Department of Public Health Sciences, University of Hawai`i at Manoa
PH 765 – Program Evaluation (3 credits)
Spring 2007

Meeting Place and Time

Kuykendall 203, Wednesdays, 4:00 – 6:45 p.m. (Our HITS tech is Eric Basa at 220-0942 or 956-9734.)

Instructor Information

Name: Kathryn L. Braun, DrPH
Phone: 956-5768 (UH office), 597-6558 (Papa Ola Lokahi office), 330-1759 (cell)
Email: kbraun@hawaii.edu
Office and Office Hours: Biomed D-203, Wednesday afternoons and by appointment

Course Description

Which interventions work? How can an intervention be improved? What does the evidence tell us about this approach vs. that approach? Why should a program continue to be funded? Why should a particular service be covered by insurance? Is this program so good that it should be replicated elsewhere? Is this program so much better than usual practice that it should become a "standard of care"?

Professionals in health and social science fields are challenged to answer questions like this everyday, as more and more funders want to know if programs achieve their objectives and produce good outcomes. Evaluation is one of the 10 essential Public Health functions and critical in the development of evidenced-based practice.

In this class, you will learn about program evaluation. You will be challenged to develop an evaluation plan, following the framework for program evaluation endorsed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. This model calls for 1) engaging stakeholders; 2) describing the project; 3) focusing the evaluation design; 4) gathering credible evidence; 5) justifying conclusions; and 6) ensuring use and sharing lessons learned. You will also carry-out part of your evaluation plan, if only to pretest some of its instruments.

The assignments include readings, take-home and in-class exercises, the development of a logic model and a written evaluation plan, light bulb papers, and oral reports. Most classes will include a short lecture, an activity, and a discussion, during which time students will be expected to present their work to date, pose questions, and get assistance.

Course Learning Objectives

At the conclusion of this course, students will be able to:

1) Define common terms in program evaluation.
2) Demonstrate application of the CDC model of program evaluation.
3) Develop a program Logic Model that summarizes the program's promises.
4) Create an evaluation plan for a health or social agency in Hawai'i, including data collection strategies for each indicator.
5) Identify/adapt or create data collection instruments, and pretest them.
6) Analyze one's learning in evaluation.
7) Improve written and verbal communication skills.

Required Text and Assigned Readings

Weiss, C. (1998). Evaluation (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Major Resources

- IRB:
  - National Cancer Institute. (2005). Human participant protections education for research teams. http://cme.cancer.gov/clinicaltrials/learning/humanparticipant-protections.asp
  - UH Committee for Human Studies forms. www.hawaii.edu/irb

- Evaluation Frameworks and Logic Models:
  - Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1999). Framework for program evaluation in public health. MMWR 48 (RR-11):1-40. http://www.cdc.gov/eval/framework.htm
  - Kellogg Foundation publications
    - Logic model development guide. (2001). Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation. http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub3669.pdf
    - Evaluation Handbook. (1998). http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub770.pdf

- Evaluation Standards (and other information)
  - American Evaluation Association. http://www.eval.org/
  - Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc/

- Selected Journal Articles -
  - Braun, K., Tsark, J., Santos, L., Aitaoto, N., Chong, C. (2006). Building Native Hawaiian capacity in cancer research and programming: The Legacy of *'Imi Hale*. *Cancer.* 107 (8 Suppl): 2082-2090.
  - Braun, K., Fong, M., Ka'ano'i, M., Kamaka M., & Gotay, C. (2005). Testing a culturally appropriate, theory-based intervention to increase colorectal cancer screening among Native Hawaiians. Preventive Medicine, 40, 619-627.
  - Hill, L.G., & Betz, D.L. (2005). Revisiting the retrospective pretest. American Journal of Evaluation, 26, 501-517.
  - Hurley, C., Renger, R., & Brunk, B. (2005). Learning from a challenging fieldwork evaluation experience: Perspectives of a student and an instructor. American Journal of Evaluation, 26, 562-578.
  - Iriti, J.E., Bickel, W.E., & Nelson, C.A. (2005). Using recommendations in evaluation: A decision-making framework for evaluators. American Journal of Evaluation, 26, 464-479.

- Other Evaluation Texts:
  - Preskill, H., & Russ-Eft, D. (2005). Building evaluation capacity: 72 activities for teaching and training. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
  - Rossi, P., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). Evaluation: A systematic approach (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Course Schedule

DATE	CLASS WORK	READINGS & HOMEWORK
Wk 1 Jan 10	L: Introductions and syllabus D: Introduction of terms – Which types of evaluation have you heard of? A: Evaluating chocolate chip cookies (Act 1) D: Student areas of interest ➢ Assignment - Read Weiss Chapters 1-2; complete take-home test #1	
Wk 2 Jan 17	L: Types of evaluation – sorting them out by phase of the program, purpose of the evaluation, who does the eval, extent to which the approach is participatory, available standards, etc A: Types of evaluation (Act 2) D: Areas of interest revisited ➢ Assignment - Read Hurley ➢ Assignment - Read Weiss Chapter 3; complete test #2.	DUE: Take-home test #1
Wk 3 Jan 25	L/A/D: Describing your program ➢ Assignment - Read CDC framework for evaluation ➢ Assignment – Find/ read 5 articles relevant to the program for which you are developing an eval plan, the problem it addresses, and ways to evaluate it	DUE: Take-home test #2

DATE	CLASS WORK	READINGS & HOMEWORK
Wk 4 Jan 31	D: Your literature on the problem, program, measures L: The CDC model of evaluation; using the Logic Model to describe the program A: Reviewing logic models (HAP and HYSN), and telling the story of the program and its aspirations A: Developing logic models for the brochure exercise ➢ Assignment – Read: Braun et al (2006) and Braun et al (2005), and develop a logic model for the CRC intervention (2005).	DUE: 5 articles relevant to the program for which you are developing an eval plan, the problem it addresses, and ways to evaluate it
Wk 5 Feb 7	D: Review your logic models from Braun (2005) L: `Imi Hale – Using multiple measures to satisfy the program's target as well as the funder A: Developing logic models for your program ➢ Assignment - Read Chapters 4-5; complete take-home test #3	DUE: LM for Braun 2005
Wk 6 Feb 14	L: Planning your evaluation A: Evaluation purposes, theory, and measures (Act 3) ➢ Assignment - Human subjects protection certificate and homework	DUE : Take-home test #3
Wk 7 Feb 21 KB gone	L: GUEST LECTURER on Institutional Review Boards and Human Subjects Protection ➢ Read Chapter 8; complete take-home test #4	DUE: Human subjects protection certificate and homework
Wk 8 Feb 28	L: Evaluation design A: Which design is it? (Act 4) A: Possible designs for your study ➢ Assignment - Read Chapter 7; complete take-home test #5	Due: Take-home test #4 DUE: 1st draft of your Logic Model
Wk 9 Mar 7	D: Review draft logic models L: SMART objectives A: SMART objectives (Act 5) A: Smartening up your logic model ➢ Assignment –1st reflection paper	Due: Take-home test #5
Wk 10 Mar 14	D: Reflections on the class L: Writing your evaluation plan – Steps 1 and 2 A: Outlining your plan – Steps 1 and 2 ➢ Assignment – Steps 1 and 2, including the 2nd draft of your logic model	DUE: 1st reflection paper
Wk 11 Mar 21	D: Review 2nd draft of logic models L. Examples of evaluations in public health – PINK, PACT A: Your progress and questions to date ➢ Assignment –Read Hill	Due: 1st draft of Eval Plan Steps 1 and 2 (inc 2nd draft of logic model)
SPRING BREAK		
Wk 12 Apr 4	D: Feedback on Eval Plans Steps 1 and 2 and logic models L: Writing your evaluation plan - Steps 3 and 4 A: Outlining your plan – Steps 3 and 4 ➢ Assignment – Find or construct at least one data collection tool	
Wk 13 Apr 11	A: Sharing of data collection tools related to outputs or outcomes L: Developing abstracts A: Analyzing abstracts and writing your own abstract ➢ Assignment – Steps 1 thru 4, including LM, abstract, and data collection tool ➢ Assignment - Read: Iriti et al. (2005)	DUE: At least one data collection tool

DATE	CLASS WORK	READINGS & HOMEWORK
Wk 14 Apr 18	L: Analyzing and interpreting data – Steps 5 and 6 D: What would you be able to recommend if you got the data you expected?	DUE Eval Plan with Steps 1-4, with abstract and data collection tool
Wk 15 Apr 25	P: 15-minute end-of-class presentations, at which you distribute copies of your abstract and logic model. Please: 1. Provide an overview of your program evaluation plan, using the logic model. 2. Describe one instrument, and present data/lessons from pre-testing. 3. Share successes, challenges, and lessons learned in developing this evaluation plan.	Be prepared to present a PPT of your findings and distribute to the class your LM and abstract.
Wk 16 May 2	L: Ethics and standards for evaluators A. Course evaluation	DUE: Final Evaluation Plan DUE: 2nd Reflection Paper

A= Activity, D = Discussion, DUE = Assignment to instructor, L = Lecture, P = Presentation

Course Policies

1. Maximum benefit from this class can be achieved only if you attend class, complete the readings and projects as they are assigned, and actively participate in the class discussions.
2. Final grades will be issued on the basis of completed assignments, projects, class attendance and participation. ALL assignments must be completed and turned in for a passing grade.
3. All written assignments must be typed with one-inch margins, with page numbers on each page, and with references cited according to the APA convention. In addition to the grading criteria given for each assignment, all assignments will be graded on the quality of critical thinking and writing skills.
5. PLAGIARISM is unacceptable and will result in a failing ("F") grade for the assignment. Students are expected to be familiar with and abide by the University of Hawai'i Student Conduct Code. Copies of the Student Conduct Code are available at the Office of Student Affairs at the Student Services Center.
6. There will be no extra credit assignments, and no Incompletes will be issued. Students are advised to concentrate on doing well on all the assignments given.
7. The class schedule is tentative. Topics for discussions may be re-scheduled depending on availability of guest speakers, and the needs and interests of the class as the semester progresses.
8. I am always willing to meet with you to discuss your progress or to clarify course assignment requirements. Best ways to contact me are via e-mail at kbraun@hawaii.edu or cell phone 330-1759.

Grading Scale for Class Assignments

	Assignments	Points	Due Dates
1	Take-home tests (5 tests @ 5 points)	25	various
2	Logic Model – 1st draft	10	Feb 28
3	Reflection paper #1	5	Mar 14
4	Draft plan – Steps 1-2	5	Mar 21
5	Draft abstract	5	Apr 11 or Apr 18
6	Data collection tool	10	Apr 11
7	Draft plan – Steps 1-4	5	Apr 18
8	Oral presentation	10	Apr 25
9	Final plan – Steps 1-6, abstract, tool	10	May 2
10	Reflection paper #2	5	May 2
11	Attendance and class participation	10	Every class meeting
	Total Points	100	

Grading Scale – I do not use the +/- grading system.

A	90-100	Excellent work. Demonstrates sophisticated understanding and effective application of concepts, frameworks and theories in class discussions and written work.
B	80-89	Above average work. Demonstrates accomplished understanding and adequate application of concepts, frameworks and theories in class discussion and written work.
C	70-79	Average work, sufficient, but not distinctive. Superficial understanding and application of concepts, frameworks, and theories.
D	60-69	Poor, insufficient work. Unable to articulate thoughts and ideas in written work. Demonstrates significant misconceptions or misses key ideas or rigid/narrow "plug in" performance.
F	0-59	Unacceptable work.

Specialization Competencies Addressed

SB5 Evaluate interventions (e.g., programs and policies) to determine impact and identify areas of improvement.

MPH Competencies Addressed

Analytic Skills (AS)	AS1 Define a public health problem. AS2 Determine appropriate use of data and statistical methods. AS6 Identify research designs used in public health, including advantages and flaws of specific designs, and determine designs appropriate to specific needs.
Communication Skills (CO)	CO1 Communicate effectively with professional and lay audiences both in writing and orally (unless a disability precludes oral communication). CO2 Solicit input from individuals and organizations.
Basic Public Health Skills (PHS)	PHS2 Apply the basic public health skills from behavioral and social sciences, biostatistics, epidemiology, and environmental health to design/evaluate programs/policies to improve health. PHS3 Demonstrate mastery of access and use of public health literature. PHS4 Use advanced computer skills as appropriate
Program Planning Skills (PP)	PP3 Develop a plan to implement a policy/program including goals, outcome and process objectives, implementation, and mechanisms to monitor and evaluate programs for their effectiveness.

Assignments

Take-Home Tests

Take-Home Test #1 – Chapter 1-2. Due 1-17-06

1. What is Weiss' definition of evaluation? Why does she call it a "practical craft?"
2. What kinds of questions does evaluation answer? Why are the answers hard to come by through informal means?
3. What is the difference between program processes and program outcomes? In an evaluation, what is the difference between process data and outcome data? Illustrate your answer using the "cookie" exercise from Week 1.
4. Describe similarities and differences between research and evaluation.
5. How can evaluation be used for decision making? For organizational learning?
6. Distinguish between formative and summative evaluation.

Take-Home Test #2 – Chapter 3. Due 1-25-06

1. What things should you do to learn about the program you are evaluating?
2. What can you do if the program you're evaluating has "fuzzy" goals and objectives?
3. Why is it important for an evaluator to understand a program's theory of change? Illustrate your answer with a theoretical or real program.
4. What would you do if the program you are evaluating cannot name its theory of change?

Take-Home Test #3 – Chapters 4-5. Due 2-14-06

1. Describe 5 major categories of potential evaluation questions.
2. What does an evaluator need to consider when deciding which evaluation questions to address?
3. Compare the advantages and disadvantages of qualitative and quantitative approaches to evaluation.
4. What kinds of ethical issues might come up during evaluation planning?
5. What are the advantages and disadvantages of using a participatory approach to program evaluation?

Take-Home Test #4 – Chapter 8. Due 2-28-06

1. When evaluating a program, why is it important to have a control group? Describe three ways to construct a control group.
2. What possible designs can you use to evaluate your program? Regardless of the design you think is feasible for this class, how COULD a control group be identified or constructed?
3. If you must use a one-group design, describe some ways to extend it beyond the "worst" design of all – the post-test only design.

Take-Home Test #5 – Chapters 7 and Chapter 6 pp 137-144. Due 3-7-06

1. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of collecting data through an interview, a focus group, a self-administered questionnaire, and program records.
2. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of census, random, and convenience sampling.
3. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using existing measures and creating your own measures.
4. When creating your own measures, what are 12 points to remember? Why is it important to pretest your data collection tools?

Human Subject Protections Certificate and Homework – Due 2-21-06

1. Complete the Human participant protections education for research teams training at the following URL and bring your certificate to class: http://cme.cancer.gov/clinicaltrials/learning/humanparticipant-protections.asp. This may take you 2 hours, but you can complete it over multiple visits.
2. Visit the website of the University of Hawai'i Committee of Human Studies www.hawaii.edu/irb. Please answer these questions on a separate piece of paper and provide to the guest lecturer. How would you decide if your study is exempt? What documents would you need to complete and submit? Who decides if your study is exempt? If your study is not determined to be exempt, then what?

Written Evaluation Plan

By the end of the semester, you will have completed an Evaluation Plan for an agency. Follow the CDC framework for evaluation in developing your plan. We will work through the process step-by-step, and you will get feedback on the various components of the plan as it develops. Here are some key components and due dates:

Logic Model – 1st draft	Feb 28
Draft plan – Steps 1-2	Mar 21
Draft abstract	Apr 11 or Apr 18
Data collection tool	Apr 11
Draft plan – Steps 1-4	Apr 18
Oral presentation	Apr 25
Final plan – Steps 1-6, abstract, tool	May 2

Reflection Papers – Due 3-14-06 and 5-2-06

Reflection papers allow you to explore underlying value implications of readings and experiences in this class. Please prepare 2 reflection papers (3-5 pages each) for this class in which you share with me the things you have learned, what this has meant to you, and where you want to go with it (e.g., what new questions has this learning raised and what new skills would you like to develop?). Papers can reflect on your feeling, observations, and thoughts about evaluation, evaluation planning, working with stakeholders, logic models, using theories of change in evaluation, constructing control groups, creating data collection tools, interpreting data, and/or the role of evaluation in public health.