Chapter 1 : Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing

The Second Edition of Practical Program Evaluation shows readers how to systematically identify stakeholders' needs in order to select the evaluation options best suited to meet those needs.

Open in a separate window Practical Program Evaluation: Assessing and Improving Planning, Implementation, and Effectiveness is an excellent first step toward a much-needed program evaluation taxonomy â€" one that is particularly useful for those new to evaluation, as well as for seasoned evaluators who would like to encourage understanding of the evaluation process. In this four-part, chapter book, Chen discusses the evaluation process from program planning to outcome assessment. He advocates a theory-driven evaluation approach that supports his taxonomy and provides a thorough review of the theory-driven approach. Chen explains that many evaluation concepts are too vague or ambiguous to apply effectively to actual evaluations. He proposes an evaluation taxonomy to exemplify a holistic approach to evaluation practice. The new taxonomy supports evaluators in their attempts to understand and apply evaluation designs, data collection techniques, and use of evaluation information at a practical program level. This is no small achievement and should be an impetus for additional work in the area of evaluation taxonomy development. The taxonomy and overview of the process are excellent tools for strengthening communication between stakeholders and evaluators. The work is replete with diagrams, examples, and definitions and would be a welcome addition to any evaluation course curriculum. Chen states that the intended audience for this book is students who have completed an entry-level evaluation course, as well as seasoned evaluators who would like to expand their knowledge and strengthen their practical skills. He acknowledges that many of the terms and definitions presented are not consistent with terms readily found in the current literature, but he encourages the readers to broaden their understanding of evaluation. For example, Chen discards the logic model in favor of his action-model and change-model approach. Although this could be an interesting challenge for seasoned evaluators, it might prove more of a burden for novice evaluators. In the final chapters, Chen also briefly addresses some criticisms of theory-driven evaluation and challenges evaluation practitioners to think about the politics and contributions of evaluation activities. Chen also skillfully demonstrates that stakeholder theory is a legitimate basis for theory-driven programs and needs to be explained and vetted like established theories of behavior change such as the Health Belief Model. He reminds evaluation practitioners that program theory and the program itself belong to the stakeholders. Chen proposes that the role evaluation practitioners should play varies from one of objective observer to one of a clear partner in the development and design of the program. With these varying roles, the evaluation approach will also change. As with all the strategies and approaches he addresses, Chen provides a thorough discussion of the positives and negatives of efficiency and effectiveness evaluation. Although the book provides an insightful discussion of evaluation in the program planning, development, and maturation stages, Chen does not discuss evaluation use or discern intended users program stakeholders. However, it does not provide adequate guidance for obtaining stakeholder questions and evaluation priorities. Chen does argue for the inclusion of stakeholders throughout the evaluation process and proposes that use of the taxonomy will facilitate discussions between evaluators and stakeholders, but this will be derived from the program theory and stage of development rather than from the intended users and projected uses of the evaluation. The book is a welcome addition to the expanding literature on evaluation, because it provides an overall conceptualization of the evaluation process from program design to implementation. Although the book is somewhat limited by its lack of discussion about how evaluation results are used, this breakthrough in conceptualization will surely encourage more work in the area. Footnotes The opinions expressed by authors contributing to this journal do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the U. Use of trade names is for identification only and does not imply endorsement by any of the groups named above. Suggested citation for this article: Prev Chronic Dis [serial online] Jan [date cited].

Chapter 2 : Practical Program Evaluation - Huey T Chen - Häftad () | Bokus

Practical Program Evaluation: Assessing and Improving Planning, Implementation, and Effectiveness is an excellent first step toward a much-needed program evaluation taxonomy â€" one that is particularly useful for those new to evaluation, as well as for seasoned evaluators who would like to encourage understanding of the evaluation process.

To determine what the effects of the program are: Assess skills development by program participants Compare changes in behavior over time Decide where to allocate new resources Demonstrate that accountability requirements are fulfilled Use information from multiple evaluations to predict the likely effects of similar programs To affect participants: Reinforce messages of the program Stimulate dialogue and raise awareness about community issues Broaden consensus among partners about program goals Teach evaluation skills to staff and other stakeholders Gather success stories Support organizational change and improvement Questions The evaluation needs to answer specific questions. Drafting questions encourages stakeholders to reveal what they believe the evaluation should answer. That is, what questions are more important to stakeholders? The process of developing evaluation questions further refines the focus of the evaluation. Methods The methods available for an evaluation are drawn from behavioral science and social research and development. Three types of methods are commonly recognized. They are experimental, quasi-experimental, and observational or case study designs. Observational or case study methods use comparisons within a group to describe and explain what happens e. No design is necessarily better than another. The choice of methods has implications for what will count as evidence, how that evidence will be gathered, and what kind of claims can be made. Because each method option has its own biases and limitations, evaluations that mix methods are generally more robust. Over the course of an evaluation, methods may need to be revised or modified. Circumstances that make a particular approach useful can change. For example, the intended use of the evaluation could shift from discovering how to improve the program to helping decide about whether the program should continue or not. Thus, methods may need to be adapted or redesigned to keep the evaluation on track. An agreement describes how the evaluation activities will be implemented. Elements of an agreement include statements about the intended purpose, users, uses, and methods, as well as a summary of the deliverables, those responsible, a timeline, and budget. The formality of the agreement depends upon the relationships that exist between those involved. For example, it may take the form of a legal contract, a detailed protocol, or a simple memorandum of understanding. Regardless of its formality, creating an explicit agreement provides an opportunity to verify the mutual understanding needed for a successful evaluation. It also provides a basis for modifying procedures if that turns out to be necessary. As you can see, focusing the evaluation design may involve many activities. For instance, both supporters and skeptics of the program could be consulted to ensure that the proposed evaluation questions are politically viable. Interviews could be held with specific intended users to better understand their information needs and timeline for action. Resource requirements could be reduced when users are willing to employ more timely but less precise evaluation methods. Gather Credible Evidence Credible evidence is the raw material of a good evaluation. The information learned should be seen by stakeholders as believable, trustworthy, and relevant to answer their questions. This requires thinking broadly about what counts as "evidence. For another question, a set of well-done, systematic observations such as interactions between an outreach worker and community residents, will have high credibility. The difference depends on what kind of information the stakeholders want and the situation in which it is gathered. In some situations, it may be necessary to consult evaluation specialists. This may be especially true if concern for data quality is especially high. In other circumstances, local people may offer the deepest insights. Regardless of their expertise, however, those involved in an evaluation should strive to collect information that will convey a credible, well-rounded picture of the program and its efforts. Having credible evidence strengthens the evaluation results as well as the recommendations that follow from them. One way to do this is by using multiple procedures for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data. Encouraging participation by stakeholders can also enhance perceived credibility. The following features of evidence gathering typically affect how credible it is seen as being: Indicators Indicators translate general

concepts about the program and its expected effects into specific, measurable parts. Examples of indicators include: That is, they reflect the aspects of the program that are most meaningful to monitor. Several indicators are usually needed to track the implementation and effects of a complex program or intervention. One way to develop multiple indicators is to create a "balanced scorecard," which contains indicators that are carefully selected to complement one another. According to this strategy, program processes and effects are viewed from multiple perspectives using small groups of related indicators. For instance, a balanced scorecard for a single program might include indicators of how the program is being delivered; what participants think of the program; what effects are observed; what goals were attained; and what changes are occurring in the environment around the program. Another approach to using multiple indicators is based on a program logic model, such as we discussed earlier in the section. A logic model can be used as a template to define a full spectrum of indicators along the pathway that leads from program activities to expected effects. They can also address intermediary factors that influence program effectiveness, including such intangible factors as service quality, community capacity, or inter -organizational relations. Indicators for these and similar concepts can be created by systematically identifying and then tracking markers of what is said or done when the concept is expressed. In the course of an evaluation, indicators may need to be modified or new ones adopted. There are definite perils to using performance indicators as a substitute for completing the evaluation process and reaching fully justified conclusions. Sources Sources of evidence in an evaluation may be people, documents, or observations. More than one source may be used to gather evidence for each indicator. For instance, an inside perspective may be reflected by internal documents and comments from staff or program managers; whereas clients and those who do not support the program may provide different, but equally relevant perspectives. Mixing these and other perspectives provides a more comprehensive view of the program or intervention. The criteria used to select sources should be clearly stated so that users and other stakeholders can interpret the evidence accurately and assess if it may be biased. The integration of qualitative and quantitative information can yield evidence that is more complete and more useful, thus meeting the needs and expectations of a wider range of stakeholders. Quality Quality refers to the appropriateness and integrity of information gathered in an evaluation. High quality data are reliable and informative. It is easier to collect if the indicators have been well defined. Other factors that affect quality may include instrument design, data collection procedures, training of those involved in data collection, source selection, coding, data management, and routine error checking. Obtaining quality data will entail tradeoffs e. Quantity Quantity refers to the amount of evidence gathered in an evaluation. It is necessary to estimate in advance the amount of information that will be required and to establish criteria to decide when to stop collecting data - to know when enough is enough. It also partly determines whether the evaluation will be able to detect effects. All evidence collected should have a clear, anticipated use. Logistics By logistics, we mean the methods, timing, and physical infrastructure for gathering and handling evidence. People and organizations also have cultural preferences that dictate acceptable ways of asking questions and collecting information, including who would be perceived as an appropriate person to ask the questions. Therefore, the techniques for gathering evidence in an evaluation must be in keeping with the cultural norms of the community. Data collection procedures should also ensure that confidentiality is protected. Justify Conclusions The process of justifying conclusions recognizes that evidence in an evaluation does not necessarily speak for itself. Conclusions become justified when they are linked to the evidence gathered and judged against agreed-upon values set by the stakeholders. Stakeholders must agree that conclusions are justified in order to use the evaluation results with confidence. Standards Standards reflect the values held by stakeholders about the program. They provide the basis to make program judgments. The use of explicit standards for judgment is fundamental to sound evaluation. They are designed to detect patterns in evidence, either by isolating important findings analysis or by combining different sources of information to reach a larger understanding synthesis. Mixed method evaluations require the separate analysis of each evidence element, as well as a synthesis of all sources to examine patterns that emerge. Deciphering facts from a given body of evidence involves deciding how to organize, classify, compare, and display information. These decisions are guided by the questions being asked, the types of data available, and especially by input from stakeholders and primary intended users. Interpretation Interpretation

is the effort to figure out what the findings mean. The facts must be interpreted to understand their practical significance. In short, interpretations draw on information and perspectives that stakeholders bring to the evaluation. They can be strengthened through active participation or interaction with the data and preliminary explanations of what happened. Judgements Judgments are statements about the merit, worth, or significance of the program. They are formed by comparing the findings and their interpretations against one or more selected standards. Because multiple standards can be applied to a given program, stakeholders may reach different or even conflicting judgments. Community members, however, may feel that despite improvements, a minimum threshold of access to services has still not been reached. Their judgment, based on standards of social equity, would therefore be negative. This type of disagreement can be a catalyst to clarify values and to negotiate the appropriate basis or bases on which the program should be judged. Recommendations Recommendations are actions to consider as a result of the evaluation. Forming recommendations requires information beyond just what is necessary to form judgments. By contrast, an evaluation can be strengthened by recommendations that anticipate and react to what users will want to know. Three things might increase the chances that recommendations will be relevant and well-received: Sharing draft recommendations Soliciting reactions from multiple stakeholders Presenting options instead of directive advice Justifying conclusions in an evaluation is a process that involves different possible steps. For instance, conclusions could be strengthened by searching for alternative explanations from the ones you have chosen, and then showing why they are unsupported by the evidence. When there are different but equally well supported conclusions, each could be presented with a summary of their strengths and weaknesses.

Chapter 3 : Practical Program Evaluation : Huey-Tsyh Chen :

of results for "practical program evaluation" Practical Program Evaluation: Theory-Driven Evaluation and the Integrated Evaluation Perspective Nov 27,

Exploring the influence and application of Campbellian validity typology in the theory and practice of outcome evaluation, this volume addresses the strengths and weaknesses of this often controversial evaluation method and presents new perspectiv He takes the reader through the essential steps in evaluation, with particularly valuable treatment of stakeholder involvement. The readers will come away with a detailed understanding of both conventional and cutting-edge approaches. It is a must-read for practicing program evaluators, evaluation scholars, and students of evaluation. He continues his innovative and pragmatic thinking about evaluation including identifying, constructing, and testing theories that can work, that is, practical theories. Chen shows how to blend formative and summative evaluation, process and outcome evaluation, theory and action, and much more. If one desires to articulate and build program theories that work, from the bottom up, and conduct effective evaluations, this rigorous and practical book is for you. New chapters gleaned from the field reveal solution sets for overcoming challenges in a variety of contexts while still balancing scientific and stakeholder needs. Chen has been a Professor at the University of Alabama at Birmingham since He was born and raised in Taiwan. Chen had taken a leadership role in designing and implementing a national evaluation system for assessing the CDC funded HIV prevention programs, which are based in health departments and community organizations. Chen has contributed to the development of evaluation theory and methodology, especially in the areas of program theory and theory-driven evaluations. His book, Theory-Driven Evaluations, has been recognized as one of the landmarks in program evaluation. He is also the recipient of the Paul F. Fundamentals for Practicing Program Evaluation 2. The Comprehensive Evaluation Typology 3. Program Monitoring and the Development of a Monitoring System 9. Constructive Outcome Evaluations The Experimentation Evaluation Approach Holistic Effectuality Evaluation Approach Stakeholder Theories in Interventions: Relative Strengths and Limitations

Chapter 4 : Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation by Joseph S. Wholey

"Practical Program Evaluation presents a useful and usable model for deciding which kind of evaluation activities to undertake in different circumstances. Chen identifies different kinds of evaluation activities that are appropriate for different stages of a program.

Fundamentals for Program Evaluation 2. The Comprehensive Evaluation Typology 3. Helping Stakeholders Clarify a Program Plan: Program Monitoring and the Development of a Monitoring System 9. Constructive Outcome Evaluations Relative Strengths and Limitations New chapters gleaned from the field reveal solution sets for overcoming challenges in a variety of contexts while still balancing scientific and stakeholder needs. Gascon, Ohio State University "Huey Chen brings decades of evaluation and experience to this new edition. He continues his innovative and pragmatic thinking about evaluation including identifying, constructing, and testing theories that can work, that is, practical theories. Chen shows how to blend formative and summative evaluation, process and outcome evaluation, theory and action, and much more. If one desires to articulate and build program theories that work, from the bottom up, and conduct effective evaluations, this rigorous and practical book is for you. The readers will come away with a detailed understanding of both conventional and cutting-edge approaches. It is a must-read for practicing program evaluators, evaluation scholars, and students of evaluation. Donaldson, Claremont Graduate University "In this eminently readable book, Chen presents a strong matrix framework for conceptualizing a full range of evaluation strategies and approaches The writing is exceptionally clear, accessible to novice evaluators, and, because it is fair-minded and principled, of relevance to seasoned evaluators as well. He takes the reader through the essential steps in evaluation, with particularly valuable treatment of stakeholder involvement. Rivera, University of New Mexico "The strength of this text is its coverage of practical concerns for consideration by practitioners who are envisioning, planning, and executing program evaluations. Chen has been a Professor at the University of Alabama at Birmingham since He was born and raised in Taiwan. Chen had taken a leadership role in designing and implementing a national evaluation system for assessing the CDC funded HIV prevention programs, which are based in health departments and community organizations. Chen has contributed to the development of evaluation theory and methodology, especially in the areas of program theory and theory-driven evaluations. His book, Theory-Driven Evaluations, has been recognized as one of the landmarks in program evaluation. He is also the recipient of the Paul F.

Chapter 5 : Practical Use of Program Evaluation among Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) Programs

Practical Program Evaluation: Assessing and Improving Planning, Implementation, and Effectiveness introduces students to the real world of evaluation, focusing on issues that arise in professional practice.

Chapter 6 : Practical Program Evaluation: Huey Chen: Books - racedaydvl.com

The purpose of program evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of criminal justice policies and programs. The ability of the research to meet these aims is related to the design of the program, its methodology, and the relationship between the administrator and evaluator.

Chapter 7 : Practical Program Evaluation - SAGE Research Methods

Practical Use of Program Evaluation among Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) Programs Recommend on Facebook Tweet Share Compartir This manual provides step-by-step guidance on how to design and implement a program evaluation.

Chapter 8 : Practical Program Evaluation: Assessing and Improving Planning, Implementation, and Effectiv

The Framework for Evaluation in Public Health [1] guides public health professionals in their use of program evaluation. It is a practical, nonprescriptive tool, designed to summarize and organize essential elements of program evaluation.

Chapter 9 : Framework for Program Evaluation - CDC

Praise for the third edition of the Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation "Mix three of the most highly regarded evaluators with a team of talented contributors, and you end up with an exceedingly practical and useful handbook that belongs on the reference shelf of every evaluator as well as program and policy officials.".