

OHSU-PSU School of Public Health

CPH 538/638: Public Health Program Evaluation

Winter 2018

Course Description

Using case study methodology, this course focuses on the acquisition of technical skills in design, data collection, and analysis for the purpose of evaluating public health programs. Program justification and evaluation for policy making purposes will be emphasized. In addition, alternative forms of evaluation will be examined including Rapid Assessment, Participatory Evaluation and historical, social networking, and other techniques. Students will have the opportunity to examine public health data sets and to design an evaluation focused on a disparate population, as well as develop policy based on critical analysis of several types of evaluations.

Credit Hours

Didactic: 3 credit hours

Prerequisites or Concurrent Enrollment Requirements

None

Faculty Information

Name: Katherine J Bradley, PhD, RN

Associate Professor

Email: bradleyk@ohsu.edu

Office: OHSU School of Nursing, Portland Campus, Room 584

Phone: 503-494-1137

Office Hours: In person, by phone or Nexus: Tuesdays 9-11, Thursdays 3-5 and by appointment

General Course Meeting Day and Time

On-line course, meets asynchronously throughout each week. Students will engage in independent learning activities from Tuesday to Monday of each week, with assignments and discussions due Tuesday evening at 5pm PST.

Course Delivery Mode

This course is conducted fully online. Students are expected to log into the site regularly in order to meet course requirements and check their student email accounts for notifications. Assignments are posted and submitted through the Sakai course site.

Course Objectives, Competencies, or Outcomes

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

1. Understand and apply principles of program evaluation to selected case studies.

2. Explore, analyze and critique several types of program evaluations.
3. Analyze and critique program evaluations from ethical and community perspectives.
4. Design an evaluation to analyze the impact of a public health program change.
5. Make recommendations for public health policy from population data and program evaluation outcomes.

In addition, students enrolled in CPH 638 will be able to: Design and submit a program evaluation proposal with a funding request.

Required Texts and Readings

Required text:

Harris, M.J. (2017). *Evaluating Public and Community Health Programs, 2nd Edition*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 9781119151074

Recommended source:

Knowlton W., Phillips, C.C. (2013). *The logic model guidebook: better strategies for great results*. (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed). (2010). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. ISBN: 978-1-4338-0561-5.

Supplemental Suggested Readings or Reference Material

Course readings that are not in the text are available electronically through the Sakai course site and through hyperlinks embedded in this document. OHSU and PSU libraries are easily accessible. Library research as needed is expected of graduate students to fill gaps in your knowledge base and to support your writings.

Attendance Requirements

This is an on-line course; there are no “live” attendance requirements. It IS expected, however, that students will maintain a regular presence on-line in discussion Forums (and this “attendance” is a substantial graded element of the course).

Grading Criteria and Release of Final Grades

The final course grades will be posted with the OHSU registrar the Monday following the last day of the term. The grading system for official grade reports includes:

| Letter Grades | Numerals used by Registrar for GPA | Percentage | Grade Description from the University Grading Policy |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------------|--|
| A | 4.0 | 93 - 100 | Honors or Excellent |
| A- | 3.7 | 90 - 92 | |
| B+ | 3.3 | 87 - 89 | Near Honors or Very Good |
| B | 3.0 | 83 - 86 | |
| B- | 2.7 | 80 - 82 | |

| | | | |
|----|-----|---------|----------------------|
| C+ | 2.3 | 77 - 79 | Satisfactory or Fair |
| C | 2.0 | 73 - 76 | |
| C- | 1.7 | 70 - 72 | |
| F | 0.0 | 0 - 69 | Failure |

Please note: OHSU policy requires Sakai sites to close three weeks after grades have been submitted to the registrar in compliance with us copyright law and adherence to the fair use doctrine of copyrighted materials in educational settings. You have the right to retain a copy of any downloadable material posted to an online class. You are encouraged to download any needed material before sites are permanently closed.

Course Content Outline

Weekly course assignments, including but not limited to readings, written memos, and online forum discussions, are posted on the course website on Sakai. Online lectures, selected readings and other content are also posted on the course site.

| Week | Topic(s) |
|------|---|
| 1 | Introduction to Program Evaluation |
| 2 | Needs Assessment & Stakeholder Engagement |
| 3 | Program Theory & Logic Models |
| 4 | Developing Evaluation Questions |
| 5 | Evaluation Design & Data Collection – Qualitative |
| 6 | Evaluation Design & Data Collection – Quantitative |
| 7 | Program Process Evaluation & Monitoring |
| 8 | Outcome & Impact Evaluation |
| 9 | Ethical Implications |
| 10 | Case Study |
| 11 | Final: Program Evaluation Poster with Voice Recording |

Course Specific Grading Standards

| Graded Assignments | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------|
| Assignment | Competencies Addressed | Percent of Grade |
| Forums & written assignments | Course Outcomes: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 | 40% |
| Midterm Paper | Course Outcome: 2 | 25% |
| Final: Poster Presentation & voice recording | Course Outcomes: 4 | 35% |

Copyright Information

Every reasonable effort has been made to protect the copyright requirements of materials used in this course. Class participants are warned not to copy, audio, or videotape in violation of copyright laws. Journal articles will be kept on reserve at the library or online for student access. Copyright law does allow for making one personal copy of each article from the original article. This limit also applies to electronic sources.

Syllabus Changes and Retention

This syllabus is not to be considered a contract between the student and the OHSU-PSU School of Public Health. It is recognized that changes may be made as the need arises. Students are responsible for keeping a copy of the course syllabus for their records.

Accommodations

Our MPH degree programs and the OHSU-PSU School of Public Health are committed to all students achieving their potential. If you have a disability or think you may have a disability (including but not limited to physical, hearing, vision, psychological and learning disabilities), which may need an accommodation, please contact the OHSU Office for Student Access at email studentaccess@ohsu.edu or tel 503-494-0082 to discuss your request. All information regarding a student's disability is kept in accordance with state and federal laws.

<http://www.ohsu.edu/xd/education/studentservices/education-diversity/student-access/index.cfm>.

Portland State students also have similar resources available via the PSU Disability Resource Center (website <http://www.pdx.edu/drc>). Please contact the DRC at tel. (503) 725-4150 or email at drc@pdx.edu.

Students with special learning needs or testing accommodations must contact Dr. Elizabeth Waddell (Program Director) in the first week of the course to formulate an appropriate learning and evaluation plan.

Commitment to Equity and Inclusion

Oregon Health & Science University is committed to creating and fostering a learning and working environment based on open communication and mutual respect. If you encounter sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, sexual assault, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, age, national origin or ancestry, veteran or military status, sex, marital status, pregnancy or parenting status, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability or any other protected status please contact the Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Department at 503-494-5148 or raaeo@ohsu.edu. Inquiries about Title IX compliance or sex/gender discrimination and harassment may be directed to the **OHSU Title IX Coordinator** at 503-494-0258 or titleix@ohsu.edu.

School of Public Health Handbook

All students are responsible for following the policies and expectations outlined in the student handbook for their program of study. Students are responsible for their own academic work and are expected to have read and practice principles of academic honesty, as presented in the handbook: http://ohsu-psu-sph.org/index.php/student_life/.

Technical Support

The OHSU ITG Help Desk is available to assist students with email account or network account access issues between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m., Monday through Friday at 503-494-2222. For technical support in using the Sakai Course Management System, please contact the Sakai Help Desk at 877-972-5249 or email us at sakai@ohsu.edu.

Reading Assignments

Please note that you should complete the readings listed under each week prior to posting in the forum on Tuesday. This information is also in the weekly course materials in Sakai. The exception is obviously Week 1 as you will likely not have enough time to complete the readings before posting.

Wherever possible, hyperlinks are embedded in the title of the article to direct you to a library copy of the assigned reading. “Ctrl + click” on the underlined text to follow the link. OHSU login is generally required to access library holdings. Please notify me if you are unable to access any of the readings or if you discover that a link is not working.

Week 1: Introduction to Program Evaluation

- Harris, M.J. (2010). *Evaluating Public and Community Health Programs*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass. [Chapter 1. An Introduction to Public and Community Health Evaluation](#). pp. 1-18. **NOTE:** The first 2 weeks of readings are made available in case there are delays with acquiring the text book.
- American Evaluation Association. (2011). [American Evaluation Association Public Statement on Cultural Competence in Evaluation](#). Fairhaven, MA: Author. Retrieved from www.eval.org. pp 1-11.
- Download the following guide as there will be readings throughout the term. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Director, Office of Strategy and Innovation. *Introduction to program evaluation for public health programs: A self-study guide*. (2011). Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <http://www.cdc.gov/eval/guide/index.htm> This week, pp 1-12.

Week 2: Needs Assessment & Stakeholder Engagement

- Harris, [Chapter 2: The Community Assessment](#). pp. 20-40.

- CDC *Self Study Guide*: pp 13-24.
- Horne, M. & Costello, J. (2003). [A public health approach to health needs assessment at the interface of primary care and community development: findings from an action research study](#). *Primary Health Care Research and Development*, 4, 340-352. doi:10.1191/1463423603pc173oa.
- Quinlisk P.; Jones M.J.; Bostick, N.A.; Walsh, L.E.; Curtiss, R.; Walker, R.; Mercer, S. & Subbarao, I. (2011). [Results of rapid needs assessments in rural and urban Iowa following large-scale flooding events in 2008](#). *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*, 5, 287-292. doi:10.1001/dmp.2011.82.

Scan:

- Preskill, H. & Jones, N. (2009) *A practical guide to engaging stakeholders in developing evaluation questions*. Princeton, N.J.: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Download at <http://www.rwjf.org/pr/product.jsp?id=49951>

Week 3: Program Theory & Logic Models

- Harris. Chapter 3: *Developing Initiatives*. pp. 42-60.
- Knowlton W., Phillips, CC. The *Logic Model Guidebook: Better Strategies for Great Results*. (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, 2013.
 - [Chapter 1: Introducing Logic Models](#)
 - [Chapter 3: Creating Program Logic Models](#)
- CDC *Self Study Guide*: pp 26-41.
- If you are new to logic model development, or prefer visual learning, the MetroWest Health Foundation video [Logic Model Basics](#) is a good resource (12 minutes).
- **Go to the website and download the Logic Model Guide as a resource.** The Kellogg Foundation website is a valuable resource to bookmark. : W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (2006). [Logic Model Development Guide](#). Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg.

Week 4: Developing Evaluation Questions

- Harris. Chapter 4: *Planning for Evaluation*. pp. 62- 78; Chapter 5: *Designing the Evaluation: Describing the Program*. pp. 80-86; Chapter 6: *Designing the Evaluation: Determining the Evaluation Questions and the Evaluation Design*. pp. 88-106.
- CDC *Self Study Guide*: pp 45-55
- CDC. (2011). Program Evaluation Tip Sheet: [Constructing Survey Questions](#).

Week 5: Evaluation Design & Data Collection – Qualitative

- Harris: Chapter 9: *Collecting the Data: Qualitative*. pp. 124-138; Chapter 10: *Analyzing and Interpreting the Data: Qualitative*. pp. 139-147.
- CDC *Self Study Guide*: pp 56-62.
- Sobo, E.J.; Simmes, D.R.; Landsverk, J.A. & Kurtin, P.S. (2003). Rapid Assessment with Qualitative Telephone Interviews: [Evaluation of California's Healthy Families program &](#)

[Medi-Cal for children](#) *American Journal of Evaluation*. 24:3. pp. 399-408..
DOI:10.1177/109821400302400308.

Recommended

- Fleischer, D.N. & Christie, C.A. (2009). [Evaluation use: Results from a survey of U.S. american evaluation association members](#). *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30:2. pp. 158-175. DOI: 10.1177/1098214008331009

Week 6: Evaluation Design & Data Collection – Quantitative

- Harris: Chapter 7: *Collecting the Data: Quantitative*. pp.100-115; Chapter 8: *Analyzing and Interpreting the Data: Quantitative*. pp. 116-123.
- CDC *Self Study Guide*: pp 63-73.
- Tucker-Brown, A. (2012). [CDC Coffee Break: using mixed methods in program evaluation](#). Slide presentation. CDC Division of Heart Disease & Stroke Prevention.
- Hamilton, J., Begley, C. & Culler, R. (2014). [Evaluation of partner collaboration to improve community-based mental health services for low income minority children and their families](#). *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 25. 50--60.

Recommended

- Green, J.C., Benjamin, L. & Goodyear, L. (2001). [The merits of mixing methods in evaluation](#), *Evaluation*. 7:1. 25-44 at: DOI: 10.1177/13563890122209504

Week 7: Program Process Evaluation & Monitoring

- Harris. Review pp. 94-96.
- CDC.(2008). [Introduction to process evaluation in tobacco use prevention and control](#). National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office of Smoking and Health pp. 1-8. <http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/publications/index.htm>
- Berkowitz, J. M., Huhman, M., Heitzler, C. D., Potter, L. D., Nolin, M. J. & Banspach, S.W. (2008). [Overview of formative, process, and outcome evaluation methods used in the VERB campaign](#). *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 34(6S): S222-S229.

Optional Reading

- Robbins, L.B., Pfeiffer, K.A., Wesolek, S.M., & Lo, Y. (2014). [Process evaluation for a school-based physical activity intervention for 6th and 7th grade boys: Reach, dose and fidelity](#). *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 42. 21-31.

Week 8: Outcome & Impact Evaluation

- Harris: Review pp 97-103. (In Chapter 6).
- CDC *Self Study Guide*: pp 74-90.

- CDC. (August 2011). [CDC Program Evaluation Tip Sheet Reach and Impact](#). National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion.
- Mohan R, Sullivan K.(2006). [Managing the politics of evaluation to achieve impact](#). *New Directions for Evaluation*, 112. pp 7-23.

Week 9: Ethical Implications

- Download and review the 2003 [American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles of Evaluators](#).
- Morris, M. (1999). [Research on evaluation ethics: what have we learned and why is it important?](#) *New Directions for Evaluation*, 82:15-24.
- Schweigert, F.J. [Predicament and promise: The internal evaluator as ethical leader](#). *New Directions for Evaluation*, 132:43-56.
- Rodi, M.S. & Paget, K.D. (2007). [Where local and national evaluators meet: Unintended treats to ethical evaluation practice](#). *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 30: 416-421.

The following is a brief case study on an ethical challenge and response:

- Morris, M. (2001). [Who is building this boat, anyway?](#) *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22: 107.
- Shulha, L. (2001). ["Tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor": The evaluator role in high stakes program design](#). *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22:111-115.

Recommended:

- Stevens, C.J., & Dial, M. (1994). [What constitutes misuse?](#) *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 64:3-13

Week 10: Case Study

- Sherwood, K.E. (2005). [Evaluating home visitation:a case study of evaluation at the David and Lucile Packard foundation](#). *New Directions for Evaluation*. 105:59-78.

Recommended Resources

- This paper introduces several tools for evidenced-based public health. Fielding, J.E. & Briss, P.A. (2006). [Promoting evidence-based public health policy: can we have better evidence and more action?](#) *Health Affairs*. 25(4):969-78.
- This paper provides recommendations from the Cochrane Collaboration on how to improve the quality of public health systemic reviews. . Waters, E., Doyle, J., Jackson, N., Howes, F., Brunton, G., & Oakley, A. (2006). [Evaluating the effectiveness of public health interventions: the role and activities of the Cochrane Collaboration](#). *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 60:285-289.
- This paper presents an evaluation approach that emphasises the importance of understanding group culture. The examples are drawn from tribal nations. LaFrance, J., Nicholas, R., & Kirkhart, K.E. (2012). [Culture writes the script: on the centrality of](#)

[context in indigenous evaluation](#). In D.J. Rog, J.L.Fitzpatrick, & R.F. Conner (Eds.). *Context: A framework for its influence on evaluation practice. New Directions for Evaluation*, 135: 59-74.

- This paper provides an overview of the benefits and limitations of using online surveys. Ritter, L. & Sue, V.M. (2007). [Introduction to using online surveys](#). *New Directions for Evaluation*. 115: 5-14.
- This paper is a practical outline to align program staff and evaluators around evaluation design that can have a program impact. Sridharan, S. & Nakaima, A. (2011). [Ten steps in making evaluation matter](#). *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 35:135-146.