation white settler. As a settler, I have a responsibility to understanding my relationship to the land as an active part of reconciliation. To read more about the history of the land, see the Queen's Encyclopedia at

<http://www.queensu.ca/encyclopedia/t/traditional-territories>

General Course Goals

The field of mental health is changing, with an increased emphasis on evidence-based prevention and intervention. As scientist-practitioners, we have a wide range of knowledge and skills to bring to the improvement of mental health programming. Program evaluation is an area of competence for registration with the College of Psychologists on Ontario and an area of competence for CPA accreditation. In this course, we will discuss current approaches and techniques by which programs in applied settings can be evaluated. We will meet with mental health practitioners who are working toward an evidence-based approach. We will consider the staging and designs for evaluation, the criteria and measurement for evaluations, and the range of methodologies and statistical approaches to evaluating change through treatment. Students will be involved in planning an evaluation for a program and working with an organization. Students will interact with the organization to discuss the nature of the program and collaboratively, design a logic models, and an evaluation plan to examine program effectiveness. Throughout the course, we will reflect on the cultural, ethical, and professional issues related to conducting evaluation research in a community setting. Students will be guided through the process of writing a proposal to evaluate an intervention.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Skills in articulating and critiquing various approaches to program evaluation and development.
2. Articulate the basic principles of evaluation in a community context.
3. The ability to describe programs through depiction of the underlying program logic.

4. The ability to prepare a plan for evaluation for an organization.
5. Skills in applying evaluation knowledge to decision making.
6. Knowledge and understanding of strategies for reporting evaluation results to program administrators and other stakeholders.
7. Skills in writing applications for funding.
8. Learning how to work effectively on a team.
9. Profession skills for consulting.

Class Schedule:

- Note there is a guest speak, Kylie Hutchinson, on October 6th. She is also presenting on October 5th on Seven habits of highly effective evaluators from 12:30-3:30. If you can go to this it would be an excellent pre to the class she is doing the day before. I will send out registration information for this event.

Kylie Hutchinson

Kylie Hutchinson has spent the past thirty years working in the not-for-profit sector as a consultant, trainer, program manager, board member, and volunteer. Working both domestically and internationally, she has conducted dozens of evaluations varying in scope and complexity that have yielded timely, relevant, and actionable recommendations for her clients. In 2011 Kylie received her Credentialed Evaluator designation from the Canadian Evaluation Society. In 2020 she was awarded the [Canadian Evaluation Society's Contribution to Evaluation in Canada award](#). In 1990 she received a student award from the Canadian Evaluation Society for an evaluation framework she developed for the Heart & Stroke Foundation of Ontario. Kylie works with nonprofits of all shapes and sizes to develop strategic plans that are meaningful, realistic, and most important, actionable. She is an experienced [Nonprofit Lifecycles Capacity Consultant](#).

DATE	TOPIC	Associated Readings	Assignment
Week 1: Sept 8	Introduction of Class Overview of Proposed Projects		Look at the Teams
Week 2: Sept 15	Foundations of Evaluation Design	Racine, N., Madigan, S., Cardinal, S., Hartwick, C., Leslie, M., Motz, M., & Pepler, D. (2022, February 24). Community-Based Research: Perspectives of Psychology Researchers and Community Partners. Canadian Psychology/Psychologiecanadienne. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cap0000318 Section A - What is Evaluation Section B - Why Do Evaluations? Section C - Who Does Evaluations? Section E- Who are the stakeholders?	Pre-competency Assessment Rank order of projects due Monday September 14th
Week 3: Sept 22	Theory of change and Logic Models	Section G: Describing the Program Section I: Logic Models	
Week 4: Sept 29	Teams logic models will be presented and workshopped. Each team will present draft logic model and get feedback		Positionality and value statement due
Week 5: Oct 6	Guest Speaker Liberating Structures and Sticky Messaging		
October 13	Reading Week		
Week 6: Oct 20	Designs for Evaluation Needs Assessment and Process Evaluation	Section J: Question to be addressed. Section N: Are questions evaluable? Section O: Process evaluation Section P: Outcome Evaluation	
Week 7: Oct 27	Methodological approaches including qualitative and quantitative Developing Measurement Plans and Time Frames	Section F: How to Strengthen the relationships Section H: Context of Program Section K and L: Instruments Section M: Data Collection Section T: How data are analyzed	Final logic models due
Week 8: Nov 3	Presentation of preliminary evaluation purpose, approach, methods and workshop any questions		

Week 9: Nov 10	Ethics of Program Evaluation Ethics of Research with Indigenous Peoples	Hayward A, Sjoblom E, Sinclair S, Cidro J. A New Era of Indigenous Research: Community-based Indigenous Research Ethics Protocols in Canada. <i>J Empir Res Hum Res Ethics</i>. 2021 Oct;16(4):403-417. doi: 10.1177/15562646211023705. Riddell, J., Salamanca, A. Pepler, D., Cardinal, S. & McIvor, O. (2017). Laying the groundwork: A practical guide for ethical research with indigenous communities. <i>International Indigenous Policy Journal</i>, 8(2). https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2017.8.2.6	
Week 10: Nov 17	Workshop Evaluations Each team will present any issues and get feedback		
Week 11: Nov 24	Knowledge Mobilization	Cooper, A., Rodway, J. & Read, R. (2018). Knowledge Mobilization Practices of Educational Researchers Across Canada. <i>Canadian Journal of Higher Education / Revue canadienne d'enseignement supérieur</i>, 48(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.7202/1050839ar Phipps, D.J., Cummings, J. Pepler, D., Craig, W. and Cardinal, S. (2016) The Co-Produced Pathway to Impact describes Knowledge Mobilization Processes. <i>Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship</i>. 9, 31-40. Retrieved from http://jces.ua.edu/the-coproduced-pathway-to-impact-describes-knowledge-mobilization-processes	
Week 12: Dec 1	Group Presentations to Clients		Post competency assessment

Readings

Alkin, M. and Vo, Anne T. (2018). *Essentials of Evaluation: From A to Z*. Guilford Press: New York, NY.

I have uploaded under assignments

There will be additional assigned readings. See above.

Assessment

1. Pre and Post Competency Assessment and Reflection	20%
Comprises three assignments (see below)	
Pre competency Assessment 5%	
Post Competence Assessment 5%	
Reflection on Competencies 10%	
2. Positionality and Values Statement	15%
3. Final Logic Model (Team Mark)- due March 18	10%
4. Evaluation Presentation to Partner (Individual mark)	15%
5. Final Program Evaluation Report to Agency (Team Mark)	<u>40%</u>
	100%

We will be working closely with a community partner to develop three program evaluation frameworks. During this course, student will part of a team for consulting and co-creating with the community partner. Each team will be creating a logic model, a power point presentation, and a report detailing their proposed program evaluation. At the end of the course, groups will present their proposed evaluation framework to the partner.

1. Pre and Post and Reflection Competency Assessment

Pre-Competency Assessment – 5%

Students are required to complete a Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) Competencies assessment form. The pre-competency assessment and instructions are in TEAMS Files. Grading is based on completion. **Due Date Tuesday 15 (before class starts)**

Post-Competency Assessment – 5%

Students are expected to complete a Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) Competencies assessment form upon completion of the course. The post-competency assessment and instructions are in TEAMS Files. Grading is based on completion. **Due Date: Tuesday Dec 1 (before class starts)**

Final Reflection – 10%

This assignment gives you an opportunity to reflect on the learnings you have gained from the course, and group work. Students will be evaluated on the **depth and quality of their reflection**, their ability to make connections between course experiences and their development as evaluators, and their consideration of how their learning will influence their future evaluation practice. Strong submissions will move beyond describing what was learned to consider **how and why their thinking has changed and what this means for their future practice**. Length is 1200-1500 words, doubled spaced. **Due Tuesday Date: Dec 8 by 5 pm**

There are 4 key components to this assignment to reflect on:

1. Group process: Reflect on the group work throughout the class and/or during your case work on developing an evaluation plan for a community partner. (e.g., How did this impact your learning? What challenges did you experience? What new insights or strategies did you gain?)
2. CES competencies: Reflect on two CES competencies of your choice. Compare your ratings from the pre/post competency form and reflect on what aspects of the course supported the advancement of knowledge and understanding in these competencies. How might these competencies align with your core values/principles as an evaluator or someone working with evaluation? What would you consider to be your evaluation principles?
3. Equity, Diversity, Indigeneity, and Inclusivity (EDII): Reflect on the components of EDII and how these may operate in evaluation as community-engaged scholarship. Consider the reality of your lived experiences and the myriad program contexts evaluators may encounter in community-engaged scholarship.
4. Future learning goals: Based on your reflections of learning in this course, establish 2-3 future learning goals related to evaluation. Provide a description of your desired learning, an approach and timeline to undertake this learning (e.g., readings, conference, professional development session).

Grading Rubric

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Group Process (25%)	Provides thoughtful and critical reflection on the group experience and clearly explains how it influenced learning. Identifies challenges, successes, and specific new insights or strategies gained through the group and/or community partner work.	Provides clear reflection on the group experience and identifies its influence on learning, including challenges and insights gained.	Describes the group experience with some reflection on learning, but connections to personal learning or new insights are limited.	Primarily describes what the group did with little reflection on the experience, challenges, or learning.
CES Competencies & Evaluation Principles (30%)	Provides thoughtful reflection on two CES competencies, clearly comparing pre/post ratings and identifying how course experiences contributed to growth. Makes strong connections among competencies, personal values, and emerging principles for evaluation practice.	Reflects clearly on two competencies and changes in pre/post ratings. Identifies relevant course experiences and makes connections to values and evaluation principles.	Discusses two competencies but provides limited analysis of changes, course influences, or connections to values and evaluation principles.	Provides minimal discussion of competencies or does not meaningfully consider changes in competency, course learning, values, or evaluation principles.
Equity, Diversity, Indigeneity &	Demonstrates thoughtful and critical reflection on EDII in evaluation and community-	Demonstrates a good understanding of	Demonstrates some understanding of	Provides limited consideration of EDII or does not

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Inclusivity (EDII) (25%)	engaged scholarship. Considers lived experience, power, context, relationships, and the diversity of communities with which evaluators may work. Clearly identifies implications for future evaluation practice.	EDII and considers how it applies to evaluation and community-engaged scholarship, including implications for practice.	EDII but reflection is primarily general or descriptive, with limited consideration of its implications for evaluation practice.	clearly connect EDII principles to evaluation and community-engaged scholarship.
Future Learning Goals (20%)	Identifies 2–3 specific and meaningful learning goals that clearly emerge from course reflections. Provides realistic strategies, resources/opportunities, and timelines for achieving each goal.	Identifies 2–3 relevant learning goals with appropriate approaches and timelines for continued learning.	Identifies learning goals, but they are broad or strategies and timelines lack specificity.	Goals are vague, not clearly related to evaluation learning, or lack realistic approaches and timelines.
Total (100%)				

2. Positionality and Values Statement (Due September 29)

Write a 750–1000-word positionality and values statement that reflects on your position as a researcher in relation to your current or anticipated research. Your statement should demonstrate thoughtful reflection rather than simply describe your background or list your identities and values. The purpose is **critical reflection, not personal disclosure**. You should only disclose personal information that you believe is relevant and that you are comfortable sharing.

Your statement should:

- connect your positionality specifically to your research;
- identify relevant perspectives, assumptions, strengths, and potential limitations;
- discuss the values that guide your research;
- consider power and your relationship with participants or communities; and
- identify concrete strategies you will use to practice reflexivity.

Grading Rubric

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
Position & Research Context – 20%	Clearly and thoughtfully explains position in relation to the research and why it matters.	Identifies relevant aspects of position and connects them to the research.	Describes position but connections to research are limited.	Primarily lists background or identities with little connection to research.
Perspectives & Assumptions – 20%	Critically examines experiences, assumptions, strengths, biases, and potential blind spots.	Identifies relevant assumptions and potential influences on research.	Some recognition of assumptions but limited critical reflection.	Little consideration of assumptions or their influence.
Power & Relationships – 15%	Thoughtfully considers power, researcher-participant relationships, and how others may perceive the researcher.	Recognizes important issues related to power and relationships.	Mentions power or relationships but provides limited analysis.	Little consideration of power or research relationships.
Values – 15%	Clearly identifies important values and demonstrates how they influence research practice and decisions.	Identifies values and makes some connections to research practice.	Identifies values but provides limited explanation of their influence.	Values are absent or primarily presented as a list.
Reflexive Practice – 20%	Identifies specific, meaningful strategies for ongoing	Identifies appropriate strategies for reflexive practice.	Strategies are general or not clearly connected to	Few or no strategies for reflexive practice are identified.

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
	reflexivity and considering alternative perspectives.		identified issues.	
Clarity & Integration – 10%	Statement is clear, well organized, reflective, and integrates the different dimensions of positionality.	Generally clear and well organized with good integration.	Organization or integration is inconsistent.	Primarily descriptive, unclear, or difficult to follow.

Total: 100%

3. Final Logic Model for Program Evaluation (Due October 30)

4.

Logic models enable the researcher to identify factors that will influence the program evaluation; identify the data and resources that are required for success. For this assignment, you will be asked to develop a logic model that describes the theory of change for your program evaluation. Your mark will be evaluated on the ability of your logic model to: describe the change strategy that your program supports; define the problem that you are addressing; definition of SMART goals; your understanding of the factors that may influence the ability to change, your statement of assumptions; and quantification of desired results. Each team will construct one logic model and it will be assumed unless indicated that all contributions were equal. A strong logic model should allow the reader to follow the program's reasoning:

Problem → Resources → Strategies/Activities → Outputs → Outcomes → Intended Change

The strongest models demonstrate a convincing **theory of change** by showing why the proposed activities should lead to the intended outcomes, what assumptions this pathway depends upon, what contextual factors could affect success, and how the team will know whether the desired change has occurred.

Grading Rubric

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
Problem Definition (15%)	Clearly defines the problem, its significance, target population, and context. Supported by appropriate evidence.	Clearly identifies the problem and population/context with some supporting evidence.	Problem is identified but may be broad, unclear, or insufficiently supported.	Problem is poorly defined, unsupported, or not clearly connected to the program.
Change Strategy & Theory of Change (20%)	Clearly explains how and why program strategies and activities are expected to produce change. Connections between activities and outcomes are logical and convincing.	Presents a logical change strategy with generally clear connections between activities and outcomes.	Change strategy is evident, but important connections or rationale are unclear.	Theory of change is unclear or activities are poorly connected to expected outcomes.
SMART Goals (15%)	Goals are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound and clearly address the identified problem.	Goals address the problem and meet most SMART criteria.	Goals are relevant but do not consistently meet SMART criteria.	Goals are vague, difficult to measure, or poorly connected to the problem.
Factors Influencing Change (10%)	Demonstrates strong understanding of factors that may facilitate or impede change.	Identifies important factors likely to influence program success.	Identifies some factors, but their relationship to change is not fully explained.	Important factors are missing or demonstrate limited understanding.
Assumptions (10%)	Clearly identifies and critically considers key assumptions that must hold for the theory of change to work.	Identifies relevant assumptions underlying the program.	Some assumptions are identified but are vague or incomplete.	Assumptions are absent, inappropriate, or demonstrate limited understanding.
Resources, Activities & Outputs (10%)	Clearly identifies necessary resources, major activities, and measurable outputs. Components are	Appropriate resources, activities, and outputs are identified with generally clear connections.	Some important resources, activities, or outputs are missing or unclear.	Components are incomplete or poorly connected to the program strategy.

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
	realistic and logically connected.			
Outcomes & Quantification of Results (15%)	Clearly identifies expected outcomes. Results are specific, measurable, and quantified where appropriate.	Outcomes are clear and generally measurable, with some quantification of expected results.	Outcomes are identified but may be vague, difficult to measure, or inadequately quantified.	Outcomes are unclear, unrealistic, or not measurable.
Overall Logic, Clarity & Presentation (5%)	Logic model is clear, coherent, easy to follow, and professionally presented.	Model is generally logical, clear, and well presented.	Overall logic can be followed, but some relationships or components are unclear.	Model is difficult to follow or important connections are missing.
Total (100%)				

4. Evaluation Power Point Presentation (Due December 1)

Each team will present a summary of their program evaluation. These presentations will provide an opportunity for both peer review and feedback prior to submitting the final report to the partner. Approximately 30 minutes will be allocated for a presentation of the proposed evaluation. These presentations will be evaluated based on the content, presentational style (oral and verbal), and ability to communicate the information to the audience. Each presenter will receive a grade.

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
Evaluation Content & Rationale (30%)	Presents a clear, comprehensive, and well-reasoned evaluation plan. Evaluation questions, methods, measures/data sources, and approach are appropriate and clearly connected to the program and partner's needs.	Presents a clear evaluation plan with appropriate questions, methods, and data sources. Most components are well connected and justified.	Presents the major components of the evaluation plan, but some elements are unclear, incomplete, or insufficiently justified.	Evaluation plan lacks important components or demonstrates limited understanding of program evaluation.

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
Organization & Integration (15%)	Presentation has a clear and logical flow. Connections among the program, evaluation questions, methods, analysis, and intended use of findings are easy to follow.	Presentation is well organized with generally clear connections among evaluation components.	Organization is generally understandable, but some sections or connections are difficult to follow.	Presentation lacks a clear structure and connections among evaluation components are difficult to understand.
Communication with Audience (15%)	Communicates complex evaluation information clearly, concisely, and in language appropriate for the community partner and audience. Effectively identifies and emphasizes the most important information.	Information is communicated clearly and is generally appropriate for the intended audience.	Communication is sometimes overly technical, unclear, or includes unnecessary detail.	Information is difficult for the intended audience to understand or key messages are unclear.
PowerPoint & Visual Presentation (10%)	Slides are clear, engaging, professional, and visually support the presentation. Information is concise and figures/tables/graphics are used effectively where appropriate.	Slides are clear and professional and generally support the presentation effectively.	Slides contain too much or too little information, or visual presentation occasionally detracts from the message.	Slides are difficult to read, poorly organized, or do not effectively support the presentation.
Individual Oral Presentation (20%)	Presenter is confident, clear, engaging, and well prepared. Speaks to the audience rather than reading from slides and demonstrates a strong understanding of their material.	Presenter communicates clearly and demonstrates good preparation and understanding of the material.	Presenter communicates the basic information but relies heavily on slides/notes or demonstrates some uncertainty with the material.	Presenter is difficult to follow, reads primarily from slides/notes, or demonstrates limited preparation or understanding.
Response to Questions & Feedback (10%)	Responds thoughtfully and accurately to questions. Demonstrates strong	Responds appropriately to questions and	Provides basic responses but has difficulty addressing	Has difficulty responding to questions or

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
	understanding of the evaluation and is receptive to constructive feedback and alternative perspectives.	feedback and demonstrates good understanding of the evaluation.	some questions or incorporating feedback.	demonstrates limited understanding of the evaluation.
Total (100%)				

5. Final Program Evaluation Proposal for the Client (Due December 15)

For the course, you will be required to write an evaluation plan to address a community partner's issue. We will have the opportunity to meet face-to-face with community partners who are keenly interested in a state-of-the-art evaluation. Through a collaborative process, small groups of students will work with partners to develop an appropriate evaluation design, measurement, analysis, and reporting package. The objective of the evaluation plan is to present a brief summary and analysis of current theory and research on the problem being addressed, and to design an evaluation to determine its effectiveness. A proposal should comprise the following: an executive summary, a background (implications and need), program description, stakeholder identification, a clear statement of the evaluation goals, program logic/theory of change, a description of your proposed methodology including a discussion of the rationale for the choice of method, method (including participants, indicators, instruments, procedures); a data analysis plan, ethical and EDII considerations, and relevance, budget, implementation schedule, and knowledge mobilization plan. The proposal can only be 20 pages double-spaced (minimum 12 pt). The proposal will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
Executive Summary (5%)	Provides a concise and compelling overview of the program, evaluation purpose, key questions, proposed methodology, and intended use of findings. Can stand alone as a summary for the community partner.	Provides a clear overview of the major elements of the evaluation plan.	Summarizes the plan but important elements are missing or unclear.	Summary is incomplete, overly detailed, or does not accurately represent the proposed evaluation.
Background, Need & Evidence (10%)	Clearly defines the problem and need for the evaluation. Provides a focused and critical	Provides a clear rationale for the evaluation supported by	Provides some relevant background and evidence, but	Background is insufficient, poorly supported, or does not

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
	synthesis of relevant theory, research, and evidence and demonstrates its implications for the proposed evaluation.	relevant theory and research.	synthesis or connection to the evaluation is limited.	establish the need for the evaluation.
Program Description & Stakeholders (5%)	Clearly describes the program, context, target population, and key activities. Identifies relevant stakeholders and thoughtfully considers their roles, perspectives, and interests in the evaluation.	Provides a clear program description and identifies the major stakeholders.	Program or stakeholder description is present but lacks sufficient detail or consideration of their roles.	Program is unclear or important stakeholders are missing.
Evaluation Goals & Questions (10%)	Evaluation goals and questions are clear, specific, feasible, and highly relevant to the program and partner's needs. Questions logically guide the evaluation design.	Goals and questions are clear, appropriate, and generally aligned with partner needs.	Goals and questions are present but may be broad, difficult to evaluate, or inconsistently aligned with the evaluation.	Goals or questions are unclear, inappropriate, or poorly connected to the evaluation purpose.
Program Logic & Theory of Change (10%)	Presents a clear and convincing theory of change showing how program resources and activities are expected to lead to outputs and outcomes. Assumptions and contextual influences are thoughtfully considered.	Presents a logical theory of change with appropriate connections among major program components and outcomes.	Basic logic is evident, but some connections, assumptions, or outcomes are unclear.	Theory of change is incomplete or does not demonstrate how program activities are expected to produce outcomes.
Evaluation Design & Methodological Rationale (15%)	Proposes a rigorous, appropriate, and feasible evaluation design. Provides a strong rationale for methodological choices and clearly demonstrates how the design will answer the evaluation questions.	Design is appropriate and feasible, with a clear rationale and good alignment with evaluation questions.	Design is generally appropriate, but rationale, feasibility, or alignment requires further development.	Design is inappropriate, insufficiently explained, or unlikely to answer the evaluation questions.

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
Methods: Participants, Indicators, Measures & Procedures (15%)	Provides a detailed and coherent methods plan. Participants, sampling, indicators, instruments/measures, data sources, and procedures are appropriate and clearly aligned with evaluation questions and outcomes.	Methods are clearly described and generally appropriate and aligned with the evaluation.	Major methodological components are included but some lack sufficient detail, justification, or alignment.	Important methodological information is missing or methods are inappropriate for the evaluation.
Data Analysis Plan (10%)	Provides a clear, appropriate, and sufficiently detailed analysis plan. Analytic strategies are well matched to the data, indicators, and evaluation questions and demonstrate how conclusions will be reached.	Analysis plan is appropriate and generally well connected to the evaluation questions and data.	Analysis strategies are identified but lack detail or clear alignment with questions and data.	Analysis plan is incomplete, inappropriate, or unclear.
Ethical & EDII Considerations (5%)	Thoughtfully integrates ethical and EDII considerations throughout the evaluation. Demonstrates attention to power, accessibility, inclusion, cultural/contextual relevance, confidentiality, and potential benefits or harms.	Identifies relevant ethical and EDII considerations and describes appropriate strategies for addressing them.	Identifies some ethical and EDII issues, but consideration is limited or not well integrated into the design.	Important ethical or EDII considerations are missing or inadequately addressed.
Feasibility: Budget & Implementation Schedule (5%)	Provides a realistic, detailed, and well-justified budget and implementation schedule that clearly demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed evaluation.	Budget and timeline are appropriate and generally realistic.	Budget or timeline is provided but requires greater detail or may present feasibility concerns.	Budget or timeline is incomplete, unrealistic, or inconsistent with the proposed evaluation.
Relevance & Knowledge	Clearly demonstrates how findings will be useful to the	Clearly considers relevance and	Addresses relevance and	Limited consideration is

Component	Excellent	Good	Developing	Limited
Mobilization (5%)	community partner and other stakeholders. Provides a thoughtful and feasible knowledge mobilization plan tailored to different audiences and intended uses.	provides appropriate strategies for sharing and using findings.	dissemination, but strategies are general or insufficiently tailored to intended users.	given to how findings will be communicated or used.
Integration, Clarity & Professional Quality (5%)	Proposal is exceptionally well integrated, concise, and professionally written. Components form a coherent evaluation plan and the document is highly accessible and useful to the community partner.	Proposal is clear, well organized, and professional with good integration across sections.	Proposal is generally understandable but has inconsistencies, repetition, or weak connections across sections.	Proposal is difficult to follow, poorly integrated, or does not meet expected professional standards.
Total (100%)				

Equality, Equity, and Respect

I am committed to providing an environment of equality and respect for all students and partners and to developing teaching and learning contexts that are welcoming to all. I recommend that students and partners use inclusive language to create a classroom atmosphere in which students' experiences and views are treated with equal respect and value in relation to their gender, racial background, sexual orientation, and ethnic backgrounds. We are encouraged to use gender-neutral or gender-inclusive language when appropriate and to become more sensitive to the impact of devaluing language to create a thoughtful and respectful community.

Plagiarism, Cheating, and Intellectual Property

Queen's University is committed to the highest standards of academic integrity and honesty. Students are expected to be familiar with these standards regarding academic honesty and to uphold the policies of the University in this respect. Academic dishonesty is a serious offence and can result in suspension or expulsion from the University.

Student Accessibility Services

Students who require accommodations in this course due to a disability affecting mobility, vision, hearing, learning, or mental or physical health are advised to discuss their needs with Student Accessibility Services and myself.