

Department of Health Promotion and Behavior  
College of Public Health  
University of Georgia

HPRB 7470: Program Evaluation in Health Promotion and Health Education  
Fall 2007  
Thursday 5:00-7:45 pm, Ramsey Center 225

Course Information

Instructor	Marsha Davis, Ph.D.
Office Location	317 Ramsey Center
e-mail	<a href="mailto:davism@uga.edu">davism@uga.edu</a>
Telephone	542-4369
Office hours	Thurs 12:30-2:30 and by appointment

Course Description

Program evaluation is the craft of applying research methods in a thoughtful way to the task of assessing the conceptualization and design, implementation, and utility of social intervention programs (with the focus, in this class, being on the evaluation of health promotion programs and policies). This is accomplished by systematically investigating the effectiveness of program processes and outcomes within their political and organizational context. The goal is to inform public health action and, by extension, to improve the health conditions for program participants.

Course Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to:

1. Discuss the purposes of program evaluation in public health
2. Analyze the contextual issues which influence an evaluation
3. Identify stakeholders for an evaluation
4. Articulate a health program's goals and objectives, target population, theory of implementation, desired outcomes, and standards of effectiveness
5. Construct an evaluation logic model
6. Formulate appropriate evaluation questions
7. Comprehend research fundamentals that are used in program evaluation (research design, data collection procedures, validity and reliability of measures, statistical analyses)
8. Compare the various research designs (experimental, quasi-experimental, and non-experimental) used in outcome evaluations
9. Explain the factors that affect the common threats to the validity and credibility of evaluation design and findings
10. Recognize the roles that process evaluation has in program monitoring, assessing program fidelity, and interpreting outcome results
11. Strategize ways to tailor evaluation reports to audience needs
12. Outline the practical aspects of managing an evaluation study
13. Discern the ethical issues in an evaluation
14. Critique evaluation studies

## Readings

Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7<sup>th</sup> edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Additional readings may be assigned for specific lectures and as a part of the class discussion assignments. These readings will be available on WebCT.

## Course Structure

This course is based on the premise that program evaluation consists of a knowledge base and myriad of skills that are most effectively learned by application. The course is built around lectures and discussion of assigned readings and assignments. The lectures will be used to convey basic information concerning the scientific methodology and practicalities of evaluation. Students are asked to come to class prepared to discuss the readings for the day. Active participation in the form of asking questions, reacting to readings, and sharing relevant evaluation experience is expected.

Assignments, in the form of structured questions, will be distributed in class and due the next class. Each class session will begin with a discussion from the assigned activity. Completed activity sheets will be turned in that day to the instructor. (Electronic submissions will not be accepted.) If you miss a class, you can obtain one-half credit by completing the assignments within one week of the missed class.

We will begin each class with a discussion of that assignment. Lecture will follow the discussion. The class assignments and discussions are important and your consistent participation is part of your course grade. Each student will apply the knowledge gained through the readings and class discussion in the preparation of an evaluation proposal.

The **course requirements and grading** include:

Assignment	Percent of Grade	Date Due
Project proposal idea	--	August 30
Project logic model	--	September 13
Midterm Exam	20	October 11
Paper: Part 1	25	October 18
Paper: Part 2	20	November 29
Paper: Part 3	5	December 11
Final Exam	20	December 11
Class Assignments/Discussions	10	Throughout

Questions for the exams will be short-answer and will be related to an application of an evaluation. The exams will be completed in class during the time allotted for class. The final exam will be comprehensive.

Evaluation of classroom discussions will be based on the level and quality of participation in classes. Students are expected to attend and participate actively in each class and must remain current in their readings throughout the semester in order to participate fully. If you complete the assignments, are prepared, present, and participate fully in the discussion, you can expect to earn full credit for the discussion/activities.

Grades will be assigned on the basis of total number of grade points earned (see table below). Incompletes are awarded only under extraordinary circumstances and only with consultation with the instructor. There must be a written agreement between instructor and student regarding how and when the coursework will be completed. Extension for completion of the work will not exceed one semester (Spring 2008), after which time the "I" will convert to an "F".

Point Distribution for Grades	
95-100	A
91-94.9	A-
87-90.9	B+
84-86.9	B
80-83.9	B-
76-79.9	C+
72-75.9	C

For the **course paper**, students will complete three individual papers which, when combined, will constitute an evaluation proposal. Modeling "real world" evaluation and the need for evaluation proposals to be timely, 10 points will be taken off the paper grade for each day that each paper is late. Electronic submissions will not be accepted.

Students will identify a health program in need of evaluation. A program is defined as a systematic set of efforts to achieve specific purposes in a defined target population. Appropriate programs include those operating in the local community. Programs may not include University research programs or any treatment programs. The purpose of this activity is to enable students to apply principles discussed in class to an authentic, community-based evaluation.

Students will identify and interview the program director or other knowledgeable person concerning a social welfare, health promotion, or public health program. From the interview, students will specify important evaluation questions to form the basis for an evaluation proposal. Students should propose an evaluation that would be feasible to do with relatively limited resources. (Students will not be involved in the conduct of the evaluation.) The instructor must approve a brief statement describing the proposed evaluation. Criteria for grading the papers include clarity of communication, quality of ideas, and attention to critical components.

## Paper: Part 1

The first paper will be comprised of a description of your proposed health promotion program, a logic model, setting where it will be implemented, and implementation strategies and evaluation context analysis. This paper will take more time than the second paper to complete because of the time and effort needed to make community contacts, conduct interviews, clarify the purpose of the evaluation, and delineate the evaluation questions. Plan accordingly and try not to get frustrated. This is all part of learning the process of conducting an evaluation. This paper, to be no more than 7-10 double-spaced pages, will include:

1. Description of the program:
  - Name of the program
  - Logic model of the program
  - Theoretical basis of the program
  - What components of the program will be evaluated
  - Goals and objectives of the program
  - Setting in which the program occurs
  - Staff, organization, intended participants
  - Past, current, or planned evaluations of the program
2. Contextual analysis:
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Audiences and their concerns
  - Role of the evaluator
  - Any evaluation constraints which may exist
3. Evaluation questions
  - Key evaluation questions

## Paper: Part 2

In light of the purpose of the evaluation, situational constraints, and the key evaluation questions, the second paper will be a description of how the evaluation is to be conducted. Students will propose two different evaluations for the program: (1) program planning or process evaluation and (2) an outcome evaluation. A good way to pace your work is to write the following sections close to the time the topics are discussed in class. The second part of the proposal (no more than 12 pages, double-spaced pages) will include:

1. Program planning or process evaluation
  - Defend the choice of program planning or process
  - Present strategies for gathering the information: who will collect the data, from whom will data be collected, when, and using what form/instrument/questionnaire
  - Outline general plans for data analysis, interpretation (e.g., how would results translate into program recommendations?)

## 2. Outcome evaluation

- In keeping with the logic model, describe the choices for outcome measures, choose the most appropriate one and defend the choice
- Choose a design, identify the strengths and weaknesses of the design, and defend the choice of design
- Identify the information needed to answer the evaluation questions
- Present strategies for gathering the information: who will collect the data, from whom will data be collected, when, and using what form/instrument/questionnaire
- Outline general plans for data analysis, interpretation (e.g., how would results translate into program recommendations?)

Paper: Part 3

The concluding sections of the proposal (not more than 3 pages) should include:

- Description of the audiences and modes of reporting
- Layout of the management plan (including project timeline)
- Discussion of how ethical issues will be handled

## Course Policies

You are responsible for all class content whether you are present for class or not. The UGA Academic Affairs policy reads, “Students are expected to attend classes regularly. A student who incurs an excessive number of absences may be withdrawn from a class at the discretion of the professor.”

If you miss a class, you can obtain one-half credit by completing the class assignments within one week of the missed class. No credit will be given beyond that time. If you miss a scheduled examination for reason of illness or personal emergency, arrangements will be made for you to complete an equivalent exam within one week of the missed exam.

Professional behavior is required. Each student is expected to contribute positively to the learning environment of the class. All academic work must meet the standards contained in “A Culture of Honesty.” Students are responsible for informing themselves about those standards before performing any academic work. The link to more detailed information about academic honesty can be found (until August 22) at: [http://www.uga.edu/ovpi/academic\\_honesty/academic\\_honesty.htm](http://www.uga.edu/ovpi/academic_honesty/academic_honesty.htm). The link after August 27 will be: <http://www.uga.edu/ovpi/honesty/acadhon.htm>

Penalties for academic dishonesty, including cheating and plagiarism, can include a grade of “F” for the course and expulsion from the University. The minimum penalty for cheating or plagiarizing in this class will be a grade of “0” on the affected assignments.

Students with disabilities who require reasonable accommodations in order to participate in course activities or meet course requirements should contact the instructor or designate during regular office hours or by appointment.

## Course Outline

What follows is a general plan for the course; deviations announced to the class by the instructor may be necessary. Additional supplemental readings will be made available on Web CT.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>
<b>August 16</b>	<b>Welcome!</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of course material</li> <li>• Definitions of evaluation</li> <li>• Role of evaluation in public health promotion and policy</li> </ul>
<b>August 23</b>	<b>Theories of evaluation</b> <b>Asking questions</b> <b>Identifying stakeholders</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of evaluation proposal</li> <li>• Theories/models of evaluation</li> <li>• Identifying audiences</li> <li>• Analyzing the context of evaluation</li> <li>• Evaluator/Stakeholder roles</li> <li>• Articulating questions</li> </ul> <p><u>Reading:</u> Rossi, Lipsey, &amp; Freeman (Chapters 1, 2 &amp; 3)</p>
<b>August 30</b>	<b>Types of evaluation questions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs assessment (e.g., Does a need exist for a given program?)</li> <li>• Evaluability (e.g., Does the program warrant an evaluation?)</li> <li>• Formative (e.g., What should the program materials consist of and how should they be delivered?)</li> <li>• Implementation (e.g., Is the program adequately implemented?)</li> <li>• Outcome (e.g., Are there changes in target outcomes and can they be attributed to the program?)</li> </ul> <p><u>Reading:</u> Rossi, Lipsey, &amp; Freeman (Chapter 4, 6, 7). Assessing the need for a program (101-132); Assessing and monitoring program process (169-201); Measuring and monitoring program outcome (203-232).</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> Program description for evaluation proposal due Class Discussion #1</p>
<b>September 6</b>	<b>What is to be evaluated?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing boundaries and a realistic evaluation</li> <li>• Program implementation theory</li> <li>• The logic of logic models</li> <li>• Using logic models to focus the evaluation</li> </ul> <p><u>Reading:</u> Rossi, Lipsey, &amp; Freeman (Chapter 5)</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> Class Discussion #2</p>

<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>
<b>September 13</b>	<p><b>Needs assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of problem</li> <li>• Determining the extent of the problem</li> <li>• Identifying target population</li> </ul> <p><u>Reading:</u> Rossi, Lipsey, &amp; Freeman (Chapter 4)</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> Logic model of program for evaluation proposal due Class Assignment #3</p>
<b>September 20</b>	<p><b>Formative evaluation: Designing the content and delivery of a program</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Message development and testing</li> <li>• Focus group methodology</li> <li>• Translation of social and behavioral theory into program materials</li> </ul> <p><u>Reading:</u> Examples of studies using formative evaluation approaches</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> Class Assignment #4</p>
<b>September 27</b>	<p><b>Process evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beyond “count data”</li> <li>• A framework for process evaluation</li> <li>• Components of a comprehensive process evaluation model</li> </ul> <p><u>Reading:</u> Any chapter from Steckler, A. and Linnan, L. (editors) (2002). <i>Process evaluation for public health interventions and research</i>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> Class Discussion #5</p>
<b>October 4</b>	<p><b>Issues in policy evaluation</b></p> <p>Guest lecturer: Dr. Phaedra Corso, Associate Professor, Department of Health Policy and Management, College of Public Health, University of Georgia</p> <p><u>Reading:</u> Chapters 1, 3, 4, 6 in Mohan and Sullivan (editors). <i>Promoting the Use of Government Evaluations in Policymaking</i>. New Directions for Evaluation, Winter 2006, vol. 112.</p>
<b>October 11</b>	<b>Midterm exam</b>

<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>
<b>October 18</b>	<p><b>Credibility and quality of research findings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campbell's validity framework (internal, external, statistical conclusion)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reading:</i> Chapter 6. Trochim, W.M.K. (2001). <i>The Research Methods Knowledge Base</i>. Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing.</p> <p><i>Assignment:</i> Paper Part 1 due Class Discussion #6</p>
<b>October 25</b>	<b>Fall break</b>
<b>November 1</b>	<p><b>Outcome evaluation research designs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experimental</li> <li>• Quasi-experimental</li> <li>• Non-experimental</li> </ul> <p><i>Reading:</i> Chapters 6 and 7. Trochim, W.M.K. (2001). <i>The Research Methods Knowledge Base</i>. Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing.</p> <p><i>Assignment:</i> Class Discussion #7</p>
<b>November 8</b>	<p><b>Measurement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choice of endpoints</li> <li>• Reliability and validity</li> </ul> <p><i>Reading:</i> Rossi, Lipsey, &amp; Freeman, (Chapter 7). Measuring and monitoring program outcomes (203-233)</p> <p>Chapter 3. Trochim, W.M.K. (2001). <i>The Research Methods Knowledge Base</i>. Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing.</p> <p><i>Assignment:</i> Class Discussion #8</p>

<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>
<b>November 15</b>	<p><b>Data collection procedures, data analysis, and interpretation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring quality control</li> <li>• Design sensitivity and power analysis</li> <li>• Practical (or ‘clinical’) significance</li> <li>• What if there is no “effect”?</li> </ul> <p><i>Reading:</i> Rossi, Lipsey, &amp; Freeman (Chapters 10 &amp; 11). Detecting, interpreting, and analyzing program effects (301-330); Measuring efficiency (331-368)</p> <p><i>Assignment:</i> Class Discussion #9</p>
<b>November 22</b>	<b>Thanksgiving</b>
<b>November 29</b>	<p><b>Reporting and use of evaluation findings</b></p> <p><b>Management of evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tailoring for a range of audiences</li> <li>• The good, the bad, and the unexpected/indifferent – creating a balanced and fair report</li> <li>• Utilization of evaluation results</li> </ul> <p><i>Reading:</i> Rossi, Lipsey, &amp; Freeman (Chapter 12). The social context of evaluation (special emphasis pgs. 373-393, 411-418).</p> <p><i>Assignment:</i> Paper Part 2 due Class Discussion #10</p>
<b>December 6</b>	<p><b>Ethics in evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards of evaluation practice</li> <li>• IRB concerns</li> </ul> <p><b>The future of evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the important issues for evaluation in the next five years in public health?</li> <li>• Encouraging an evaluation culture</li> <li>• Building evaluation capacity</li> </ul> <p><i>Reading:</i> Rossi, Lipsey, &amp; Freeman (Chapter 12). The social context of evaluation (special emphasis pgs. 393-410, 418-421).</p> <p><i>Assignment:</i> Class Discussion #11</p>
<b>December 11</b>	<p><b>Final Exam</b> 7:00 – 10:00 pm</p> <p>Paper Part 3 due</p>