**HPM 472 Program Evaluation in Health Care**

**(Three Credit Hours)**

**Department of Health Policy and Management**

**Gillings School of Global Public Health**

**Spring 2016 Syllabus**

**2304 McGavran Greenberg**

**Time: Monday – Wednesday (11:15 – 12:30pm)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Instructor: Becky Slifkin, PhD, MHA  Office: 1116 Rosenau  Email: [becky\_slifkin@unc.edu](mailto:becky_slifkin@unc.edu)  Phone: 919-843-1219 | TA: Krutika Amin  PhD candidate  Office: Office hours upon request  Email: [kba9@live.unc.edu](mailto:kba9@live.unc.edu) |

**Course Overview**

This course provides an overview of the key concepts, methods, and approaches in the field of evaluation, 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. The class will cover both quantitative and qualitative evaluation approaches, and guest lecturers will provide 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.

**Course Objectives and HPM Competencies**

*Course Learning Objective HPM Competencies*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Describe the practical and methodological basics of conducting an evaluation | Performance measurement  Analytical thinking  Strategic orientation  Systems thinking |
| 2. | 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 | Information seeking  Analytical thinking  Strategic orientation  Innovative thinking  Initiative  Communications skills |
| 3. | Interpret and prepare responses to RFP/RFAs from governmental or non-governmental funding agencies | Analytical thinking  Communication skills  Team dynamics  Innovative Thinking  Performance measurement |
| 4. | Describe 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  Initiative  Project management |
| 5. | Gain and demonstrate confidence and professional competencies in evaluation research methods and approaches | Professionalism  Self-confidence  Strategic Orientation |

**Resources and Texts**

**Website**

All students are enrolled on the Sakai course website. The Sakai site will be used for announcements, schedule changes, guidance material, and access to readings and other course documents (aside from the readings in the assigned text books). Assignments and deliverables will also be turned in and returned via the Sakai Assignment Tool.

**Texts** (Available at the UNC Bookstore or can be purchased independently online):

Davidson, JE, *Evaluation Methodology Basics*, Sage, 2005

This is a practical text with a straightforward approach and useful checklists. Referred to in schedule as EMB.

Trochim, W, et al. *Research Methods: The Essential Knowledge Base*, Cengage Learning 2016.

This book is an encyclopedia of research design and analysis methods, and a reference book worth keeping. Referred to in schedule as RM.

**Requirements and Expectations**

**Evaluation Plan**

Students will develop an evaluation plan for an agency and a program within it that they have selected. There will be a number of key deliverables related to the evaluation plan, as discussed below. 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 an interesting Master’s paper topic. The key requirement is to identify an actual program. In a few cases, the work could actually be directly applicable to the agency or organization. Regardless, the work across the semester should provide a taste of a “real-world” experience. If the student is unable to identify a program, the instructor can help identify some local opportunities.

Examples of evaluation plans from previous years will be posted on Sakai.

One drawback to focusing on an actual program is that much analytical/evaluative work may have already been accomplished, making the student’s original thinking and value-added more difficult to demonstrate. Moreover, there could be a lot of information easily available and very tempting to over-harvest. 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 information on the Health Sciences Library website: <http://guides.lib.unc.edu/c.php?g=9028&p=45251>.

***Program Choice***. A brief description of the program for which you write an evaluation plan is due on January 25th. If you have identified the program prior to the 25th, please let the instructor know. **It could be to your benefi**t—the guest lecturer on meta analyses/literature reviews who is speaking on the 25th would like to use examples from class.

***Background/description of program.*** (2%) A more in depth description of your program choice is due February 3nd. This description should be less than a page in length, and should include the following information:

* A statement of why this program was created and the need it was meant to address
* Overview of the activities or services to be evaluated
* Stage of development of the program to be evaluated (eg, is the program still in planning, has it been implemented—and if so, how recently; is the program completed and this is a post-hoc evaluation)
* Environmental context within which the program is being evaluated

***Literature Review***: (10%) Students will prepare an abbreviated literature review related to the program and its evaluability. 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 the program’s history and 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 half page (~250 words) executive summary, followed by approximately 2-3 pages that *synthesize the findings*. Your appendix should include approximately 8-10 annotated references (i.e., the citation plus 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 better, but not always feasible or even complete among the wealth of online and other information sources that are available. Your appendix should also describe your search strategy or approach, key words, and results in terms of a flow chart diagram (examples will be provided). The draft literature review is due February 15th.

***Logic Model***. (10%) Students will prepare a program logic model that demonstrates a detailed understanding of the program, its goals, and impact from a systems perspective, e.g., inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, environment. Logic modeling will be discussed in class, and guidelines are available in the supplementary readings. A draft of the logic model is due February 22nd, and the final logic model is due March 21 (after receiving feedback from instructors).

***Evaluation questions:*** (4%) A paragraph describing the “big Picture” evaluation questions, whether the evaluation will assess absolute or relative merit/worth, and the audience for the evaluation is due March 21.

***Data Collection Strategy***: (10%) Students will develop a data collection strategy to obtain data needed for the evaluation. The data collection strategy may include one or multiple methods (for example, use of secondary data, a short questionnaire, a structured interview guide, or a focus group protocol) and should demonstrate knowledge of survey research methods and issues as presented in the texts and in class. You will need to consider IRB issues as part of your data collection strategy. A draft data collection strategy is due March 30th.

***Final Evaluation Plan***. (10%) The final deliverable for the evaluation plan will be tying together all of the above material into an expanded final evaluation plan, including the program need and description, evaluation questions, literature review, logic model, and data collection strategy. The final plan should reflect the 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 10-12 double spaced pages including your revised logic model (but not including your annotated bibliography) or appendices with data collection prototype(s), as appropriate. Please submit all materials in word format only: “.docx” or “.doc”. The final evaluation plan is due April 22nd.

**Other Course Activities and Requirements**

***Semester Planning Using a Gantt Chart or other Scheduling Tool***. (2%) Students will develop a Gantt Chart (or other program planning tool) for assignments and deliverables for both this class and the Spring Semester overall. The personal Gantt Chart or work schedule is due January 27nd. In addition to providing exposure to systematic planning, the Gantt Chart should also help you navigate the semester with less stress!

***Administrative Data Exercise***. (10%) Students will work in groups to analyze secondary data as a mock evaluation component. Groups will present their analysis of the administrative data via powerpoint in class on April 4th.

***IRB Certification Training***. (2%) 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 training and submit their certification to the instructor by April 13th.

***Mini-Proposal/RFP Exercise***. (10%) In order to expose students to “real-world” Requests for Proposals (RFPs), there will be one RFP “rapid response” exercises done in small teams of 4-5 students. Existing RFPs from government or private sources will be condensed and assigned to groups to design rapid response proposals, which will be presented and critiqued in class in the same manner as the administrative data exercise. The information should be presented in powerpoint, on April 13th.

***Critique of Published Program Evaluation***. (10%) In place of a final exam, students will provide a 3-5 page double-spaced summary and critique of a published program evaluation, focusing especially on the design, methods, and conclusions. Instructors will provide 3-4 evaluations for students to choose from. The final critique is due April 27th.

***Class Participation***. Interaction with and learning from peers, the instructor, and guests, will be critical. Regular class attendance and active participation in the discussions is expected. 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. If a student fails to actively participate or attend classes, their grade can be lowered at the discretion of the instructor (e.g., H- to P).

**Deliverables, Due Dates, and Grading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Deliverable | Level of Assessment | Due Date | Total Points | Comments |
| 1. | Evaluation plan program choice | Individual | 1/25 | Not graded |  |
| 2. | Gantt Chart/Work Plan for semester | Individual | 1/27 | 2=Complete 0=Incomplete | Planning for all spring semester courses |
| 3. | Program background/description | Individual | 2/3 | 2 | 1 page background summary of the program you are planning to evaluate |
| 4. | Focused literature review | Individual | 2/15 | 10 | 2-3 pages, with executive summary (and separate Appendix with annotated bibliography) |
| 5. | Draft logic model | Individual | 2/22 | Not graded |  |
| 4. | Midterm exam | Individual | 3/9 | 20 | Terms and concepts focus—“professional literacy” |
| 5. | Final logic model | Individual | 3/21 | 10 |  |
| 6. | Evaluation questions and audience | Individual | 3/21 | 4 |  |
| 7. | Data collection strategy | Individual | 3/30 | 10 |  |
| 8. | Administrative data presentation | Team | 4/4 | 10 | All team members receive the same points, unless someone consistently fails to contribute. (Required peer evaluations will be factored into the grade) |
| 9. | IRB Certification | Individual | 4/13 | 2=Complete 0=Incomplete |  |
| 10. | RFP Exercise | Team | 4/13 | 10 | All team members receive the same points, unless someone consistently fails to contribute. (Required peer evaluations will be factored into the grade) |
| 10. | Final evaluation plan | Individual | 4/22 | 10 | 10-12 pages excluding figures, bibliography, and appendices |
| 11. | Evaluation article critique | Individual | 4/27 | 10 | 3-5 pages |
|  | Total Possible Points |  |  | 100 | L: <75, P: 75-89, H: 90-100 |

There will be no final exam. Except for final evaluation plan do not submit deliverables in “.pdf” format; submit in MS Word only: “.docx” or “.doc”. Double-space, 12 point font, one-inch margins for all documents. Be sure to put your name on the document itself, and begin each deliverable file name with: *lastname\_firstinitial*.

**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/>.

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 multitasking, 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 class room come from students themselves, as well as from lecturers and guests. Please limit the use of electronic devices only to class-relevant activities.

**Readings and Requirements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Monday Jan. 11** | **Session 1: Course Objectives** |
| *Objectives* | * Understand and be able to describe course requirements and expectations * Learn definition and key characteristics of program evaluation |
| *Readings* | EMB Chapter 1  GAO. Designing Evaluations. GAO-12-208G. Jan. 2012. <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/588146.pdf> Chapter 1 |
| ***Assignments Due*** | **Come prepared to briefly introduce yourself and describe any evaluation experience you have, any health care program delivery experience you have, and whether your post-graduation goals might include evaluation activities.** |
| **Wednesday, Jan. 13** | **Session 2: Using evaluation logic** |
| *Objectives* | * In class exercise: Use an everyday experience to understand what it means to make explicit evaluative criteria, standards and judgments. * Become familiar with the community health center program, as we will use this program as an example throughout the semester. |
| *Readings* | <http://bphc.hrsa.gov/about/what-is-a-health-center/index.html>  <http://bphc.hrsa.gov/programrequirements/index.html>  <http://bphc.hrsa.gov/qualityimprovement/clinicalquality/qualityimprovement.html> |
| **Monday, Jan. 18** | **MLK Birthday no class** |
| **Wednesday, Jan. 20** | **Session 3: Purpose and Scope** |
| *Objectives* | * Understand how to determine the purpose, scope, and “big picture” questions of an evaluation * Differentiate types of evaluations and describe examples * Understand how evaluation questions should relate to the stage of program implementation |
| *Readings* | EMB Chapter 2  GAO. Designing Evaluations. GAO-12-208G. Jan. 2012. <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/588146.pdf> Chapter 2 |
| **monday, Jan. 25** | **Session 4: Meta Analysis-Literature Review**  **Asheley Skinner, PhD** |
| *Objectives* | * Identify literature search strategies * Be able to diagram search strategies * Describe keys steps in synthesizing literature * Gain familiarity with different reference managers |
| *Readings* | UNC Writing Center. Literature Reviews. <http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/literature-reviews/>  PubMed  http://guides.lib.unc.edu/pubmedtentips (particularly #1, 2, 4, 5) |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **Initial program selection: provide a short description of the program for which you are creating an evaluation plan.** |
| **wednesday, Jan. 27** | **Session 5: Engaging Stakeholders** |
| *Objectives* | * Describe the reasons to engage stakeholders in program evaluations * Identify key stakeholders to involve in the process * Identify the different points to gather stakeholder input |
| *Readings* | CDC. Introduction to Program Evaluation for Public Health Programs: A Self-Study Guide. US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. October 2011. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/eval/guide/CDCEvalManual.pdf>  Pages 13-20 |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **Turn in Gantt chart that includes your work plan for your semester. Include the deliverables for all your courses.** |
| **Monday, Feb.1** | **Academy Health Policy Institute**  **No class** |
| **Wednesday, Feb. 3** | **Session 6: Evaluative Criteria** |
| *Objectives* | * Learn how to select evaluative criteria * Understand the potential problems with only assessing a program’s stated goal(s) * Understand the benefit of a goal free evaluation * Learn how to conduct a needs assessment |
| *Readings* | EMB Chapter 3  GAO. Pages 25-top of 26 |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **Provide a 1 page summary of the program for which you are developing an evaluation plan.** |
| **Monday, Feb. 8th** | **Session 7: Logic Models**  **Krutika Amin** |
| *Objectives* | * Describe different approaches to logic models * Define components of logic models that provide context for evaluation plan * Design and describe logic models using program theory |
| *Readings* | W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Logic Model Development Guide. January 2004. Available for download at: [http://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide.](http://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide)  *Optional*:  University of Kansas Workgroup for Community Health and Development. Community Tool Box. Developing a Logic Model or Theory of Change. <http://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/overview/models-for-community-health-and-development/logic-model-development/main>  Earp JA and Ennett ST. Conceptual models for health education research and practice. Health Education Research. 1999; 6(2): 163-171.  Nancholas, S. How to do (or not to do) a logical framework. Health Policy and Planning. 1998; 13(2). |
| **Wednesday, Feb. 10** | **Session 8: Focusing Evaluation Purpose and Design** |
| *Objectives* | * Understand temporal considerations in evaluation focus * Understand data considerations when designing an evaluation * Identify key indicators to measure program performance * Learn the importance of choosing measurements and sources of data based on evaluative criteria and who will use evaluation information |
| *Readings* | EMB Chapter 4  CDC. Introduction to Program Evaluation for Public Health Programs: A Self-Study Guide. US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. October 2011. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/eval/guide/CDCEvalManual.pdf>  Pages 42-55  GAO. Pages 18 – 24, 28 – top of 29  Habicht JB, Victora CG, Vaughan JP. Evaluation designs for adequacy, plausibility and probability of public health programme performance and impact. *International Journal of Epidemiology,* 28(1): 10-18. 1999. |
| **Monday, Feb. 15** | **Session 9: Quantitative Evaluation and Quasi Experimental Design** |
| *Objectives* | * Explain advantages and challenges of randomized experiments * Recognize and describe commonly used quasi-experimental designs (QED) * Assess strengths, weaknesses, and considerations in selecting QED * Recognize threats to validity and ways to strengthen design * Outline and interpret results figures and potential impact of selection threats |
| *Readings* | RM 206-225, 258-274 |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **Turn in your focused literature review. It should include an abstract, 2-3 page synthesis of findings, and an Appendix with an annotated bibliography. The literature review should include 8-10 references.** |
| **Wednesday, Feb. 17** | **Session 10: Overview of Questionnaire Design and Writing**  **Bryce Reeve, PhD**  **Associate Professor**  **Health Policy and Management** |
| *Objectives* | * Describe different question designs and response strategies * Explain the flow of questions * Identify bad question designs * Measurement error, comprehension, recall, cognitive load, sensitive topics |
| *Readings* | RM 115 (section 5.2) – 140 Reliability and validity |
| **Monday, Feb. 22** | **Session 11: Secondary data** |
| *Objectives* | * Recognize commonly used secondary administrative data sources, both national survey data and program administrative data * Understand uses of secondary data for responding to RFPs (background and problem statements) * Understand uses of secondary data for quantitative evaluations |
| *Readings* | Smith AK, Ayanian JZ, Covinsky KE, et al. Conducting High-Value Secondary Dataset Analysis: An Introductory Guide and Resources. J Gen Intern Med Aug 2011; 26(8): 920-929. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3138974/> |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **Turn in a draft of your program logic model** |
| **Wednesday, Feb. 24** | **Sessions 12: Cost Analyses** |
| *Objectives* | * Explain importance of appraisal and selection of socioeconomically viable programs * Describe approaches to analyze the financial and economic impact of a program * Examine key principles of economic analyses |
| *Readings* | McEwan PJ. Cost-effectiveness analysis of education and health interventions in developing countries. J Development Effectiveness. 2012: 4(2): 189-213. |
| **Monday, Feb. 29** | **Session 13: Qualitative Methods—In-Depth Interviews, Case Studies, Written Documents, Direct Observation** |
| *Objectives* | * Explain when qualitative data are appropriate to use * Identify different forms of qualitative data and their strengths and weaknesses |
| *Readings* | RM 56-73  *Optional Reading*:  USAID. Conducting Key Informant Interviews. Performance Monitoring and Evaluation TIPS. 1996, Number 2. <http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNABS541.pdf> |
| **Wednesday, Mar 2** | **Session 14: Survey method choice and Writing Questions for Evaluations** |
| *Objectives* | * Compare different methods of collecting primary data * Learn considerations for writing survey or interview questions |
| *Readings* | RM 172-193 (up to section 7.5)  *Optional reading:*  Taylor-Powell E. Questionnaire Design: Asking questions with a purpose. University of Wisconsin Cooperate Extension. May 1998. Available at: <http://learningstore.uwex.edu/assets/pdfs/g3658-2.pdf> |
| **Monday, Mar. 7** | **Session 15: Qualitative Methods—Focus Groups Sandra Greene, DrPH** |
| *Objectives* | * Provide in-depth example of one qualitative technique: focus groups * Discuss techniques for developing focus group protocols * Discuss techniques for focus group moderation * Provide examples of how focus groups can be used in research |
| *Readings* | Eliot & Associates. Guidelines for Conducting a Focus Group. 2005. Available at: <http://assessment.aas.duke.edu/documents/How_to_Conduct_a_Focus_Group.pdf> |
| *Assignments* | None |
| **Wednesday, Mar. 9** | **Session 16: MID TERM EXAM** |
| **Monday, March 14** | **SPRING BREAK** |
| **Wednesday, Mar 16** | **SPRING BREAK** |
| **Monday, March 21** | **Session 17: Midterm review – Data Collection Strategy Pair and Share** |
| *Objectives* | * Work with a partner to get feedback on draft data collection strategy * Be able to use the logic model to explain data collection strategies in evaluation plan * Explain how data collection strategy will capture the data needed for evaluation |
| *Readings* | None |
| ***Assignments Due*** | **Final Program Logic Model due, Evaluation questions due**  **Hand out administrative data exercise** |
| **Wednesday, March 23** | **Session 18: Coding** |
| *Objectives* | * Learn how to code qualitative survey responses |
| *Readings* | Bradley EH, Currey LA, and Devers JK. Qualitative Data Analysis for Health Services Research: Developing Taxonomy, Themes, and Theory. Health Services Research.2007: 42(4): 1758-72. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2006.00684.x/pdf> |
| **Monday, March 28** | **Session 19: Causation and Values in evaluation** |
| *Objectives* | * Understand the difference between association and causation * Learn strategies for inferring causation * Understand the role of values, and the relationship with subjectivity |
| *Readings* | EMB Chapters 5 & 6 |
| **Wednesday, March 30** | **Session 20: Determining Importance** |
| *Objectives* | * Learn reason to determine relative importance of multiple dimensions or components of an evaluation * Understand strategies for determining importance |
| *Readings* | EMB Chapter 7 |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **Data collection strategy** |
| **Monday, April 4** | **Session 21: Applications of Administrative Data and introduce RFP** |
| *Objectives* | * Presentations of analysis of administrative data * Familiarize class with RFP |
| *Readings* | Paul JP, Tilson HH. Use and Opportunities for Administrative Data Bases in Pharmacoeconomic Research. Chapter 121 in Quality of Life and Pharmaeconomics in Clinical Trials. Second Edition. Spilker editor. Available on Sakai.  Ray WA. Policy and Program Analysis Using Administrative Databases. Annals of Internal Medicine. 1997;127:712-718. Available at: <http://annals.org/article.aspx?articleid=710918#LackofConcurrentControls> |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **Presentation of analysis of administrative data in PowerPoint** |
| **Wednesday, Apr. 6** | **Session 22: Balanced Scorecard**  **George Pink, PhD**  **Health Policy and Management** |
| *Objectives* | * Explain how organizations can use a balanced scorecard as part of their program evaluation |
| *Readings* | Zelman WN, Pink GH, Matthais CB. Use of the Balanced Scorecard in Health Care. Journal of Health Care Finance. 2003;29(4):1-16. Available at: <http://kiwinurse.co.nz/Tertiary%20Conference/PDF%27s/2009/General%20Papers/NM%20BSC%20in%20health%20organisations.pdf> |
| **Monday, April 11** | **Session 23: Request For Proposal (RFP) Exercise 1** |
| *Objectives* | * Be able to develop evaluation proposals for rapid turnaround RFP * Identify strategies to reduce costs and time needed for data collection * Describe potential challenges to effective real world evaluation |
| *Readings* | None |
| **Wednesday, April 13** | **Session 24: RFP Exercise 1 Presentations** |
| *Objectives* | * Be able to develop evaluation proposal for rapid turnaround RFP * Identify strategies to reduce costs and time needed for data collection * Describe potential challenges to effective real world evaluation |
| *Readings* | None |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **You need to have completed your IRB certification and printed out the certificate. See:** [**http://research.unc.edu/offices/human-research-ethics/getting-started/training/**](http://research.unc.edu/offices/human-research-ethics/getting-started/training/) **You should obtain the certification for social and behavioral research. If you think your evaluation will involve clinical trials, then you should obtain the biomedical research training.** |
| **Monday, April 18** | **Session 25: Determining Merit** |
| *Objectives* | * Learn reason to determine merit of performance * Understand strategies for determining merit |
| *Readings* | EMB Chapter 8 |
| **Wednesday, April 20** | **Session 26: Synthesis of Findings** |
| *Objectives* | * Learn how to draw overall conclusions from multiple findings |
| *Readings* | EMB Chapter 9 |
| ***Assignments Due*** | **Turn in Final Evaluation Plan** |
| **Monday, April 25** | **Session 27: Ethics in Evaluation: Informed Consent and IRB Issues**  **Charlotte Coley** |
| *Objectives* | * Describe past abuses in human subject research * Explain the need for informed consent and IRB oversight * Understand what studies are subject to IRB review, and which studies may be eligible for expedited review or exemption |
| *Readings* | RM 34-46 |
| **Wednesday, April 27** | **Session 28: Making Recommendations, Course Summary and Evaluation Pams session 27** |
| *Objectives* | * Explore reasons why evaluation studies are underutilized and strategies to promote use of evaluation findings and recommendations. |
| *Readings* | None |
| ***Assignment Due*** | **Turn in evaluation critique** |

**Additional Resources (Note: This bibliography compiled by Karl Umble, PhD, Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Health Policy and Management)**

# **Additional Readings that You Might Find Helpful on Key Topics**

## **Overviews of Program Evaluation and Evaluation Planning; Step by Step Guidelines**

[**Better Evaluation**](http://betterevaluation.org/) **is a web site with excellent resources and guidance for every step in planning an evaluation, along with videos about each stage.** This new site is managed by some leading evaluators from Australia and New Zealand, and contains many links for those involved in international evaluations.

**In addition to CDC and its Guide that we read in this course,** many organizations have produced web-based introductions to program evaluation that you might find helpful personally or for use by staff. A comprehensive site with links to other step-wise frameworks to these is found [here](http://www.cdc.gov/eval/resources/index.htm): <http://www.cdc.gov/eval/resources/index.htm>

**W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook (1998, widely cited and used)**

This handbook is appropriate for any type of program and uses a nine-step approach. Similar conceptually to the CDC Guide but offers more detail an`d helpful discussion on many issues, such as whether to insist on a highly scientific manner of evaluation or the need to be more flexible, and comparing and contrasting data collection tools. Useful worldwide.

<http://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2010/w-k-kellogg-foundation-evaluation-handbook>

**Making Evaluations Matter: A Practical Guide for Evaluators (2011)**

This *quite excellent* guide details a set of practices for making evaluations useful at the ground level. Useful worldwide, but written directly for low-resource environments. It provides more advanced material than the CDC Guide on stakeholder engagement options, learning from evaluation, and evaluating complex programs. Williams and other authors.

<https://www.wageningenur.nl/en/Publication-details.htm?publicationId=publication-way-343035343531>

**UN Development Program Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (2009)**

This lengthy handbook is intended for grantees of the UN Development Programme, but is useful for all evaluators. It is based on a philosophy *of planning for and ensuring* implementation and results and discusses different kinds of evaluations.

<http://Web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>

**Practical Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of Rural Development Projects (recently updated)**

<http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/oe/process/guide/index.htm>

This guide, developed by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), helps project managers improve the quality of monitoring and evaluating in IFAD-supported projects. It is essentially a detailed on-line textbook and would be highly relevant for all countries, but it is written especially for low-resource environments.

**Newcomer, KE, Hatry H, Wholey J. (2010). Planning and designing useful evaluations.**

Chapter 1 in [Wholey, J., Hatry, H., & Newcomer, K. (2010). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation (3rd edition](http://www.themedfomscu.org/media/Handbook_of_Practical_Program_Evaluation.pdf)) [(entire book hyperlinked).](http://www.themedfomscu.org/media/Handbook_of_Practical_Program_Evaluation.pdf) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. A great chapter on creating useful evaluations by some of the most influential writers over the last 30 years. A lot of wisdom in a short space on useful evaluation from start to finish. Duplicates a lot of the recommendations of the CDC guide, but is deeper and stronger on many points. You may want to look at the Table of Contents of this book as a permanent resource – it is an excellent introduction to concepts and skills and available on-line via the hyperlink, and a great overview of this entire course actually. We did not assign it because it mirrors but deepens the CDC Guide. It would be good wisdom for your staff.

## **Logic and Theory of Change Modeling, Exploratory Evaluation, Evaluability Assessment**

* [University of Wisconsin’s comprehensive training site](http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html) on logic models. Has many examples such as these plus training materials for self-teaching or training others:
* <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/pdf/YouthLMswithnarr.pdf>

We like this example because it provides an overall and sub-logic models for a complex initiative.

* + <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/pdf/LM_CNE.pdf>

We like this example because it shows several layers of a complex program to improve community nutrition.

* + <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/pdf/WaterQualityProgram.pdf>

We like this example because it presents indicators and evaluation questions with the logic model.

* The W.K. Kellogg Foundation has an excellent [logic model development guide](http://www.wkkf.org/resource-directory/resource/2006/02/wk-kellogg-foundation-logic-model-development-guide).
* [A Review of Theory of Change in International Development](http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/JSRP/ToC_Lit_Review.pdf)
* Funnell, S., & Rogers, P. (2011). Purposeful Program Theory. Jossey-Bass. This quite excellent book is *available as an e-book through the UNC library web site*. Highly recommended; Rogers is a leading evaluator globally. This is an advanced and practical look at the ways we can use logic models and program theory models in evaluation work.
* [“Developing a Logic Model or Theory of Change](http://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/overview/models-for-community-health-and-development/logic-model-development/main).” Main Section, Checklist, Examples, and Tools. Community Tool Box at the University of Kansas is replete with accessible resources for practitioners on all aspects of evaluation and community initiatives, domestic or global.
* Leviton, L. et al. (2010). Evaluability assessment to improve public health policies, programs, and practices. Annual Review of Public Health, 31:213-233. Great article by leaders at Robert Wood Johnson about successful use of logic models and dialog with stakeholders to frame appropriate evaluations, with many references. Exploratory evaluation is a better word for evaluability assessment.
* Wholey, J. (2004). Evaluability assessment. Chapter 2 in Wholey, J., Hatry, H., & Newcomer, K. (2004). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation (2nd edition). (Classic article on this helpful approach to deciding what to evaluate for a program at a given stage of its development).
* McLaughlin, J.A., & Jordan, G.B. (2010). Using logic models. Chapter 3 in Wholey, J., Hatry, H., & Newcomer, K. (2010). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation (3rd edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (You may wish to look at the Table of Contents of this entire on-line book for things you could use for your self-directed learning. E.g., for a deeper take on stakeholder analysis see Chapter 2 by Bryson and Patton.)

## **Making Evaluations Useful and Stakeholder Engagement**

* [Making Evaluations Matter: A Practical Guide for Evaluators (2011)](https://www.wageningenur.nl/en/Publication-details.htm?publicationId=publication-way-343035343531) has deep material on stakeholder engagement to ensure that evaluations are useful; great thinking on what learning means and how to promote it through evaluation.
* [A Practical Guide for Engaging Stakeholders in Developing Evaluation Questions](http://www.fsg.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/PDF/Engaging_Stakeholders_Guide.pdf)  Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Developed by some leading evaluators who have focused their attention on how to engage stakeholders and foster organizational and staff learning through evaluation.
* Patton, M.Q. (2010). [Utilization-focused Evaluation Checklist.](http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/archive_checklists/ufe.pdf) Patton’s work on building and conducting evaluations in a way that promotes use of the findings has been widely influential, and he is one of the major theorists/practitioners in the field. This checklist summarizes key principles of this work.
* Patton, M.Q. (2012). Essentials of Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Sage. (A shorter summary of the next book listed)
* Patton, M.Q. (2008). Utilization-focused evaluation (4th ed). Sage. (A very influential book and set of concepts and terminology. One of the most influential books on evaluation practice over the last 25 years).
* [Estrella M. and Gaventa J. Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A Literature Review. IDS Working Paper 70](http://led.co.za/sites/led.co.za/files/documents/151.pdf). International Workshop on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. International Institute for Rural Reconstruction. 1997. Document is 48 pages long, followed by appendices and large bibliography after that. Excellent bibliography on rationale, aspects, and implementation of participatory systems. Dated 1997, but excellent introduction to key issues. Gaventa is a big name in participatory evaluation and social justice.

## **Politics of Evaluation**

* Mohan R, Sullivan K. (2006). Managing the politics of evaluation to achieve impact. New Directions for Evaluation, 112, p. 7-23. (Article in UNC library reserves).

## **Choosing Evaluation Questions**

* Hollander, M., Miller J.A., Kadlec, H. (2010). Evaluation of healthcare services: Asking the right questions to develop new policy and program-relevant knowledge for decision-making. Healthcare Quarterly, 13(4) 2010: 40-47. Note: This article is available at [this link](http://www.longwoods.com/content/21997#app1): strongly suggest that you download the *PDF* because it’s more readable. Extensive list of possible evaluation questions to ask about health services.
* Chapter 3 in Rossi et al.: Program Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. A great chapter on developing the evaluation questions for an evaluation. I can supply a pdf copy if a student is interested.
* E. Jane Davidson, Evaluation Methodology Basics. Entire book is available as an e-book through the UNC library site. Adds a lot of very valuable material on criteria for making judgments and having priority evaluation questions and criteria.

## **Evaluating Implementation or Process; Monitoring**

* Poister, T. (2010). Monitoring Performance Outcomes. Chapter 5 Wholey, J., Hatry, H., & Newcomer, K. (eds). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation (3rd edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Excellent chapter on selecting quality, output, and outcome measures and developing meaningful monitoring systems. Explains the difference between program evaluation and program performance measurement and monitoring systems, and is highly recommended material.
* <http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/10504133390Participatory_Program_Evaluation_Manual.pdf> has good material on staff and organizational learning as the goal of monitoring rather than just counting activities and outputs listed on blueprints and models.
* Steckler, A., & Linnan, L. (Eds.) (2002). Process evaluation for public health interventions and research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Excellent book with many examples from real programs. (Amazon; also is in UNC library for borrowing)
* Chapter 6 in Rossi et al.: Program Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. I can supply a pdf copy if a student is interested.
* Hatry, H. Performance Measurement, (2nd ed). Urban Institute Press. Chs1, 2 and 6. (In this courses Electronic Reserves on Sakai)
* Kates J, Marconi K, Mannle TE. Developing a performance management system for a Federal public health program: the Ryan White CARE ACT Titles I and II. Evaluation and Program Planning. 2001, 24: 145-155. (In this courses Electronic Reserves on Sakai)
* The Global Fund to Fight AIDs, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit. Part 1: The M&E System and Global Fund M&E Requirements. February 2009. (In this courses Electronic Reserves on Sakai)

## **Evaluating Impact**

* <http://betterevaluation.org/themes/impact_evaluation> The Better Evaluation web site has extensive current links on impact evaluation.
* <http://www.interaction.org/impact-evaluation-notes> Interaction produced webinars and practice notes documents about impact evaluation, linking monitoring and evaluation, mixed-methods impact evaluation, and evaluation use, along with case studies. These videos and materials are highly recommended and current.
* Better Evaluation web site [Understand Causes of Outcomes and Impacts video](http://betterevaluation.org/events/coffee_break_webinars_2013#webinarPart5)  At this link, several videos are linked; please listen to number 5 on causes of outcomes and impacts, narrated by Jane Davidson. This is an excellent, brief explanation of ways to reason about causation in program evaluation.
* After reviewing the video by Jane Davidson (linked above), please briefly look at the [other material on the Better Evaluation web site on Understanding Causes and Outcomes](http://betterevaluation.org/plan/understandcauses), which discusses the points that Davidson made in the video. Please review some (not all, it is too extensive) of the materials found here. You will see that this Better Evaluation site contains summaries of techniques and approaches, and linked resources for each topic.
* If you would like another excellent written description of Davidson’s helpful points from the video, see Chapter 5 in Evaluation Methodology Basics by Jane Davidson, linked as an e-book on the UNC Library web site.
* We also invite you to take a few minutes to become familiar with the larger Better Evaluation web site because it is a very helpfully arrayed set of resources for your long-term use. The Rainbow framework is a helpful stepwise approach to evaluation planning, and numerous current resources are linked in every section. In addition, it contains excellent descriptions of numerous evaluation approaches.

## **Evaluating Partnerships and Complex Initiatives**

* Frey, B. et al. (2006). Measuring collaboration among partners. Am. J. Evaluation, 27(3), 383-392. (UNC library e-reserves).
* Rogers, P. J. (2008). Using programme theory to evaluate complicated and complex aspects of interventions. *Evaluation*, 14(1), 29 - 48. Retrieved from <http://evi.sagepub.com/content/14/1/29.full.pdf> html
* Materials by William Trochim and Rebecca Urban – Cornell University Office for Research on Evaluation <https://core.human.cornell.edu/research/systems/index.cfm> Advanced work on evaluating complex systems of interacting factors. For example, in malarial control efforts, where should one draw boundaries around the causal systems and chains that produce the program, and in evaluating how and way mitigation efforts are working? When complex systemic factors beyond the initiative itself are playing an important role, this work should provide guidance.
* Book: Patton, M.Q. (2011). Developmental Evaluation. Guilford Press. (see also videos below).
* Videos. [Planning and Evaluating for Social Change: An Evening at Simon Fraser University with Michael Quinn Patton, Part One](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b7n64JEjUUk). He introduces the concept of Developmental Evaluation which is geared towards evaluation for social innovators and heads of complex programs that constantly need to change and adapt to the environment. Michael Patton is a very engaging and entertaining speaker, lots of good examples and a fun creation story for evaluation. I recommend it to anyone looking at this issue of complexity. There's a part 2 as well with examples.

## **Other Suggested Evaluation Resource Sites to use in the course or in future work**

* [www.cdc.gov/eval](http://www.cdc.gov/eval) The CDC has very fine links and guidelines on evaluation
* [www.betterevaluation.org](http://www.betterevaluation.org) A wonderful site that guides the reader through the process of evaluation from start to end – highly recommended and easy to follow, relevant in USA or globally
* [American Evaluation Association](http://www.eval.org/) – great resources meta-site. For those whose work is closely related to program evaluation on a regular basis, we *highly recommend* joining the AEA. Dues are very reasonable, and the journals, webinars, listserv, and conferences are outstanding. This is a great way to join the wider evaluation community of practice.
* [The Community Toolbox, University of Kansas](http://ctb.ku.edu/en) – a fantastic site for those who work at the community level or who advise and train those who do. Resources helpful for domestic and global work.
* <http://www.esourceresearch.org/> - excellent overview of evaluation and research methods
* <http://gsociology.icaap.org/methods/> - meta-site with lots of links
* <http://www.pitt.edu/~super1/> (on line ppt lectures on epid, statistics, eval.)
* William Trochim web site, Cornell: [www.socialresearchmethods.net](http://www.socialresearchmethods.net)

Trochim also has a related site about research on evaluation linked to his home page which has resources on complex systems and evaluation, which might be useful to those of you engaged with complex programs involving many pieces, partners, and interactions. <http://www.human.cornell.edu/bio.cfm?netid=wmt1>

* Specifically global health program evaluation: while the above are relevant anywhere, see the following for specific guidance in global domains. There are also other sites in this area.
  + [My M&E](http://www.mymande.org/) – a very good site on global monitoring and evaluation
  + [www.betterevaluation.org](http://www.betterevaluation.org) A wonderful site that guides the reader through the process of evaluation from start to end – highly recommended and easy to follow, relevant in USA or globally
  + International Initiative for Impact Evaluation [www.3ieimpact.org](http://www.3ieimpact.org) this organization emphasizes the use of rigorous experimental and quasi-experimental designs for impact evaluation, a stance which is somewhat controversial when held out as “the one best way to do evaluation”
  + World Health Organization, CDC, Pan-American Health Organization, USAID, Gates Foundation
  + [International Development Evaluation Association](http://www.ideas-int.org/home/index.cfm?navID=1&itemID=1&CFID=660323&CFTOKEN=88267140)
  + Bamberger M and Segone M (2011) How to design and manage Equity-focused evaluations, UNICEF Evaluation Office. Available at: <http://mymande.org/sites/default/files/EWP5_Equity_focused_evaluations.pdf>