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Topics for Today’s Workshop

• Building capacity in Community Collaborations through Evaluation: Discussion

• Tools for Evaluating and Strengthening Collaborative Partnerships: How the CDC uses evaluation to build capacity
  – Background
  – CDC Framework for Program Evaluation
  – Hands-on Exercise

• Review of Evaluation Tools handout
Building capacity in Community Collaborations through Evaluation: Discussion

• Why evaluate collaborative efforts? What aspects of a collaboration do you believe are important to evaluate and why?

• How do you think evaluation can strengthen and build the capacity of collaborations?
Background: TB in the United States

- Just under 14,000 cases in 2006
- Reportable disease since 1953
- Program goal: Eliminate TB
- 68 jurisdictions funded through Division of TB Elimination (DTBE) cooperative agreement
  - States, big cities, territories
  - Program consultants from the division assigned to assist grantees
Background:
Program Evaluation in TB programs

- Prior to 2000: Limited use of data for program improvement
- 2000 – 2004: Interest increased
- 2005: “Program evaluation” highlighted as a core function of all TB programs
Where We Started:

**Inputs**

1 evaluator in DTBE
1 manager who believed in program evaluation
1 large state program committed to evaluation
~15 people interested in evaluation
General push for evaluation at CDC

**Goal**

Build program evaluation capacity
= State & local program capacity
CDC staff capacity
What we did:

Recruited the Willing

- Evaluation Working Group (EWG)
  - Started in 2002
  - Open membership
  - Includes DTBE and state participants
  - Provides guidance, expertise and manpower on program evaluation capacity building efforts
CDC Framework for Program Evaluation

Steps
- Engage stakeholders
- Ensure use and share lessons learned
- Justify conclusions
- Gather credible evidence
- Describe the program
- Focus the evaluation design

Standards
- Utility
- Feasibility
- Propriety
- Accuracy
Step 1: Identifying Stakeholders

- Who cares about your collaborative partnership?
- What do they care about?
- Which individuals support the program?
- Which individuals are skeptical about or antagonistic toward the program?
Involving Stakeholders Throughout the Evaluation

Stakeholders should be involved in:

• Describing the program and context
• Selecting evaluation questions and methods
• Serving as data sources
• Interpreting findings
• Disseminating information
• Implementing results
Step 2: Program Description

• Summarizes the program being evaluated
• Establishes common definitions and terms
• Delineates program objectives and establishes program’s ability to make changes
• Describes how the program fits into the larger picture
Elements of Program Description

- Need for program
- Target population
- Intended “effects”
- Activities
- Causal theory: “What affects what”

- What “bounds” the program:
  - Inputs
  - Context
  - Stage of development
  - Assumptions
SMART Objectives

- S: Specific
- M: Measurable
- A: Achievable
- R: Relevant
- T: Time-bound
Describing a Program Using a Logic Model

Logic models are:

- graphic representations of the *intended* relationships of a program’s activities and their *intended* effects.

- a disciplined “road map” denoting the substance of a program and what it expects to achieve.
Constructing Logic Models

• Identify and list:
  – Activities - things that the program is doing
  – Intended Effects - changes that are expected to result from program activities

• Arrange in a time sequence

• Draw arrows

• Review and refine
Logic Model Terminology

• Inputs
  – Resources used by the activity
• Activities
  – Actions
• Outputs
  – Product(s) of an activity
• Outcomes (or Effects)
  – Results and benefits to program participants
• Impact (or Distal Effects)
  – Long-term effects and changes in organizations, communities, or systems
Constructing a Simple Logic Model

Inputs → Actions → Outputs → Outcomes → Impacts

PROCESS            EFFECTS
Social Marketing Collaboration Case Study Logic Model

**OUTCOMES**
- Decreased in the prevalence of TB among African American community
- Increased percentage of patients initiated & completed treatment
- Decreased Stigma & perception of TB
- Increased TB knowledge
- Increased TB awareness
- Increased TB awareness
- Increased TB awareness

**INPUTS**
- CDC project officer
- TB controller
- Health educator
- Faith based organization
- Bars/pool hall owners
- Community action agencies
- Local advisory
- TB patients
- Community member

**ACTIVITIES**
- Development of educational materials & messages
- Product design
- Product completed
- Pilot testing
- Product tested
- Distribution of educational materials & messages
- Flyers posting
- Flyers posted
- Campaign
- TB message air at radio station
- Messages aired
- Education
- TB presentation
- Presentation made

**OUTPUTS**
- Increased TB awareness
- Messages HEARD
- Materials LEARNED
- Flyers READ
Filling in the Blanks....

"I think you should be more explicit here in Step Two."
Tips for Developing a Logic Model

• When planning a new program… **start with outcomes**
• When evaluating an existing program… **start with activities**
• **Add boxes and arrows** to fully describe the program
  – Problems, community needs
  – External influences/factors
  – Assumptions
  – Target populations and clients
• **There are no right or wrong logic models**
• **Do what works to be clear!**
Step 3: Focusing the Evaluation

- Establishing priorities
- Identifying limited number of targeted questions
- Considering logistical issues
- Determining what results can be expected given the program’s scope and stage of development
Criteria for Selecting Evaluation Questions

Purpose

- What questions are stakeholders asking?
- How will evaluation information be used?

Reality checks

- How long has the intervention been underway?
- How intensive is the intervention?
- What resources are available for evaluation?
Step 4: Collecting Data

What Are Indicators?

- Specific, observable, and measurable signs of a program’s performance that measure
  - Activities (process)
  - Results (outcomes)
- Help tell the program story
Goal → Objective → Indicator

• Process Goal: Develop a shared vision and a clear mission and goals for the collaborative to prevent homelessness in X city.

• Objective: All members of the collaborative participate in development a mission statement during the first 3 months of operation.

• Indicator: A completed mission statement that is agreed upon and approved by all members within the first 3 months.

• Outcome Goal: Reduce transmission of TB in correctional facilities through the efforts of the TB collaborative in X city.

• Objective: Increase TB screening of all inmates in X correctional facility at time of initial processing to 100% for year 2007

• Indicator: Number (%) of inmates in X facility screened for TB at initial processing Jan-Dec 2007
Characteristics of Good Indicators

- Measure progress toward your result
- Relevant to the program
- Useful to the evaluation
- Understandable to the stakeholders
- Valid, a true reflection of facts
- Feasible to obtain
- Clear and specific
Data Collection

• Data collection methods
  – Surveys
  – Interviews
  – Focus groups
  – Document review
  – Observation
  – Secondary data analysis

• Use multiple methods whenever possible
## Example

A Community Partnership to Prevent OBESITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Activities</th>
<th>Evaluation Methods</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After-school activities</td>
<td>Activity logs; Surveys and/or Interviews with participants</td>
<td>Attendance (#), # of hours/days per week, evaluation of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent training</td>
<td>Attendance logs, Focus Group, Pre- and Post-test of parents</td>
<td>Attendance (#), Satisfaction, Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness campaigns</td>
<td>Media Reach Reports</td>
<td># of ads per week by outlets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CDC SLO Project*
Step 5: Justifying Conclusions
Analyzing Data

• Assess data as appropriate for each method
  – Qualitative data:
    • Content analysis
    • Domain analysis
    • Policy analysis
  – Quantitative data:
    • Frequencies or simple counts
    • Statistical tests for differences
    • Multivariate modeling
Interpreting the Data

• “Facts” are not enough to draw conclusions

• Different stakeholders will judge “facts” differently

• Process for building consensus on conclusions may be needed
Justifying Claims About Intervention Effectiveness

• Performance using a comparison or control group
• Time sequence
• Similar effects observed in other contexts
• Accounting for/eliminating alternative explanations
• Plausible mechanisms/program theory
Step 6: Using Evaluation Findings

- Assess process and practice
- Target areas for improvement
- Develop standardized tools
- Strategize changes to operations
- Prioritize activities & resources
- Identify practices for replication
- Train staff & others
- Garner political support
- Identify areas for future evaluation
Mechanisms for Sharing Evaluation Information

• Written reports
• Presentations (formal or informal)
• Articles in newsletters
• Graphs, pictures, illustrations
• Stories
Review of Evaluation Tools

- Tools for Designing and Conducting Evaluations
- Tools for Developing Surveys, Questionnaires and Measures
- Tools for Understanding Evaluations of Collaborative and Community Interventions
- Websites for Free Qualitative Data Analysis Software: Centers for Disease Control
Thank you!

Questions?

Maureen Wilce: mwilce@cdc.gov

Mary Ohmer: mohmer@gsu.edu