HPM 472.001 Program Evaluation in Health Care  
(Three Credit Hours)  
Department of Health Policy and Management  
Gillings School of Global Public Health  
Spring 2018 Syllabus  
Michael Hooker Research Center 0003 (Lower Atrium)  
Mondays and Wednesdays, 11:15 AM -- 12:30 PM  

Instructor: John E. Paul, PhD, MSPH  
Clinical Professor  
Office: 1102-B McGavran-Greenberg  

E-mail: paulj@email.unc.edu  
Phone: 919-966-7373  

Course Overview  
This course provides an overview of the key concepts, methods, and approaches in the field of evaluation research, with a focus on health care programs. Practical experience will be gained by students choosing an actual program as a semester-long project, and developing an evaluation plan for the program as the final course deliverable. The class will cover both quantitative and qualitative approaches in evaluation, and guest health services researchers/evaluation practitioners will provide both methodological insights as well as real-world issues around evaluation implementation and interpretation. At the end of the course students should feel knowledgeable and competent in taking on active, well-informed roles in public and private evaluation projects. Depending upon the student’s focus this course can count toward credits for the SPH Global Health Certificate.

Course Objectives and HPM Competencies  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Learning Objective</th>
<th>HPM Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand and critique the major theoretical approaches, techniques, and methods involved in evaluation research</td>
<td>Professional Literacy; Analytical Thinking; Strategic Orientation; Systems Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand and prepare key components of an evaluation plan, including logic models and literature reviews, and be able to integrate them into a formal evaluability assessment/evaluation plan</td>
<td>Information Seeking; Analytical Thinking; Strategic Orientation; Innovative Thinking; Communication Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understand, interpret and prepare responses to RFPs/RFAs from governmental and non-governmental funding agencies</td>
<td>Analytical Thinking; Self-Confidence; Professionalism; Communication Skills; Team Dynamics; Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Understand the practical constraints in evaluation research—budgets, time, data, and political context—and be able to formulate strategies and approaches for addressing them

Strategic Orientation; Political Savvy; Information Seeking; Change Management; Project Management;

5. Gain and demonstrate confidence and professional competence in evaluation research methods and approaches

Professionalism; Self-Confidence; Interpersonal Awareness and Emotional Intelligence; Reputation Management

Resources and Texts

Website

All students will be enrolled on the Sakai course website. The Sakai site will be used for announcements, schedule changes, resource material, and access to readings and other course documents. All assignments and deliverables will be turned in and returned via the Sakai Assignment Tool.

Required Texts:

- Bamberger M., Real World Evaluation, Sage, 2006/2012 (“RWE”). Either 1st or 2nd editions OK.
  This text is a very practical text with a strong developing country, field setting focus. For those students interested in global health it is highly recommended as almost a field manual. The text has lots of useful checklists, and helpful appendixes. First or second edition of the text are OK as long as the sections/chapters are mapped accurately to the topics specified.

- Trochim, W., Research Methods: The Essential Knowledge Base, 2nd ed. Centage, 2016 (“TR”)  
  This book is an encyclopedia of research design and analysis methods, and a reference book worth keeping. The book is linked to student web resources; access will be provided.

Optional Text

  This text is a practical and straightforward primer with useful checklists.

Supplemental Readings and Resources:

Other suggested/optional texts/reading/resources are posted on Sakai or will be otherwise distributed as the semester progresses. Course e-Reserves can be accessed through Sakai.

Requirements and Expectations

Evaluation Plan

1. Program Choice. Students will select an agency and a program to study in depth across the semester with regard to evaluation. There will be a number of key deliverables related to the selected program, beginning with program identification and selection, discussed over the first two weeks of the semester. In thinking about what agency and program to study, students should reflect on their interests
as well as internship and/or career aspirations. Investigating an organization or program in depth could be very helpful for advancing ones chances of landing a summer internship or subsequent job offer. Another way to identify a program would be to think in terms of the required Master’s Paper for the MSPH degree. Exploring questions and data availability around a specific organization could lead to a productive and interesting Master’s Paper topic. Finally, if none of these avenues prove fruitful, the instructor can help identify some local existing project/program opportunities. The key requirement is to identify an actual program. In a few cases, the work you do could actually be directly applicable to the agency or organization, which would be great; in any case, the work across the semester should provide an enlightening “real-world” experience.

A drawback of focusing on an actual program, however, is that much analytical/evaluative work may have already been accomplished, making your original thinking and value-added more difficult to demonstrate. Moreover, there could be a lot of information easily available and very tempting to “overharvest.” It is critical that all sources be fully cited, and that any occurrence or appearance of plagiarism be carefully avoided. When in doubt, over-document! For questions regarding plagiarism and proper citation of sources please see the tutorial on the Health Sciences Library website, http://www.hsl.unc.edu/services/tutorials/plagiarismtutorial/intro.html.

2. Logic Model and Stakeholder Analysis. Following identification/selection of your program, a program logic model and stakeholder analysis will be prepared. Logic models (also called “program theory models” and “intervention models”) should demonstrate and communicate a detailed understanding of the program and its goals and impact from a systems perspective, e.g., inputs, activities, outputs, environment. Examples of logic models will be discussed in class, and guidelines are available in the supplementary readings. The stakeholder analysis should be comprehensive and can be displayed in a variety of manners as well.

3. Literature Review. An abbreviated literature review related to the program and its evaluability (e.g., examples of methods used elsewhere) will also be prepared. This is not the kind of detailed, substantive literature review that might be expected for a Master’s Paper or dissertation, but a more typical evaluation research literature review done to get oneself (or one’s boss or organization) up to speed and on board with the proposed evaluation. The challenge is to present background on your selected project/program and a review of what is known about the impact of such projects, in a short, concise document of 2-3 pages, maximum. It is suggested that the lit review consist of a ½ page (~250 words) executive summary, followed by approximately 8-10 annotated references (i.e., the citation plus 1-2 sentences or a short paragraph identifying the relevant points). References from the web are acceptable, but must be as fully cited as possible, beyond just providing the .url, e.g. author, organization, date of publication/posting, web accession date, etc. The web can be a great place to start by identifying and then seeking out the more robust, primary sources of information. Published, peer-reviewed literature is of course the “gold standard,” but not always feasible or even complete among the wealth of online and other information sources that are available. An appendix to the abbreviated lit review should describe your search strategy or approach, key words, and results in terms of a flow chart diagram (examples will be provided).

4. Data Collection Strategy. A strategy and suggested approach needs to be developed to address identified data needs as part of the evaluation design. The strategy could include prototype data collection instruments, structured interview guides, focus group protocols, or administrative data set specifications. Be sure to consider human subjects/IRB issues in your strategy.

5. Final Evaluation Plan. The final deliverable for the semester will be tying together of the above material into an expanded final evaluation plan. Relevant sections of this deliverable should reflect comments received on earlier segments, and contain additional value-added material that you may have identified about the program. The final deliverable should not exceed 15-20 double-spaced pages

---

1 e.g., domestic vs. international; prevention vs. treatment; mothers and children vs. LTC; for profit vs. not-for-profit, etc.
including your revised logic model, but not counting an annotated bibliography (i.e., a revised literature review) and appendixes with data collection prototype(s), as appropriate. Submitting a draft plan is optional two weeks before the final due date. Please do not submit preliminary deliverables in “.pdf” format as we cannot then annotate or comment on them in that format. Except for the final submission submit in MS Word only: “.docx” or “.doc”.

Other Course Activities and Requirements:

Semester Planning Using a Gantt Chart or other Scheduling Tool

An additional class requirement is to develop a Gantt Chart (or other program planning tool) for assignments and deliverables, for this class and your Spring Semester overall. The personal Gantt Chart or work schedule is due early in the semester. In addition to providing exposure to systematic planning, the Gantt Chart should also help you navigate the semester with less stress!

IRB Certification Training

Understanding issues around involvement of human subjects in research is critically important. These issues fall under the jurisdiction of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) or Ethics Review Committees. Through completion of UNC’s online IRB certification course for social and behavioral research (http://ohre.unc.edu/educ.php) students will have a useful, if not required, credential for part-time research jobs, summer internships, etc. Unless already in place, students should complete and verify certification prior to Spring Break. This requirement will be graded on a Complete/Incomplete basis.

Critique of Published Program Evaluation

In place of a final exam, all students will be asked to identify a published program evaluation from the peer-reviewed literature and provide a 3-4 page double-spaced summary and critique of the evaluation, focusing especially on the design, methods, and conclusions. Students must identify the article they propose to critique for pre-approval by the instructor before Spring Break.

Mini-Proposal/RFP Exercise

In order to expose students to “real-world” Requests for Proposals (RFPs), there will be an RFP “rapid response” exercises done in small teams. Existing RFPs from government or private sources will be condensed and assigned for rapid response proposals, which will be presented and critiqued in class.

Class Participation

This class will be conducted in a highly collegial manner and interaction with and learning from peers, as well as with the instructor and guests, will be critical. Regular class attendance is expected and active participation in the discussions will constitute an important part of the class participation grade. Further, guest experts will be providing substantive, skill-oriented presentations and real-world examples that will be important for the achievement of course objectives. Unless impossible, let the instructor know by email ahead of time if you will not be able to attend class on any particular day.
## Deliverables, Due Dates, and Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Level of Assessment</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gantt Chart/ Work Plan for semester</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1/24</td>
<td>Complete/Incomplete</td>
<td>Planning for all Spring Semester courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Final Program Selection (initial due 1/22)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1/29</td>
<td>Complete/Incomplete</td>
<td>Focus for semester-long evaluation plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Final Program Logic Model and Stakeholder Analysis (draft due 2/5)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>2/28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mid Term exam</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Terms and concepts focus; “professional literacy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IRB Certification</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td>Complete/Incomplete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Selection of article for critique</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>3/21</td>
<td>Complete/Incomplete</td>
<td>Critique of a published evaluation will be in place of a final exam (critique due 4/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Focused literature review</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>3/28</td>
<td>Complete/Incomplete</td>
<td>2-3 pages, with executive summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RFP Exercise</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All team members receive same points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Data collection strategy</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>4/9</td>
<td>Complete/Incomplete</td>
<td>Instrument critique(s) possible as alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evaluation article critique</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>4/18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3-4 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Final Evaluation Plan, including presentation on 4/11 or 4/16 (opt. draft plan due 4/11)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>4/25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15 - 20 pages excluding figures, bibliography, and appendixes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Instructor Assessment</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Class participation, contribution, and engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Possible Points** | **100**  
L: <70  P: 70-79  P+: 80-89  H: 90-100

The evaluation article critique will be in place of a final exam. Except for your Final Evaluation Plan do not submit deliverables in “.pdf” format; submit in MS Word only: “.docx” or “.doc”. Double-space, one-inch margins for all documents. Be sure to put your name on the document itself, and begin each deliverable file name with: *lastname_finitial*. 

---
UNC Honor Code

The principles of academic honesty, integrity, and responsible citizenship govern the performance of all academic work and student conduct at UNC. Your acceptance of enrollment in the University presupposes a commitment to the principles embodied in the Code of Student Conduct and a respect for this most significant Carolina tradition. Your reward is in the practice of these principles. Your participation in this course comes with the expectation that your work will be completed in full observance of the Honor Code. Academic dishonesty in any form is unacceptable, because any breach in academic integrity, however small, strikes destructively at the University's life and work. If you have any questions about your responsibility or the responsibility of faculty members under the Honor Code, please consult with someone in either the Office of the Student Attorney General (966-4084) or the Office of the Dean of Students (966-4042). Read “The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance” (http://instrument.unc.edu). Guidance on plagiarism: http://www.lib.unc.edu/instruct/plagiarism/.

Encouraging, Recognizing, and Valuing Diversity

Diversity includes consideration of: (1) life experiences, including type, variety, uniqueness, duration, and intensity; and (2) factors related to “diversity of presence,” including, among others, age, economic circumstances, ethnic identification, family educational attainment, disability, gender, geographic origin, maturity, race, religion, sexual orientation, social position, and veteran status.

Leveraging diversity is supported by the mission statement of HPM. In the classroom, diversity strengthens the products, enriches the learning, and broadens the perspectives of all in the class. Diversity requires an atmosphere of inclusion and tolerance, which oftentimes challenges our own closely-held ideas, as well as our personal comfort zones. The results, however, create a sense of community and promote excellence in the learning environment. This class will follow principles of inclusion, respect, tolerance, and acceptance that support the values of diversity.

Course Evaluation

The Department of Health Policy and Management is participating in the Course Evaluation System, the university's new online course evaluation tool, enabled at the end of each semester. Your responses will be anonymous, with feedback provided in the aggregate; open-ended comments will be shared with instructors, but not identified with individual students. Your participation is a course requirement, as providing constructive feedback is a professional expectation. Such feedback is critical to improving the quality of our courses, as well as providing input to the assessment of your instructors.

Electronic Devices

Use of electronic devices in this class is encouraged for taking notes, or perhaps quick look-up of information relevant to the discussion. Use of electronic devices (including cell phones) for multi-tasking, checking email, sending instant messages, playing games, etc. is inappropriate and oftentimes rude to the presenter as well as inconsiderate to other class members. Complaints about electronic devices in the classroom come from students themselves, as well as from lecturers and guests. Please limit the use of electronic devices only to class-relevant activities.