

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Public Health Syllabi

Public Health, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of

Spring 2018

COHE 7233 - Ecologically Focused Program Evaluation

Moya L. Alfonso

Georgia Southern University, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, malfonso@georgiasouthern.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/coph-syllabi>

 Part of the [Public Health Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alfonso, Moya L., "COHE 7233 - Ecologically Focused Program Evaluation" (2018). *Public Health Syllabi*. 226.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/coph-syllabi/226>

This other is brought to you for free and open access by the Public Health, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Public Health Syllabi by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Georgia Southern University
Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health

COHE 7233 – Ecologically Focused Program Evaluation
Spring 2018

Instructor: Moya L. Alfonso, PhD, MSPH
Office: Hendricks Hall 2014
Phone: (912) 478-0966
E-Mail Address: malfonso@georgiasouthern.edu (best contact method; 48 response time, email is not checked during evenings or weekends, plan accordingly)
Office Hours: Monday and Wednesdays 10 am until 2 pm
By apt. (no Fridays)
Web Page: <http://www.georgiasouthern.edu>
Class Meets: Mondays and Wednesdays 230 until 345 pm
Location: Information Technology 3204

-- Course schedules can be found at: <http://www.collegesource.org/displayinfo/catalink.asp> --

Prerequisites: Graduate course in health promotion planning or permission of the instructor.

Catalog Description: This course provides an overview of the principles of program evaluation. It explores the methods associated with systematic evaluation of public health education programs. Students will learn the skills needed to plan, conduct, and critique evaluation research. The content of the course includes: program logic models, formative, process, impact, outcome, and summative evaluation; theory driven evaluation; a review of validity issues as they relate to evaluation; sampling in a complex context; operationalizing variables; assessment of measurement instruments; and analysis of quantitative evaluation designs. In addition, issues that impact evaluation across the ecological model, specifically the importance of context and equity issues, will be examined. Qualitative methods used in program evaluation and mixed method designs for evaluation will be highlighted. Supporting the needs of stakeholders in the evaluation will be emphasized.

Required Texts: Newcomer, K.E., Hatry, H.P., & Wholey, J.S. (2015). Handbook of practical program evaluation. 4th Edition. Hoboaswdeken, NJ: Josey-Bass.

Reference Texts: Websites and electronic resources provided in the syllabus and on Folio.

Program Goals: At the completion of this program the student will be able to:

1. Utilize basic theories, concepts and models from a range of social and behavioral disciplines that are used in public health research and practice to identify the causes of social and behavioral factors that affect health of individuals and populations.
2. Assess individual, organizational and community concerns, assets resources and deficits for social and behavioral science interventions.
3. Identify critical stakeholders for the planning, implementation and evaluation of public health programs, policies and interventions.
4. Demonstrate steps and procedures for the planning, implementation and evaluation of public health programs, policies and interventions.
5. Apply evidence-based, ethically grounded approaches in the development and evaluation of social and behavioral science interventions.

Course Objectives: At the completion of this course the student will be able to:

1. Define program evaluation and discuss its applications to community health.
2. Collaboratively develop logic models for simple and complex program evaluations.
3. Demonstrate how to develop a mission, goal and objective focused evaluation plan.
4. Demonstrate how to plan, implement, and disseminate a community-based public health intervention evaluation.
5. Demonstrate how to develop evidence-based program evaluations to address community health issues.
6. Demonstrate qualitative and quantitative data collection skills.
7. Demonstrate skills for conducting formative and summative evaluation such as impact and outcome evaluation.
8. Discuss the program evaluation standards.
9. Demonstrate the process of operationalizing variables to measure in evaluation designs.
10. Assess the quality and usefulness of various measurement instruments.
11. Analyze the importance of context on developing and conducting evaluation plans.
12. Discuss strategies for conducting a utilization-focused evaluation.

Overview of the Content to be Covered during the Semester:

Week	Dates	Topic	Readings	Assignment
1	1/8 & 1/10	Introduction and Course Overview Overview of service learning project	Syllabus CDC: Introduction to Program Evaluation for Public Health	Download syllabus from Folio and bring to class

		<p>Program evaluation partner introductions</p> <p>Introduction to program evaluation</p>	<p>Programs</p> <p>McLeroy et al. (1988) An Ecological Perspective on Health Promotion Programs. HEQ 15(4):351-77.</p>	<p>Select program for program evaluation service learning project</p>
2	1/15 & 1/17	<p>1/15/2018 MLK Holiday no class</p> <p>Overview of program evaluation types and cultural competence</p>	<p>Newcomer et al. Chapter 1 and 12</p>	<p>IRB Training Certificate and Letter of Support Due via Dropbox by 5 pm on 1/17</p>
3	1/22 & 1/24	<p>Evaluation Ethics and Case Studies</p> <p>The IRB process for service learning projects</p>	<p>Milstein & Wetterhall (2000) A Framework Featuring Steps and Standards for Program Evaluation. HPP 1(3) 221-8.</p> <p>Newcomer et al. Chapter 9</p> <p>AEA Guiding Principles for Evaluators</p>	
4	1/29 & 1/31	<p>Planning for Evaluation – Evaluation Assessment, Engaging Stakeholders</p>	<p>McNamara: Basic Guide to Program Evaluation (Planning Your Program Evaluation, Who Should Carry Out the Evaluation Plan, Contents of an Evaluation Plan)</p> <p>Newcomer et al. Chapter 2</p>	
5	2/5 & 2/7	<p>Program Development Overview & Logic Modeling</p> <p>Writing program objectives and choosing indicators</p>	<p>Newcomer et al. Chapter 3</p> <p>W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Logic Model Development Guide.</p> <p>Fielden et al. (2007). Key Considerations for Logic Model Development in Research Partnerships. Eval Prog Plan 30:115-24.</p>	<p>In Class Time to Describe your program – Service Learning project</p>
6	2/12 & 2/14	<p>Formative and Process Evaluation</p>	<p>Berkowitz et al. (2008). Overview of formative,</p>	

			process & outcome evaluation methods used in the VERB campaign. Am J Prev Med 34:65	
7	2/19 & 2/21	Impact and Outcome Evaluation	Newcomer et al. Chapters 5 - 10	Service learning program description and logic model due 2/21 to Dropbox by 5 pm
8	2/26 & 2/28	Secondary Data Sources OASIS, Census Bureau, YRBS	Newcomer et al. Chapters 13 and 14	
9	2/19 & 2/21	Research Methods – Qual and Quan In Class Practice Sessions	Review notes from your research methods course Come prepared to practice qual and quan research methods For review read: Newcomer et al. Chapters 17, 19, 20, 22, & 23	
10	2/26 & 2/28	Midterm Exam Review 2/26 Midterm Exam In Class 2/28	Bring materials to class and review sheet on 3/5 for review sessionzs	
11	3/5 & 3/7	Exploratory Evaluation Evaluating Community Change Programs	Newcomer et al Chapters 4 and 11	Evaluation Plan for service learning project due to Dropbox by 5 pm on 3/7
12	3/12 & 3/14	Spring Break – Enjoy!		
13	3/19 & 3/21	March 19 th Dr. Alfonso at Southeast Evaluation Association – Guest Lectures on Cost Effectiveness Evaluation and Meta Analyses, Systematic Reviews, and Evaluation Synthesis	Newcomer et al. Chapters 24 and 25	Evaluation Instruments due to Dropbox by 5 pm on 3/21

14	3/26 & 3/28	Writing Up Results and Evaluation Reporting	Newcomer et al. Chapters 27 and 28 CDC Developing an effective evaluation report https://www.cdc.gov/eval/materials/developing-an-effective-evaluation-report_tag508.pdf Lavinghouze et al. (2007) The Program Success Story: A Valuable Tool for Program Evaluation. HPP 8(4):323-31	
15	4/2 & 4/4	4/2 Special topics – Participatory/empowerment evaluation 4/4 Dr. Alfonso at Gulf South Summit – No class but work in group on finishing your service learning project	The community toolbox: Participatory evaluation http://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/overview/model-for-community-change-and-improvement/participatory-evaluation/main Kellogg Foundation: Facilitator’s Guide: Participatory Evaluation with Youth People	Collect evaluation data and analyze
16	4/9 & 4/11	Special Topics: Evaluating Coalition Functioning, Community Capacity, and Sustainability	Alfonso et al. (2007) Fortune Britt et al. Granner & Sharpe	Write final service learning evaluation report
17	4/16 & 4/18	Special Topic: Strategies for Making Evaluation Useful		Evaluation Service Learning Project Final Report due 5 pm via Folio Dropbox on 4/18
18	4/23 & 4/25	Service Learning Program Evaluation Final Report Presentations (20 to 30 minutes per presentation)	No readings	PowerPoint presentations due by 5 pm on 4/25
19	4/30 & 5/2	Final Exam Due	No readings, no classes	Exam and reflection

				paper due 5 pm via Folio Dropbox on 5/2
--	--	--	--	---

The last day to withdrawal without penalty is March 5, 2018.

Instructional Methods: Class meetings will be a combination of lecture, class discussion, and computer software demonstration. Written homework assignments, in class assignments, service learning products including reflection paper, and exams will be used to assess student learning outcomes.

Exam Schedule and Final Examination:

Midterm Examination: February 28, 2018
 Final Examination (take home): Due May 2, 2018

Grading: *Weighting* of assignments for purposes of grading will be as follows:

Midterm Exam	100 points
Final Exam	100 points
CITI Training Certificate	25 points
Evaluation Program Description and Logic Model	25 points
Evaluation Plan	25 points
Evaluation Instruments	25 points
Evaluation Final Report	100 points
Service Learning Reflection Paper	25 points

Total Possible Points 425 points (100%)

The following point scale will be utilized in grading:

- 382-to-425 points (90%) A
- 340-to-381 points (80%) B
- 297-to-339 points (70%) C
- 255-to-296 points (60%) D

For calculation of your final grade, all grades above will be included. **A's will be reserved for those who are truly exceptional (i.e., excellent or above average).**

All exams and assignments will be graded and returned promptly so that students may accurately calculate their grades at any point in time during the semester. You can check your grades at any point in time by going to Folio.

There are times when extraordinary circumstances occur (e.g., serious illness, death in the family, etc.). In such circumstances, and/or if you need additional time to satisfactorily complete any course requirement, **please consult with the instructor immediately or within two days (48 hours) of the event.** Everyday illness, work related issues, etc. do not count as emergencies. *Nota Bene:* Extensions are not guaranteed and will be granted solely at the discretion of the instructor.

NO EXTRA CREDIT PROJECTS WILL BE ASSIGNED!

Grade determination: I do NOT determine your grade. You do. Your grade is based on your performance. If you have questions or concerns, it is YOUR responsibility to contact the instructor and discuss your concerns or questions. Please take advantage of office hours.

Descriptions of Requirements:

- A. Mid-term and final exam: (Course Objectives 1 – 16)
Two exams will be given that test your knowledge of program evaluation and mastery of critical thinking. These will be comprehensive exams and will include multiple choice, true/false, short answer and essay questions covering both material taught in classes as well as assigned readings. Students should be familiar not only with concepts learned, but should also be able to apply these concepts to hypothetical research contexts. (Course Objectives 1 – 16)
- B. Service Learning Projects: (Course Objectives: 1-16)
Over the course of the semester you will work in groups to complete a program evaluation for a community-based organization. The program evaluation will be broken down into a series of assignments worth 25 points that will be described in class and are listed on the course syllabus. The following components are required: proof of IRB training, a program description with logic model (3 pages total), an evaluation plan including design, evaluation methods, and data analysis (2 to 3 pages total), qualitative and/or quantitative instruments (page length varies depending on instrument type), and final evaluation report that pulls together all other components and includes a results and discussion section (10 to 12 pages total). The final evaluation report should include copies of study instruments as appendices. Instruments do not count toward the final page length total.
- C. Service Learning Reflection Paper.
I'm interested in what you learned from the service learning project, so a reflection paper is required. References are not required for the reflection paper. The reflection paper should address the following questions:
 - 1. What did you learn about yourself as a public health professional as a result of participating in the service learning process?

2. How did participation in the service learning project reinforce what you learned in the classroom?
3. How do you think the community forum will affect your community-based organization? What steps should they take next?

Service Learning Assignment Components for Full Evaluation Report

<u>Component</u>	<u>Description</u>
CITI Training Certificate	If you have not already done so, please complete the basic human subjects IRB training on the CITI IRB training website (https://about.citiprogram.org/en/homepage/). You will have to create an account and affiliate yourself with Georgia Southern University.
Letter of Support for IRB Application	Each group will need to work with their community partner to develop a letter of support that details the support the community partner will provide for your project. For an example, please either email me or look on the GSU IRB forms website. Examples of support include access to participants, access to existing deidentified data, etc. You will need to write the letter of support for the community partner, email it to them after I have approved it, request that they put it on their letterhead, sign it, and send you and me a signed copy (scanned is easiest) for submission to IRB.
Evaluation Plan	<p>This is the major deliverable for the class. You will choose a partner/program, and develop and conduct an evaluation.</p> <p>You will need to have access to data on the program's structure, goals, and implementation, and be able to conduct an interview with the community partner/stakeholder in the program. Program partners will come to class the first week, which is when you will select a partner to work with.</p> <p>Key elements of this assignment are assigned as drafts throughout the semester, to allow you to receive guidance and feedback from me as you develop your plan and instruments and conduct the evaluation. An overall grading rubric is available on Folio. The final evaluation report should be no less than 10 pages double spaced not including appendices (e.g., instruments, informed consent forms, letters of support). The final report should include the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Background (public health implications and

	<p>need)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Program description and logic model -Stakeholder identification and description of your interview with them -Evaluation goal statement -A description of your methodology, including the evaluation indicators to be used -Your data analysis plan -A description of how you plan to disseminate the findings -Results of your evaluation -Discussion of your evaluation findings, implications, and next steps and recommendations for your partnering organization -Reference list with at least 5 journal citations (background and methods sections should always be grounded in the literature) -An appendix including your letter of support, instruments, and informed consent forms)
Program and Stakeholder Description	<p>This should be a substantial section of your overall final document that allows the reader to fully understand the program you propose to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Community the program serves -2-3 paragraph literature review on the need for the program -Program goals -Program setting -Stakeholders -Intervention design -A description of any prior formative assessment or evaluation conducted on the program
Evaluation Purpose Statement	<p>Concise (no more than 2 paragraphs) summary of the specific goals of the evaluation. The reader should be able, from this summary, to understand exactly what information the evaluation will provide, and how that information will be used.</p>
Stakeholder Interview Overview	<p>One page summary in the final evaluation report of a semi-structured interview with the major stakeholders of your program that describes what they need and want from your group in terms of evaluation support.</p>
Logic Model	<p>Logic model schematic (professional quality)</p>

	that details the program’s resources, assumptions, intended activities, outputs, and the expected short, mid, and long-term outcomes of these activities.
Secondary Data Source Inclusion	Select an online source of secondary data relevant to your program, review the data set online, and provide a summary of at least two variables from that dataset that might be used to provide long-term outcome data on your program’s impact.
Instrumentation	Develop a quantitative or qualitative instrument to be used to collect data for your evaluation. Your instrument should map back to your evaluation goals and objectives and include questions specific to your evaluation indicators.
Evaluation PowerPoint Presentation	A 20 minute PowerPoint presentation describing all components described in this table. A final slide should include information specific to challenges you faced, how you overcame them, and lessons you learned. Your community partner will be invited to attend, so your presentation should be professional in quality.

Children in the classroom: The instructor understands that many students are parents and that, on occasion, child care issues emerge. If an occasion arises where child care is an issue and a student would like to attend class with their child, the student must ask the instructor for permission prior to bringing the child to class. This is because the instructor has to think of the needs of the entire class, which includes parents and their peers. Therefore, notice and a complete understanding of the requirements for having a child in the classroom are required. As 24 hours' notice is not always possible when dealing with child care, the instructor requires the request be placed in writing (via email) NO LESS than 5 hours prior to the start of class if the student wishes to attend class with their child. In addition, it is up to the instructor to consider and approve or deny the request based on their understanding of the situation **and** the needs of the class. If a child is brought to class without the consent of the instructor, the instructor has the right to request that the student leaves the classroom. Also, if consent to bring a child by the instructor is given, the instructor expects the child to not interfere with classroom management. Children who are disruptive, which is deemed so by the instructor, will be asked to leave along with their parent and the student will be responsible for making up the material missed in class. There are no exceptions to this policy.

Academic Integrity:

The instructor believes that the conduct of a student registered or taking courses in the JPHCOPH should be consistent with that of a professional person. Courtesy, honesty, and respect should be shown by students toward faculty members, guest lecturers, administrative support staff, and fellow students. Similarly, students should expect faculty to treat them fairly, showing respect for their ideas and opinions and striving to help them achieve maximum benefits from their experience in the JPHCOPH. **Students should communicate professionally via email with the professor and other students. The professor reserves the right to forward unprofessional emails to Dr. Telfair for follow up. In addition, the professor reserves the right to NOT respond to unprofessional emails.**

Please adhere to the strictest academic standards of conduct noted in the *GSU Student Conduct Code* and the *Undergraduate & Graduate Catalog*. Familiarize yourself with University's policies. Enrollment in this course is an implied contract between you and the instructor. Academic integrity relates to the appropriate use of intellectual property. The syllabus and all materials presented and/or distributed during this course are protected by copyright law. You are authorized to take notes, but that authorization extends only to making one set of notes for personal (and no other) use. Students are not authorized to sell, license, commercially publish, distribute, transmit, display, or record notes in or from class without written permission of the instructor.

Student academic misconduct refers to behavior that may include plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, falsification of records or official documents, intentional misuse of equipment or materials (including library materials), and aiding and abetting the perpetration of such acts. The preparation of reports, papers, and examinations, assigned on an individual basis, must represent each student's own effort. Reference sources should be indicated clearly. The use of assistance from other students or aids of any kind during a written examination, except when the use of aids

such as electronic devices, books or notes has been approved by an instructor, is a violation of the standard of academic conduct.

According to the Academic Dishonesty Policy of GSU, Plagiarism includes (but is not limited to):

- A. Directly quoting the words of others without using quotation marks or indented format to identify them.
- B. Using published or unpublished sources of information without identifying them.
- C. Paraphrasing material or ideas without identifying the source.
- D. Unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic material.

If you are accused of plagiarism by a JPHCOPH, the following policy, as per the Judicial Affairs website (<http://students.georgiasouthern.edu/judicial/faculty.htm>) will be enforced:

PROCEDURES FOR ADJUDICATING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY CASES

First Offense - In Violation Plea

1. If the professor and the Dean of Students agree that the evidence is sufficient to warrant a charge of academic dishonesty, the professor should contact the Office of Judicial Affairs to determine if this is a first violation of academic dishonesty. The incident will be reported via the following website: <http://students.georgiasouthern.edu/judicial/faculty.htm>
2. If it is a first violation, the professor should talk with the student about the violation. If the student accepts responsibility in writing and the professor decides to adjudicate the case, the following procedures will be followed:
 - a. The student will be placed on disciplinary probation for a minimum of one semester by the Office of Judicial Affairs.
 - b. The student will be subject to any academic sanctions imposed by the professor (from receiving a 0 on the assignment to receiving a failing grade in the class).
 - c. A copy of all the material involved in the case (Academic Dishonesty Report Form and the Request For Instructor to Adjudicate Form) and a brief statement from the professor concerning the facts of the case and the course syllabus should be mailed to the Office of Judicial Affairs for inclusion in the student's discipline record.

First Offense - Not In Violation Plea (student does not admit the violation)

If the professor and the Dean of Students agree that the evidence is sufficient to warrant a charge of academic dishonesty, the professor should contact the Office of Judicial Affairs to determine if this is the first or second violation of academic dishonesty. The student will be charged with academic dishonesty and the University Judicial Board or a University Hearing Officer would hear the case. If the student is found responsible, the following penalty will normally be imposed:

- a. The student will be placed on Disciplinary Probation for a minimum of one semester by the Office of Judicial Affairs.
- b. The student will be subject to any academic sanctions imposed by the professor.

Second Violation of Academic Dishonesty

If the professor and the Dean of Students agree that the evidence is sufficient to warrant a charge

of academic dishonesty, and if it is determined this is the second violation, the student will be charged with academic dishonesty and the University Judicial Board or a University Hearing Officer would hear the case.

If the student is found responsible, the following penalty will normally be imposed:

- a. Suspension for a minimum of one semester or expulsion.
- b. The student will be subject to any academic sanctions imposed by the professor.

NOT RESPONSIBLE FINDING

When a student is found not responsible of academic dishonesty, the work in question (assignment, paper, test, etc.) would be forwarded to the Department Chair. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that the work is evaluated by a faculty member other than the individual who brought the charge and, if necessary, submit a final grade to the Registrar. For the protection of the faculty member and the student, the work in question should not be referred back to the faculty member who charged the student with academic dishonesty. In the case of a Department Chair bringing charges against a student, an administrator at the Dean's level will ensure that the student's work is evaluated in an appropriate manner.

CONFIDENTIALITY

In accordance with provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 and the Georgia Open Records Act, any information related to a violation of academic dishonesty or the outcome of a judicial hearing regarding academic dishonesty, is prohibited and must be treated as confidential by members of the faculty."

Academic Handbook:

Please abide by the Academic Handbook

<http://students.georgiasouthern.edu/sta/guide/07GuideWeb.pdf> Failure to comply

with any part of the Handbook may be a violation and result in an "F" in the course and/or referral for disciplinary action.

University Calendar: The University Calendar can be found at:

<http://em.georgiasouthern.edu/registrar/resources/calendars/>

Attendance Policy: Attendance the first day of class is **mandatory** per University policy.

Federal regulations require attendance be verified prior to distribution of financial aid allotments.

One Final Note: The contents of this syllabus are as complete and accurate as possible. The instructor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus and course materials. The instructor will make every effort to inform students of changes as they occur. It is the student's responsibility to know what changes have been made in order to successfully complete the requirements of the course.