INTRODUCTION

Health programs usually are implemented to achieve specific outcomes by performing some type of intervention or service. While evaluations may be performed for a variety of reasons, most are conducted to answer two fundamental questions: Is the program causing intended changes?; and second, Why is this the case? Evaluations produce information that helps decision makers to understand the reasons for program performance, and to make informed judgments about improving a program, extending it to other sites, or cutting back or abolishing a program so that resources may be allocated elsewhere. In essence, evaluation is a management or decision making tool for funders, administrators, planners, policy-makers and other health officials.

DESCRIPTION

This course deals with the application of research methods to judge the success of health programs. The course focus is public health programs and health services, although the concepts and methods are equally relevant to other sectors. Lectures and discussions concerning problems and techniques are combined with field experiences in health services delivery or health programs. In this course you will be able to:

1. Explain concepts, strategies, and techniques for evaluating health programs;
2. Discuss political, administrative, ethical, and cultural issues in evaluating health programs;
3. Describe examples of evaluation research in health services as well as other sectors;
4. Develop an evaluation design of an existing program that addresses a particular health or social problem; and
5. Assess the adequacy of proposals and program evaluations designed by others.
COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1) EVALUATION PROJECT. The best way to learn evaluation is to design one. Therefore, the chief objective and requirement of this course is to design – but not conduct -- an evaluation of a health program, health policy, or the delivery of health care. Each student will identify a health program, health policy, or health care topic for their evaluation project. Based on field information about the program, you will develop an evaluation question(s) addressing the impacts of the program or its implementation (or both). Your assignment is to develop a feasible evaluation design to answer one or both of these questions for the program of your choice (you do not have to actually perform the evaluation for this class). Based on comments received in the class presentation and progress report, each student will submit a final report after the last day of class.

Your performance in this course will be based mainly on your ability to organize and design an evaluation. There are 3 assignments to fulfill this requirement, which are described later in more detail:

Project Presentation. Beginning in the 3rd week of the quarter, the time in class will be divided roughly into two halves. The first half of the class will be lecture and discussion of assigned readings. The second half will be the presentation and discussion of student projects as they are developed. Each student will make one presentation on their progress and lead a discussion, informed by key readings, on conceptual and methodological challenges encountered in their evaluation projects, as well as political or other issues about the program that may affect the evaluation. Each student’s presentation should address the topic of the session for that week in class. The presentations are expected to benefit the class in two ways. First, each student will receive comments about their projects from the class and the instructor, which may lead to improvements in the progress and final reports. Second, each presentation may reveal evaluation methods and insights that inform the design of other evaluation projects in the class.

Progress Report. The Progress Report is another opportunity for students to receive early reviews of their work. The goal is to provide feedback that can improve the quality of the evaluation questions, conceptual model and study design.

Final Report. Based on comments received in the Presentation and Progress Report, each student will submit a Final Report. Submitting a copy of your Final Report to your health program is recommended strongly.

Students may form a small group of no more than 3 students and do a single group evaluation. Groups have the advantage of spreading the work and instilling teamwork skills, which are important elements of evaluation, administration and public health practice. For group evaluations, only a single Presentation, Progress Report and Final Report are required.

2) IMPACT EVALUATION ARTICLE REVIEW. Students will review an impact evaluation article. Details of the assignment are described later in this syllabus.
**COURSE GRADING AND DUE DATES**

Course grades are based on your performance in completing the assignments listed below. Each assignment's points indicate its relative importance in the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact article review</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>November 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>November 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>On or before December 11 (5:00 pm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I greatly appreciate receiving your assignments on time. Your performance in this course will likely be greater if you meet the above due dates.

The Progress Report is intended to be a "mid-course" assessment of your evaluation questions and conceptual models for the class project. Comments will help you improve your evaluations.

For the Final Report, points are assigned based on three criteria. The first criterion is whether all parts of the assignment are completed. For example, points would be deducted if a part is missing from the Final Report (see outline at end of syllabus). The second criterion is continuity. Evaluations are usually conducted to answer specific questions. Therefore, the methods should describe clearly how you will go about answering your questions. Points would be deducted if this continuity is absent or weak across sections of the report, or if the methods are unclear or incorrect. The third criterion is quality. The main issue here is how thorough your work is in applying evaluation principles from the text and class sessions in your written and assignments.

The article review allocates points as described in the assignment later in the syllabus. Points are awarded based on the accuracy and thoroughness of the answers.

Course grades are assigned based on total points earned at the end of the course. I do not assign a 4.0, 3.9, etc., to the points earned on any given assignment. In general, I usually award very few 4.0 and 3.9 course grades in any class that I teach. Most students earn grades ranging between a 3.8 and a 3.3 (normal distribution) in past classes.
DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR COURSE GRADES

The following descriptive statements for numerical grades are guidelines for the assignment of grades to graduate students taking courses offered through the Department of Health Services. The guidelines have been endorsed by Department faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Grade</th>
<th>Interpretive Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Excellent and exceptional work for a graduate student. Work at this level is unusually thorough, well-reasoned, methodologically sophisticated, and well-written. Work is of good professional quality, shows an incisive understanding of health services-related issues and demonstrates clear recognition of appropriate analytical approaches to address health problems and questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Strong work for a graduate student. Work at this level shows some signs of creativity, is thorough and well-reasoned, indicates strong understanding of appropriate methodological or analytical approaches, and demonstrates clear recognition and good understanding of salient health services-related issues and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Competent and sound work for a graduate student; well-reasoned and thorough, methodologically sound, but not especially creative or insightful or technically sophisticated; shows adequate understanding of health services-related issues and problems, although that understanding may be somewhat incomplete. This is the graduate student grade that indicates neither unusual strength or exceptional weakness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Adequate work for a graduate student even though some weaknesses are evident. Moderately thorough and well-reasoned, but some indication that understanding of the important issues is less than complete and perhaps inadequate in other respects as well. Methodological or analytical approaches used are generally adequate but have one or more weaknesses or limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Borderline work for a graduate student; barely meets the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course; understanding of salient issues is incomplete, methodological or analytical work performed in the course is minimally adequate. Overall performance, if consistent in graduate courses, would barely suffice to sustain graduate status in &quot;good standing.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Deficient work for a graduate student; does not meet the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course. Work is inadequately developed or flawed by numerous errors and misunderstanding of important issues. Methodological or analytical work performed is weak and fails to demonstrate knowledge or technical competence expected of graduate students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Academic Integrity** ([http://sph.washington.edu/students/academicintegrity/](http://sph.washington.edu/students/academicintegrity/))

Students at the University of Washington (UW) are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic conduct, professional honesty, and personal integrity.

The UW School of Public Health (SPH) is committed to upholding standards of academic integrity consistent with the academic and professional communities of which it is a part. Plagiarism, cheating, and other misconduct are serious violations of the University of Washington **Student Conduct Code** (WAC 478-120). We expect you to know and follow the university’s policies on cheating and plagiarism, and the **SPH Academic Integrity Policy**. Any suspected cases of academic misconduct will be handled according to University of Washington regulations. For more information, see the University of Washington **Community Standards and Student Conduct** website.

**Access and Accommodation** ([http://depts.washington.edu/uwdrs/faculty-resources/syllabus-statement/](http://depts.washington.edu/uwdrs/faculty-resources/syllabus-statement/)):

Your experience in this class is important to me. If you have already established accommodations with Disability Resources for Students (DRS), please communicate your approved accommodations to me at your earliest convenience so we can discuss your needs in this course.

If you have not yet established services through DRS, but have a temporary health condition or permanent disability that requires accommodations (conditions include but not limited to; mental health, attention-related, learning, vision, hearing, physical or health impacts), you are welcome to contact DRS at 206-543-8924 or uwdrs@uw.edu or disability.uw.edu. DRS offers resources and coordinates reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities and/or temporary health conditions. Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process between you, your instructor(s) and DRS. It is the policy and practice of the University of Washington to create inclusive and accessible learning environments consistent with federal and state law.
COURSE OUTLINE
AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

In this class, evaluation is defined as a “3-Act Play” with a variety of actors and interest groups, each having a role, and entering and exiting the “stage” at different points in the evaluation process. Evaluators are one of these actors and have distinct roles in the play. The course is organized into the following sections:

I. Introduction
II. Act I: Asking the Question
III. Act II: Answering the Question
IV. Act III: Use of the Answers
V. Other Topics

REQUIRED READINGS

Required readings are listed for each session. Readings come from two sources:

2. Required readings for selected sessions available through the course Web site.

Readings serve as resources for helping students to design their evaluations. Students who master the material in the readings are usually more successful in developing evaluation designs of high quality.
### HSERV 522 HEALTH PROGRAM EVALUATION
#### 2015 SESSION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 6</td>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION:</strong> Course Overview and Introduction to Evaluation</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACT I: ASKING THE QUESTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 13</td>
<td>How to Ask Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACT II: ANSWERING THE QUESTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 20</td>
<td>I. Designing a Process Evaluation</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 27</td>
<td>II. Designing an Impact Evaluation: Getting Started</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 3</td>
<td>Designing an Impact Evaluation (continued)</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Study: Impact Evaluation of Menu Labeling in King County &amp; the Pros/Cons of Population-Level Evaluations</td>
<td>Chen &amp; Ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 3</td>
<td>Due Date for Impact Evaluation Article Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scene II: Planning the Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10</td>
<td>I. Developing an Evaluation Plan: Overview</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. Developing an Evaluation Plan: Selecting the Population, Sampling &amp; Sample Size: Is this evaluation underpowered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10</td>
<td>Target Due Date for Progress Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>Choosing Measures and Designing a Survey</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 24</td>
<td>Basic Qualitative Data Collection &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative Case Study: Respite Partnership Collaborative</td>
<td>Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1</td>
<td>Data Analysis: does it answer the evaluation questions?</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACT III: USE OF THE ANSWERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 8</td>
<td>Use of Evaluation Answers in Decision Making</td>
<td>Grembowski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Report due on or before December 11th**

December 11 is the last day of instruction in Fall quarter. Last day of Fall quarter is December 18.
I. INTRODUCTION

COURSE OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION TO EVALUATION

David Grembowski

OBJECTIVES
1. To review the objectives, assignments and due dates of the course.
2. To define program evaluation and its role in policy cycle: Evaluation as a 3-Act Play.
3. To describe the major reasons why program evaluations are conducted.
4. To discuss who should conduct evaluations and define the role of the evaluator.
5. To discuss ethical cultural issues in design and conduct of program evaluations.

STUDY QUESTIONS
1. What are the major types of evaluation, and what are their relationships to each other?
2. What are the 3 basic steps of the evaluation process, or the 3-Act play? How do politics influence the evaluation process? What are some of the overt and covert reasons for conducting evaluations?
3. Should evaluations be conducted by consultants or employees of the organization implementing the program?
4. What ethical dilemmas often confront evaluators? How can the guiding principles for evaluators help resolve them in the field?
5. What are some essential ingredients for conducting culturally competent evaluations?

READINGS


Alaska Dental Health Therapists and the politics of evaluation:

Washington State. Healthier Washington: Better Health, Better Care, Lower Costs. Olympia WA: Office of the Governor, 2014; pages 1-28 only (these are the page numbers on the application, not the pdf-page numbers). This document is Washington State’s application to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid for a State Innovation Models (SIM) Round 2 of Funding to transform Washington’s medical and social service system. In 2015 Washington State received a $65,000,000 award, and SIM implementation begins in January 2016. Please see the Healthier Washington website for more information: http://www.hca.wa.gov/hw/Pages/default.aspx

SKIM: Maciejewski ML, Weaver EM, Hebert PL. Synonyms in health services research methodology. Med Care Res Rev. 2011 Apr;68(2):156-76. Different disciplines have different terms for the same research concepts and methods. This article presents a “crosswalk” of the terminology, which may assist you in communicating with other students in this class and the broader university and the research world. This article presents a glossary of research terms that you can use throughout the class and in your future careers. In particular, note the section on selection bias toward the end of the article.


OPTIONAL: Chouinard JA, Cousins JB. A review and synthesis of current research on cross-cultural evaluation. American Journal of Evaluation 2009;30(4):457-494. Table 1 contains a list of 52 cross-cultural evaluations, and some of those might be useful for thinking about cross-cultural issues in evaluation.


NOTE:

“Skim” means spending no more than 5 minutes reviewing an article.

“Optional” means the article is not required but may be of interest or might be related to your class project; take a look if you want to.
October 13

ACT I: ASKING THE QUESTION

HOW TO ASK EVALUATION QUESTIONS

David Grembowski

OBJECTIVES
1. To define the key role that questions play in designing evaluations.

2. To define program theory and program objectives and ways to illustrate them through conceptual models.

3. To define and illustrate the steps in formulating evaluation questions: specify program theory; specify program objectives; and translate objectives into questions.

4. To practice framing evaluation questions for a health program in class.

STUDY QUESTIONS
1. Programs typically have two underlying theories. What are they and why are they important? Can you specify the program theory for your class project (later on in the course)?

2. How can a program’s theory and objectives be translated into evaluation questions?

3. Can you list at least three guidelines for writing evaluation questions?

READINGS
Chapter 3

OPTIONAL: American Cancer Society. Stating Outcomes for American Cancer Society Programs: A Handbook for Volunteers and Staff. [skim examples of logic models].


DESIGNING A PROCESS EVALUATION (EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION)

David Grembowski

OBJECTIVES

1. To describe the nature of implementation evaluations and discuss how they can complement impact evaluations.

2. To describe the importance of evaluation questions and a program’s theory in designing an evaluation of program implementation.

3. To describe basic evaluation designs for conducting an evaluation of program implementation.

4. To illustrate how these designs can be used to answer specific questions about program implementation.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. What types of questions are often asked in evaluations of program implementation? What questions of program implementation might apply to your class project? What is fidelity of program implementation and why is it important?

2. What is a program’s “hierarchy of objectives” and how can it be used to structure an evaluation of program implementation?

3. What design issues often confront evaluations of program implementation?

4. What are mixed methods evaluations? What are reasons for conducting a mixed methods evaluation?

READINGS

Chapter 6


OPTIONAL: Washington TA. The homeless need more than just a pillow, they need a pillar: an evaluation of a transitional housing program. Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services 2002;83(2):183-88. This is an example of a process evaluation using qualitative methods.


OPTIONAL: Creswell JW, Klassen AC, Plano Clark VL, Smith KC for the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Chapter 3: The nature and design of mixed methods research, pages 4-10 only. One purpose of this NIH report is to present guidelines for researchers on how to write NIH grant applications with mixed methods study designs. The report also presents guidelines for how reviewers should critique grant applications with mixed methods study designs. Available at: http://obssr.od.nih.gov/scientific_areas/methodology/mixed_methods_research/index.aspx
OBJECTIVES for October 27 and Nov 3

1. To define the requirements for making causal inferences in impact evaluation.
2. To define the concepts of “internal validity” and “external validity” and “construct validity.”
3. To define the major threats to the validity of answers to questions in impact evaluations.
4. To define the 3 basic types of impact evaluation designs.
5. To define and illustrate quasi-experimental and experimental designs.
6. To review the goal of generalized causal inference.
7. To define and illustrate statistical conclusion validity.
8. To define and illustrate construct validity and external validity.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. What are the requirements for making causal inferences in an impact evaluation?
2. What is the difference between the definitions of internal and external validity?
3. What are the major threats to internal validity?
4. What are the names of the different impact designs described in Chapter 4? If you had to describe each design to your parents, how would you do so?
5. What factors should an evaluator consider in choosing an impact design for a program?
6. Are experimental designs always better than quasi-experimental designs?
7. What can an evaluator do if an impact design fails (i.e., is not implemented as intended in the field)?
8. What is meant by “statistical conclusion validity”?
9. What is meant by “construct validity” and “external validity”?
READINGS

Chapter 4, pages 79-121.


CASE STUDY: IMPACT EVALUATION OF MENU LABELING IN KING COUNTY

Roxana Chen, Myduc Ta

OBJECTIVES

1) To describe several strategies used by the local health department in addressing social determinants of health to effect population-wide and targeted changes in health.

2) To illustrate various methods used to conduct impact evaluations of these strategies.

3) To describe assets and limitations in population-level evaluations.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. List three “lessons learned” about doing evaluations of community-based public health programs from this case study.

2. Does the case study offer guidance for resolving any issues in designing your own evaluation for this class?

3. Do you think the results from this evaluation would be important to decision makers? Why or why not?

READINGS


http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6307a4.htm
(Note: the following pages are brief and provide helpful background on the four initiatives: CPPW, CTG, PICH, and COO.)

4. CPPW:  
   http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/partnerships/CPPW.aspx

5. Community Transformation Grant (CTG):  
   http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/partnerships/CTG.aspx

6. Partnership to Improve Community Health (PICH):  
   http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/about/healthycommunities.aspx  
   (Click on the [+] symbol to read the background on PICH.)


Optional Readings
On PSE:

On menu-labeling evaluations:
OBJECTIVES
Same as October 27.

STUDY QUESTIONS
Same as October 27

READINGS
Chapter 4, the remaining sections of the chapter.
I. DEVELOPING AN EVALUATION PLAN: OVERVIEW

II. DEVELOPING AN EVALUATION PLAN: SELECTING THE POPULATION, SAMPLING & SAMPLE SIZE:

Is this evaluation underpowered?

David Grembowski

OBJECTIVES

1. To describe the basic components of an evaluation plan and how to go about completing these components
2. To discuss external validity and eligibility issues in defining the population of the evaluation
3. To describe sampling approaches for selecting subjects from program populations
4. To describe how to calculate minimum sample size requirements in quantitative evaluations

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. What is meant by achieving a “proper fit” in an evaluation design?
2. Does an evaluator need to be concerned about internal validity when conducting a simple survey of program participants?
3. What is the difference between calculating a minimum sample size vs. a minimum detectable difference?

READINGS

Chapter 7

OPTIONAL: Chouinard JA, Cousins JB. A review and synthesis of current research on cross-cultural evaluation. American Journal of Evaluation 2009;30(4):457-494. Table 1 contains a list of 52 cross-cultural evaluations, and some of those might be useful for thinking about cross-cultural issues in evaluation.
CHOOSING MEASURES & DESIGNING A SURVEY

David Grembowski

OBJECTIVES
1. To review the role of measurement in the evaluation design.
2. To describe methods for identifying the measures required by an evaluation.
3. To present examples of common measures in health program evaluations, including scales and indices.
4. To define the connection between the level of measurement and the data analysis.
5. To define reliability and validity and discuss how they determine the quality of measures.
6. To review the advantages and disadvantages of the major types of surveys.

STUDY QUESTIONS
1. What is measurement reliability and validity? How are they related to internal validity?
2. Can a measure be unreliable but still be valid?
3. How do a program’s measures affect the data collection and data analysis plan?
4. Why is variation important in choosing a measure?
5. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the different modes of survey research?
6. What steps should be taken to protect the rights of Human Subjects?
7. Given the context of your project, what data sources and methods of data collection will you propose for your evaluation?

READINGS
Chapter 8

SKIM: Walker EA, Stevens KA, Persaud S. Promoting diabetes self-management among African-Americans: an educational intervention. Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved 2010;21(3):169-86. This article illustrates one way to describe and document the measures in a study [Note the measures in Box 1].


OPTIONAL: UW Human Subjects Division: The place to go to for UW requirements and regulations. http://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/


CASE STUDY: MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN A GLOBAL HEALTH CONTEXT: The KenyaEMR Project

Nancy Puttkammer

OBJECTIVES

1. To use a case study to illustrate factors that are important to consider when conducting program evaluation in a global health context.

2. The case presentation will address:
   a. The project being evaluated
   b. The project conceptual model and evaluation framework
   c. Design of process and outcome evaluation activities
   d. Methods and data sources (including reliability and validity of measures)
   e. Summary of findings and use of findings for project improvement
   f. Reflections on the role of an internal evaluation team
   g. Considerations in carrying out evaluation activities in a global health context

CASE STUDY QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION

1. What is the value of both process and outcome evaluation in the context of the KenyaEMR project, a health systems strengthening intervention to improve health information systems for HIV care and treatment programs? When resources for evaluation are limited, what are the benefits of emphasizing one vs. the other?

2. What are some of the advantages and disadvantages of an internal evaluator role?

3. What are some of the political, cultural, and contextual considerations that are important when conducting a program evaluation in a country that is different from your own? As an evaluator, what steps can you take to prepare yourself to incorporate these considerations in your work?

READINGS


QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY: Respite Partnership Collaborative Evaluation

Grace Wang, Senior Researcher, American Institutes for Research (AIR)

OBJECTIVES
To illustrate use of qualitative document review and interview methods in an evaluation of a community coalition. The case presentation will address:

a. A description of Sacramento County’s Innovation Project under the state’s Mental Health Services Act. The Innovation Project seeks to:
   1) create learning opportunities on how the project is developed and administered;
   2) integrate community feedback into program development and implementation; and
   3) expedite the release of funds of respite services to community organizations.

b. Qualitative design of the evaluation to assess the extent to which the Innovation Project:
   1) Promotes successful collaboration between public and private entities (i.e., Sacramento County Division of Behavioral Health Services and the Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management) in Sacramento County.
   2) Demonstrates a community-driven process.
   3) Improves the quality and outcomes of respite services in Sacramento County.

c. Strengths and challenges of document review and interviews in evaluation

STUDY QUESTIONS
1. What are the tradeoffs of including qualitative approaches in an evaluation?

2. Why incorporate longitudinal, qualitative data collection into an evaluation?

3. How do you share sensitive information that emerges from qualitative interviews?

4. What safety considerations should you plan for when working in the field?

READINGS
Respite Partnership Collaborative Report 1 and 2, Executive Summaries of each report, available at: http://www.shfcenter.org/rpc/evaluation

Bradley EH, Curry LA, Devers KJ. Qualitative data analysis for health services research: developing taxonomy, themes, and theory. Health Services Research 2007;42(4):1758-72.

RESOURCES: Additional information is at the Community Tool Box website at: http://ctb.ku.edu/
INTRODUCTION TO BASIC QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS

David Grembowski

Historically, individuals have used quantitative data to evaluate programs. Although this can be very helpful, it does not provide a very rich source of information. Qualitative data can be used to describe a program in more detail in your client’s own words. Qualitative data are most commonly collected in the form of open-ended surveys, focus groups, or individual interviews.

This session will provide students with a basic introduction to qualitative analysis concepts such as coding, developing themes, summarizing qualitative responses from surveys, questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups and how to combine qualitative data with traditional quantitative data.

OBJECTIVES

1. To identify basic qualitative analysis concepts such as coding, developing themes, and summarizing qualitative responses from surveys, questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups.
2. To increase understanding of how qualitative methods can be incorporated into health program evaluation proposals.

READINGS

Bradley EH, Curry LA, Devers KJ. Qualitative data analysis for health services research: developing taxonomy, themes, and theory. Health Services Research 2007;42(4):1758-72.

CLASS DISCUSSION: Mao Y, Richter S. Content analysis: Canadian newspaper coverage of homelessness. Sage Research Methods Cases. 2014; Online doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/978144627305014526829. [Case study where the authors describe how they went about conducting a content analysis.]


OPTIONAL: David MT, Brolin M. Focus group: evaluation of substance abuse treatment program. Sage Research Methods Cases. 2014; Online doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/978144627305013512924. [Case study where the authors describe how they went about conducting a focus group.]
OPTIONAL: Mendoza VD. Measurement, tips, and errors: making an instrument design in risk perception. Sage Research Methods Cases. 2014; Online doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/978144627305013519224. [Case study where the author describes how she went about constructing a multi-item scale to measure risk perception for her masters thesis.]


RESOURCES

Additional information can be found at the Community Tool Box website at: http://ctb.ku.edu/
DATA ANALYSIS: DOES IT ANSWER THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS?

David Grembowski

OBJECTIVES
1. To define the purpose of the data analysis plan in an evaluation design.
2. To present key issues that must be addressed in developing an evaluation plan.
3. To describe analytical procedures commonly used for different evaluation designs.
4. To describe analytical procedures commonly used for evaluation of program implementation.
5. To illustrate data analyses conducted to answer an evaluation question.

STUDY QUESTIONS
1. How does a program’s measures affect the data analysis plan?
2. What are the three types of data analysis? Should multivariable analyses always be performed in quantitative evaluations of program impacts or implementation?
3. What statistical techniques might be used for each impact design?

READINGS
Chapter 9


**Journal Epidemiology Community Health Series (Optional)**

**ESSAY:** Macintyre S. Good intentions and received wisdom are not good enough: the need for controlled trials in public health. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 2011;65:564-67.


ACT III: USE OF THE ANSWERS
Use of Evaluation Answers in Decision Making

David Grembowski

OBJECTIVES
1. To review the purpose of Act III, the use of evaluation answers in decision making, and the role of the evaluator.
2. To present guidelines for developing recommendations based on the results and conclusions of the evaluation.
3. To describe how dissemination plans can be developed to communicate findings and recommendations to different audiences.
4. To identify factors that increase use of evaluation findings in decision making.
5. To discuss the politics of dissemination and the role of evaluators.

STUDY QUESTIONS
1. What steps can evaluators take to make sure their findings are considered by decision makers?
2. What is the role of the evaluator in Act III? How is it different from the other Acts?
3. If you actually conducted your own evaluations, how would you go about disseminating their results? Do political issues affect your answer?

READINGS
Chapters 10 and 11


This assignment addresses three course objectives. By performing this article review, you will be assessing the adequacy of the evaluation performed by the authors. In doing so, you also will demonstrate your knowledge of strategies and techniques for evaluating the impacts of health programs. After completing the assignment, you also should be able to describe one impact evaluation in health services and public health. These skills are useful for reading impact evaluations in the literature, conducting future evaluations of public health programs, or managing evaluations performed by others.

Drawing on readings and class discussion, review the impact evaluation article by Fauth, et al, by completing the following three parts (15 points):

Part 1. (4 points) Program Objectives and Evaluation Question(s).
   a. What is the program’s purpose/objective(s)? What question(s) were the investigators trying to answer in this evaluation?
   b. What is this program’s theory of cause and effect (please summarize in a few sentences)? How would you diagram it? [For the last sentence, "How would you diagram it?," I would like you to draw a model with boxes and arrows that illustrates the program’s theory of cause and effect, and your response should describe your drawn model.]

Part 2. (8 points) Evaluation Design.
   a. Diagram the type of evaluation impact design which you think they have employed (this is a diagram with X’s and O’s like the ones in Chapter 4 of the textbook). What is the name of this study design? Why do you suppose they chose this design over other alternatives? Specifically, which potential threats to internal validity have they ruled out with this design and what threats might remain? What might be some important considerations other than the pros and cons of the designs themselves, in choosing this design? Would you have used a different design--why or why not?
   b. In the top row of Table 3, how would you interpret the OLS regression coefficient of -.40? In the top row of Table 4, how would you interpret the OLS regression coefficient of .07 in column 1?
   c. Briefly, what were the conclusions of the evaluation (that is, what was the answer(s) to the question(s) in part (a) above? [NOTE: for this assignment, please assume that the statistical analyses are performed correctly.]

Part 3. (3 points) Recommendations. Based on their findings, would you recommend that such a program be implemented in other cities--why or why not? Please discuss the threats to external validity in explaining the reasons for your recommendation(s).

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
HSERV 522 HEALTH PROGRAM EVALUATION

PROGRESS REPORT

Your double-spaced PROGRESS REPORT should indicate your progress to date, with emphasis on the nature of the problem you are addressing, the basic design you are proposing to use, and the feasibility of carrying out the proposed work (Sections A to E below). The Progress Report is an opportunity for obtaining customized feedback on your class project, particularly for your evaluation questions. Once you settle on one or more evaluation questions for your program, your Final Report will present the methods for answering them. Thus, it is important at this stage to come up with a reasonable number of questions that are feasible to answer, given the context and limitations of the program. The text that you write for this assignment can be used in the front part of your Final Report.

TARGET DUE DATE: November 10th.

A. Program and Background: What are the characteristics and objectives of the program? What problem does the program address and why is the problem important? What organization(s) is implementing the program?

What is the program's "theory of cause and effect" [that is, why (causal assumptions) will the program reduce or solve the problem]? This section must include a conceptual model that illustrates why the program is expected to cause expected outcomes. The program’s implementation strategy may be integrated into this conceptual model, or a second conceptual model of the program’s implementation strategy may be completed, which is often useful for developing process evaluation questions (Limit of 3 double-spaced pages, including the model(s))

B. Evaluation Questions: What question(s) does the evaluation seek to answer? Why are these questions chosen? (Limit of 1 double-spaced page)

C. Literature Review: Do earlier studies aid in developing the evaluation design? Do other evaluations of the same or similar programs appear in the literature, and if so, what did they find? Are their results generalizable to your program? Are there any studies in the literature that provide guidance for designing your evaluation (for example, a scale for measuring program outcomes, satisfaction or some other concept)? Please include a reference list at the end of the report. (Limit of 1 double-spaced page)

D. Evaluation Type and Design: What categories of evaluation are being used (impact evaluation or evaluation of program implementation or both) to answer the questions in (B) above? Describe the evaluation design(s) for answering the question(s), addressing (Limit of 1 double-spaced page):
1. Threats to internal validity (impact evaluation only);
2. Threats to external validity (for evaluations of program impact and implementation, the issue is whether the results will be generalizable to other settings)

E. Describe the logistics of your research in terms of (Limit of 1 page):
1. The characteristics of the setting in which it is being carried out;
2. Discussion of problems/obstacles you may have encountered and your assessment of how to deal with them.
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
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FINAL REPORT

The FINAL REPORT should follow the page limits below, be double-spaced pages, and include references. Your written report should cover all of the sections described below. **DUE DATE: ON OR BEFORE DECEMBER 11 (5:00 pm).**

A. Program and Background: What are the characteristics and objectives of the program? What problem does the program address and why is the problem important? What organization(s) is implementing the program?

What is the program's "theory of cause and effect" [that is, why (causal assumptions) will the program reduce or solve the problem]? This section must include a conceptual model that illustrates why the program is expected to cause expected outcomes. The program’s implementation strategy may be integrated into this conceptual model, or a second conceptual model of the program’s implementation strategy may be completed, which is often useful for developing process evaluation questions (Limit of 3 double-spaced pages, including the model(s))

B. Evaluation Questions: What question(s) does the evaluation seek to answer? Why are these questions chosen? (Limit of 1 double-spaced page)

C. Literature Review: Do earlier studies aid in developing the evaluation design? Do other evaluations of the same or similar programs appear in the literature, and if so, what did they find? Are their results generalizable to your program? Are there any studies in the literature that provide guidance for designing your evaluation (for example, a scale for measuring program outcomes, satisfaction or some other concept)? Please include a reference list at the end of the report. (Limit of 2 double-spaced pages)

D. Evaluation Type and Design: What categories of evaluation are being used (impact evaluation or evaluation of program implementation or both) to answer the evaluation questions in (B)? Describe the evaluation design(s) for answering the question(s), addressing (Limit of 2 double-spaced pages):

1. Threats to internal validity (impact evaluation only);

2. Threats to external validity (for evaluations of program impacts and implementation, the issue is whether the results will be generalizable to other settings)
E. Methods: Describe the methods of your evaluation for answering all of your evaluation questions in Section B above, organized preferably as follows (Limit of 6 double-spaced pages):

1. Population and Sample: Describe the evaluation’s population(s), sample(s) (if any), and probability or purposive sampling plan(s) (if any). In many evaluations, everyone in the population or sample may or may not be included in the evaluation. If some people are excluded, describe the eligibility criteria (or inclusion/exclusion criteria) that define what people are in vs. out of the evaluation. This section also should report the expected number of cases in each sample (sample size) or population (population size).

2. Quantitative Measures: In this section, you should describe the quantitative measures (if any) that you will collect from each population or sample to answer the evaluation questions in Section B (ignore this section if all questions require qualitative information). In writing the text this section, you may construct a Table to document the quantitative measures of the evaluation (the Table goes in the Appendix), and your text should review the contents of the Table. The Table should list the evaluation’s dependent and independent measures that you plan to collect to answer the evaluation questions. The Tables should be organized into columns. For instance, the first column would list the dependent measures followed by the independent measures. The second column, for example, might indicate the question(s) in Section C that each measure will be used to answer (or the measures could be grouped by question). The third column might indicate the source of the measure, such as a survey, medical claims, program records, or other sources. If the measure is from the literature, another column would cite the first author of the publication that developed or used the measure (and put the full citation in your reference list). A final column might note the reliability and validity of the key measures published in previous studies. If reliability and validity are unknown, please briefly note in the text the implications of this missing information for the evaluation. [NOTE: surveys (such as mail, telephone, Web, e-mail) with closed-ended (multiple choice) responses are defined as quantitative measures.]
   a. Dependent variable(s):
      - Impact evaluation: definition and measurement of program outcomes
      - Program implementation: definition and measurement of program outcomes, activities, costs, participants’ exposure to the program, fidelity and so forth, depending on applicability.
   b. Independent variables(s), which may affect outcomes or program implementation. For example, outcomes or attitudes about the program may be different for men vs. women (gender is an independent variable); whether a client is in the treatment or control group.

3. Qualitative Information: describe the qualitative information (if any) that you plan to collect to answer one or more questions in Section B (ignore this section if all questions require quantitative measures). Secondary sources of qualitative information can be, for example, program documents, records, or chart reviews. Primary sources include open-ended, semi-structured interviews of program clients or managers and focus groups. Describe methods for assuring the reliability and validity of the information here or in No. 5 below.
4. Data Collection: describe your data collection plans, including:
   a. Description of the data collection plan, including the recruitment of individuals to participate in data collection, obtaining informed consent of participants, whether incentives for participation will be offered, whether data collected will be anonymous or not, and if not, how confidentiality will be protected, and any plans to follow-up and re-contact participants.

   b. If your evaluation will use data gathering tools that already exist, please include them in the Appendix. [Note: if you are conducting a survey, the questionnaire is not required for this Report.]

   c. For evaluations conducting semi-structured interviews or focus groups, this section should describe the qualitative information that will be collected, and the draft qualitative questions must be included in the Appendix. Data collection protocols for collecting information from program records, medical charts and other sources also should be described.

   d. IRB and HIPAA considerations may exist in your evaluation. If the evaluation is defined as research and IRB review is required, briefly describe the plan for obtaining IRB review and approval. IRB review also may be required if the evaluation will be collecting information regulated by HIPAA. Note any ethical considerations, such as conflicts of interest, that may exist in the evaluation.

5. Data Analysis: describe your plan for quantitative and qualitative data analyses. The goal of this section is to describe how you will analyze the quantitative measures or qualitative information to answer each question in Section B. For quantitative measures, please include sample tables (or figures) displaying how you plan to present the results in an Appendix. Qualitative analyses should describe how the reliability of content coding or other qualitative data collection will be assessed.

6. Power. If you are doing an impact evaluation, describe the statistical power for detecting a significant difference for the key outcomes, based on the expected number of cases. That is, how big of a difference in your main outcome variable will you be able to detect for the sample or population size? If you are doing a process evaluation and are making key comparisons of two or more groups in the program (for example, comparing program attendance for men and women clients), how big of a difference (for example, in attendance) will you be able to detect between the two groups? Because process evaluations often make many comparisons like this, power issues should be limited to the main comparisons.

F. Describe the logistics of your research in terms of (Limit of 2 double-spaced pages):
   1. The characteristics of the setting in which it is being carried out;
   2. Its requirements in terms of personnel, space, equipment, and means of financing;
   3. Estimated timeline for completing the evaluation; and
   4. Discussion of problems/obstacles you may have encountered and your assessment of how to deal with them.
WEB SITES


AnSWR (Analysis Software for Word-based Records) is a free software available on the Center for Disease Control website. AnSWR can help you electronically organize your qualitative data into common categories that can be used to develop themes. The CDC website for AnSWR (found below) gives further explanation of qualitative data, how AnSWR can be used and directions for downloading the software.
http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/software/answr.htm


Community Tool Box website at: http://ctb.ku.edu/ Resources for conducting community-based evaluations.

Diversity Rx.  A clearinghouse of information on how to meet the language and cultural needs of minorities, immigrants, refugees, and other diverse populations seeking health care (http://www.DiversityRx.org)

Empowerment Evaluation.  This is the Home Page for the Collaborative, Participatory and Empowerment topical interest group of the American Evaluation Association (http://homepage.mac.com/profdavidf/empowermentevaluation.htm) (and his blog) http://eevaluation.blogspot.com/).

Health and Psychosocial Instruments:  Search for finding scales to measure self-efficacy, depression and many, many other concepts.  (http://healthlinks.washington.edu/contentBrowser.jsp?ctype=1&segment=H)

The HRET Health Disparities Toolkit gives hospitals, health systems, clinics, and health plans the information and resources needed for collecting race, ethnicity, and primary language data from patients.  In order to make this invaluable Toolkit more accessible to all health care providers, the Toolkit is now available free of charge.  Go to (http://www.hretdisparities.org) to access the new Toolkit.

Health Services Research Methods (sponsored by AcademyHealth):  www.HSRmethods.org

Health Services Research Methodology Core Library Recommendations, 2007

International Health and Evaluation: Check the Web site for “MEASURE Evaluation,” which is one of five components of the “Monitoring and Evaluation to Assess and Use Results” (MEASURE) ten-year effort, funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development’s (USAID) Bureau of Global Health (BGH): http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/home.html

The Knowledge Base: An Online Research Methods Textbook.  This site provides all kinds of useful information on research methods that can aid in the development of evaluation designs (http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/).
Practihc (Pragmatic Randomized Controlled Trials in HealthCare) is a European Union-funded converted action which provides open-access tools, training and mentoring to researchers in developing countries who are interested in designing and conducting pragmatic randomized controlled trials of healthcare interventions. http://www.practihc.org/index.htm

Rutgers Cooperative Extension, Procedures for Program Evaluation and Research. The Web site contains basic methods for evaluating education programs and conducting surveys, with links to other sites (http://www.rce.rutgers.edu/evaluation/).

Resources to Help You Learn and Use Stata. UCLA has a website with lots of information on how to use the Stata statistical software package, including examples of Stata data analysis and output (http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/).

Sample size/Power Calculations: The name of the software is GLIMMPSE and you can find it at: http://glimmpse.samplesizeshop.org/

Statistics Homepage. The site can be a useful source for information about various kinds of statistical techniques (http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html).
