Chapter 1 : Program evaluation - Wikipedia

JANUARY UNC-HPDP Center for Training and Research Translation, UNC-CH 1 Evaluation Framework Questions Phase 1: Formative Evaluation Formative evaluation assesses stakeholder's awareness, preferences, needs, and capacity and the.

What do we mean by stakeholders and their interests? Why identify and analyze stakeholders and their interests? Who are potential stakeholders? When should you identify stakeholders? How do you identify and analyze stakeholders and their interests? The Community Tool Box is a big fan of participatory process. That means involving as many as possible of those who are affected by or have an interest in any project, initiative, intervention, or effort. We believe strongly that, in most cases, involving all of these folks will lead to a better process, greater community support and buy-in, more ideas on the table, a better understanding of the community context, and, ultimately, a more effective effort. In order to conduct a participatory process and gain all the advantages it brings, you have to figure out who the stakeholders are, which of them need to be involved at what level, and what issues they may bring with them. Stakeholders are those who may be affected by or have an effect on an effort. They may also include people who have a strong interest in the effort for academic, philosophical, or political reasons, even though they and their families, friends, and associates are not directly affected by it. One way to characterize stakeholders is by their relationship to the effort in question. Primary stakeholders are the people or groups that stand to be directly affected, either positively or negatively, by an effort or the actions of an agency, institution, or organization. In some cases, there are primary stakeholders on both sides of the equation: A rent control policy, for example, benefits tenants, but may hurt landlords. Secondary stakeholders are people or groups that are indirectly affected, either positively or negatively, by an effort or the actions of an agency, institution, or organization. A program to reduce domestic violence, for instance, could have a positive effect on emergency room personnel by reducing the number of cases they see. It might require more training for police to help them handle domestic violence calls in a different way. Both of these groups would be secondary stakeholders. Key stakeholders, who might belong to either or neither of the first two groups, are those who can have a positive or negative effect on an effort, or who are important within or to an organization, agency, or institution engaged in an effort. The director of an organization might be an obvious key stakeholder, but so might the line staff â€" those who work directly with participants â€" who carry out the work of the effort. Other examples of key stakeholders might be funders, elected or appointed government officials, heads of businesses, or clergy and other community figures who wield a significant amount of influence. While an interest in an effort or organization could be just that â€" intellectually, academically, philosophically, or politically motivated attention â€" stakeholders are generally said to have an interest in an effort or organization based on whether they can affect or be affected by it. The more they stand to benefit or lose by it, the stronger their interest is likely to be. The more heavily involved they are in the effort or organization, the stronger their interest as well. A few of the more common: An employment training program might improve economic prospects for low-income people, for example. Zoning regulations may also have economic consequences for various groups. An effort to improve racial harmony could alter the social climate for members of both the racial or ethnic minority and the majority. Involving workers in decision-making can enhance work life and make people more satisfied with their jobs. Flexible work hours, relief programs for caregivers, parental leave, and other efforts that provide people with time for leisure or taking care of the business of life can relieve stress and increase productivity. Protection of open space, conservation of resources, attention to climate change, and other environmental efforts can add to everyday life. These can also be seen as harmful to business and private ownership. Free or sliding-scale medical facilities and other similar programs provide a clear benefit for low-income people and can improve community health. Neighborhood watch or patrol programs, better policing in high-crime neighborhoods, work safety initiatives â€" all of these and many other efforts can improve safety for specific

populations or for the community as a whole. Community mental health centers and adult day care can be extremely important not only to people with mental health issues, but also to their families and to the community as a whole. The most important reason for identifying and understanding stakeholders is that it allows you to recruit them as part of the effort. The Community Tool Box believes that, in most cases, a participatory effort that involves representation of as many stakeholders as possible has a number of important advantages: It puts more ideas on the table than would be the case if the development and implementation of the effort were confined to a single organization or to a small group of like-minded people. It includes varied perspectives from all sectors and elements of the community affected, thus giving a clearer picture of the community context and potential pitfalls and assets. It gains buy-in and support for the effort from all stakeholders by making them an integral part of its development, planning, implementation, and evaluation. All stakeholders can have a say in the development of an effort that may seriously affect them. If everyone has a seat at the table, concerns can be aired and resolved before they become stumbling blocks. Having all stakeholders on board makes a huge difference in terms of political and moral clout. It creates bridging social capital for the community. Social capital is the web of acquaintances, friendships, family ties, favors, obligations, and other social currency that can be used to cement relationships and strengthen community. Bridging social capital, which creates connections among diverse groups that might not otherwise interact, is perhaps the most valuable kind. It makes possible a community without barriers of class or economics, where people from all walks of life can know and value one another. A participatory process, often including everyone from welfare recipients to bank officers and physicians, can help to create just this sort of situation. It increases the credibility of your organization. Involving and attending to the concerns of all stakeholders establishes your organization as fair, ethical, and transparent, and makes it more likely that others will work with you in other circumstances. It increases the chances for the success of your effort. For all of the above reasons, identifying stakeholders and responding to their concerns makes it far more likely that your effort will have both the community support it needs and the appropriate focus to be effective. As we discussed, there are primary and secondary stakeholders, as well as key stakeholders who may or may not fall into one of the other two categories. Primary stakeholders Beneficiaries or targets of the effort Beneficiaries are those who stand to gain something â€" services, skills, money, goods, social connection, etc. Targets are those who may or may not stand to gain personally, or whose actions represent a benefit to a particular usually disadvantaged population or to the community as a whole. A particular population â€" a racial or ethnic group, a socio-economic group, residents of a housing project, etc. Residents of a particular geographic area â€" a neighborhood, a town, a rural area. People experiencing or at risk for a particular problem or condition â€" homelessness, lack of basic skills, unemployment, diabetes. People involved or participants in a particular organization or institution â€" students at a school, youth involved in the justice system, welfare recipients. Policy makers and agencies that are the targets of advocacy efforts. Secondary Stakeholders Those directly involved with or responsible for beneficiaries or targets of the effort These might include individuals and organizations that live with, are close to, or care for the people in question, and those that offer services directly to them. Among these you might find: Parents, spouses, siblings, children, other family members, significant others, friends. Schools and their employees â€" teachers, counselors, aides, etc. Doctors and other medical professionals, particularly primary care providers. Social workers and psychotherapists. Health and human service organizations and their line staff â€" youth workers, welfare case workers, etc. Community volunteers in various capacities, from drivers to volunteer instructors in training programs to those who staff food pantries and soup kitchens. Those whose jobs or lives might be affected by the process or results of the effort Some of these individuals and groups overlap with those in the previous category. Police and other law or regulation enforcement agencies. New approaches to violence prevention, dealing with drug abuse or domestic violence, or other similar changes may require training and the practice of new skills on the part of members of these agencies. Emergency room personnel, teachers, and others who are legally bound to report possible child abuse and neglect or other similar situations. Open-space laws, zoning regulations, and other

requirements, as well as incentives, may affect how, where, and what contractors and developers choose to build. Ordinary community members whose lives, jobs, or routines might be affected by an effort or policy change, such as the location of a homeless shelter in the neighborhood or changes in zoning regulations. Key stakeholders Government officials and policy makers These are the people who can devise, pass, and enforce laws and regulations that may either fulfill the goals of your effort or directly cancel them out. Federal and state or provincial representatives, senators, members of parliament, etc. The executives that carry out laws, administer budgets, and generally run the show can contribute greatly to the success â€" or failure â€" of an effort. Boards of health, planning, zoning, etc. Government agencies often devise and issue regulations and reporting requirements, and can sometimes make or break an effort by how they choose to regulate and how vigorously they enforce their regulations. Those who can influence others The media People in positions that convey influence. Clergy members, doctors, CEOs, and college presidents are all examples of people in this group. Community leaders â€" people that others listen to. Those with an interest in the outcome of an effort Some individuals and groups may not be affected by or involved in an effort, but may nonetheless care enough about it that they are willing to work to influence its outcome. Many of them may have a following or a natural constituency â€" business people, for instance â€" and may therefore have a fair amount of clout. The business community usually will recognize its interest in any effort that will provide it with more and better workers, or make it easier and more likely to make a profit. By the same token, it is likely to oppose efforts that it sees as costing it money or imposing regulations on it. Organizations and individuals who have a philosophical or political interest in the issue or population that an effort involves may organize to support the effort or to defeat it. People with academic or research interests related to a targeted issue or population. Their work may have convinced them of the need for an intervention or initiative, or they may simply be sympathetic to the goals of the effort and understand them better than most. When widespread community support is needed, the community as a whole may be the key stakeholder. When should you identify stakeholders and their interests? Regardless of the purpose of your effort, identifying stakeholders and their interests should be among the first, if not the very first, of the items on your agenda. If you want to involve stakeholders in a participatory process, the reasons are obvious. They should be part of every phase of the work, so that they can both contribute and take ownership. Their knowledge of the community and understanding of its needs can prove invaluable in helping you to avoid mistakes in your approach and in the people you choose to involve. If your intent is a participatory action research project, stakeholders should be included in any assessment and pre-planning activities as well as planning and implementation. If you want your process to be regarded as transparent, stakeholder involvement from the beginning is absolutely necessary. In situations where there are legal implications, such as the building of a development, involving stakeholders from the beginning is both fair and can help stave off the possibility of lawsuits down the road.

Chapter 2 : Program Evaluation Questions | American University

Stakeholders constitute an important resource for identifying the questions a program evaluation should consider, selecting the methodology to be used, identifying data sources, interpreting findings, and implementing recommendations (CDC,).

Each of these stages raises different questions to be answered by the evaluator, and correspondingly different evaluation approaches are needed. Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman suggest the following kinds of assessment, which may be appropriate at these different stages: This includes identifying and diagnosing the actual problem the program is trying to address, who or what is affected by the problem, how widespread the problem is, and what are the measurable effects that are caused by the problem. For example, for a housing program aimed at mitigating homelessness, a program evaluator may want to find out how many people are homeless in a given geographic area and what their demographics are. Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman caution against undertaking an intervention without properly assessing the need for one, because this might result in a great deal of wasted funds if the need did not exist or was misconceived. Needs assessment involves research and regular consultation with community stakeholders and with the people that will benefit from the project before the program can be developed and implemented. Hence it should be a bottom-up approach. In this way potential problems can be realized early because the process would have involved the community in identifying the need and thereby allowed the opportunity to identify potential barriers. The important task of a program evaluator is thus to: First, construct a precise definition of what the problem is. This is most effectively done by collaboratively including all possible stakeholders, i. Including buy-in early on in the process reduces potential for push-back, miscommunication, and incomplete information later on. Second, assess the extent of the problem. Evaluators need to work out where the problem is located and how big it is. Pointing out that a problem exists is much easier than having to specify where it is located and how rife it is. But indicating how many children it affects and where it is located geographically and socially would require knowledge about abused children, the characteristics of perpetrators and the impact of the problem throughout the political authority in question. This can be difficult considering that child abuse is not a public behavior, also keeping in mind that estimates of the rates on private behavior are usually not possible because of factors like unreported cases. In this case evaluators would have to use data from several sources and apply different approaches in order to estimate incidence rates. There are two more questions that need to be answered: Having identified the need and having familiarized oneself with the community evaluators should conduct a performance analysis to identify whether the proposed plan in the program will actually be able to eliminate the need. For example, whether the job performance standards are set by an organization or whether some governmental rules need to be considered when undertaking the task. There are three units of the population: The difference or the gap between the two situations will help identify the need, purpose and aims of the program. Identify priorities and importance In the first step above, evaluators would have identified a number of interventions that could potentially address the need e. This must be done by considering the following factors: And to also assess the skills of the people that will be carrying out the interventions. Identify possible solutions and growth opportunities Compare the consequences of the interventions if it was to be implemented or not. Needs analysis is hence a very crucial step in evaluating programs because the effectiveness of a program cannot be assessed unless we know what the problem was in the first place. However, research in South Africa increasingly shows that in spite of increased education and knowledge, people still often do not practice safe sex. This is why it is important to read research that has been done in the area. Explicating this logic can also reveal unintended or unforeseen consequences of a program, both positive and negative. The program theory drives the hypotheses to test for impact evaluation. Developing a logic model can also build common understanding amongst program staff and stakeholders about what the program is actually supposed to do and how it is supposed to do it, which is often lacking see Participatory impact pathways analysis. Of

course, it is also possible that during the process of trying to elicit the logic model behind a program the evaluators may discover that such a model is either incompletely developed, internally contradictory, or in worst cases essentially nonexistent. This decidedly limits the effectiveness of the evaluation, although it does not necessarily reduce or eliminate the program. An evaluator should create a logic model with input from many different stake holders. Logic Models have 5 major components: Resources or Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Short-term outcomes, and Long-term outcomes [13] Creating a logic model helps articulate the problem, the resources and capacity that are currently being used to address the problem, and the measurable outcomes from the program. Looking at the different components of a program in relation to the overall short-term and long-term goals allows for illumination of potential misalignments. Creating an actual logic model is particularly important because it helps clarify for all stakeholders: Assessment in relation to social needs [7] This entails assessing the program theory by relating it to the needs of the target population the program is intended to serve. If the program theory fails to address the needs of the target population it will be rendered ineffective even when if it is well implemented. Rutman , Smith , and Wholly suggested the questions listed below to assist with the review process. Are the program goals and objectives feasible? Is the change process presumed in the program theory feasible? Are the procedures for identifying members of the target population, delivering service to them, and sustaining that service through completion well defined and suffiient? Are the constituent components, activities, and functions of the program well defined and sufficient? Are the resources allocated to the program and its various activities adequate? Assessment through comparison with research and practice [7] This form of assessment requires gaining information from research literature and existing practices to assess various components of the program theory. The evaluator can assess whether the program theory is congruent with research evidence and practical experiences of programs with similar concepts. Assessing implementation[edit] Process analysis looks beyond the theory of what the program is supposed to do and instead evaluates how the program is being implemented. This evaluation determines whether the components identified as critical to the success of the program are being implemented. The evaluation determines whether target populations are being reached, people are receiving the intended services, staff are adequately qualified. Process evaluation is an ongoing process in which repeated measures may be used to evaluate whether the program is being implemented effectively. This problem is particularly critical because many innovations, particularly in areas like education and public policy, consist of fairly complex chains of action. Many of which these elements rely on the prior correct implementation of other elements, and will fail if the prior implementation was not done correctly. This was conclusively demonstrated by Gene V. Glass and many others during the s. Since incorrect or ineffective implementation will produce the same kind of neutral or negative results that would be produced by correct implementation of a poor innovation, it is essential that evaluation research assess the implementation process itself. Assessing the impact effectiveness [edit] The impact evaluation determines the causal effects of the program. This involves trying to measure if the program has achieved its intended outcomes, i. Program Outcomes[edit] An outcome is the state of the target population or the social conditions that a program is expected to have changed. Thus the concept of an outcome does not necessarily mean that the program targets have actually changed or that the program has caused them to change in any way. Outcome change refers to the difference between outcome levels at different points in time. Program effect refers to that portion of an outcome change that can be attributed uniquely to a program as opposed to the influence of some other factor. Measuring Program Outcomes[edit] Outcome measurement is a matter of representing the circumstances defined as the outcome by means of observable indicators that vary systematically with changes or differences in those circumstances. It further helps you to clarify your understanding of your program. But the most important reason for undertaking the effort is to understand the impacts of your work on the people you serve. This can involve using sophisticated statistical techniques in order to measure the effect of the program and to find causal relationship between the program and the various outcomes. Assessing efficiency[edit] Finally, cost-benefit or cost-efficiency analysis assesses the efficiency of a program. Evaluators outline the benefits and cost of the

program for comparison. An efficient program has a lower cost-benefit ratio. There are two types of efficiency, namely, static and dynamic. While static efficiency concerns achieving the objectives with least costs, dynamic efficiency concerns continuous improvement. Events or processes outside of the program may be the real cause of the observed outcome or the real prevention of the anticipated outcome. Causation is difficult to determine. One main reason for this is self selection bias. For example, in a job training program, some people decide to participate and others do not. Those who do participate may differ from those who do not in important ways. They may be more determined to find a job or have better support resources. These characteristics may actually be causing the observed outcome of increased employment, not the job training program. Evaluations conducted with random assignment are able to make stronger inferences about causation. Randomly assigning people to participate or to not participate in the program, reduces or eliminates self-selection bias. Thus, the group of people who participate would likely be more comparable to the group who did not participate. However, since most programs cannot use random assignment, causation cannot be determined. Impact analysis can still provide useful information. For example, the outcomes of the program can be described. Thus the evaluation can describe that people who participated in the program were more likely to experience a given outcome than people who did not participate. If the program is fairly large, and there are enough data, statistical analysis can be used to make a reasonable case for the program by showing, for example, that other causes are unlikely. Reliability, validity and sensitivity in program evaluation[edit] It is important to ensure that the instruments for example, tests, questionnaires, etc. According to Rossi et al. Sensitivity[edit] The principal purpose of the evaluation process is to measure whether the program has an effect on the social problem it seeks to redress; hence, the measurement instrument must be sensitive enough to discern these potential changes Rossi et al. Only measures which adequately achieve the benchmarks of reliability, validity and sensitivity can be said to be credible evaluations. It is the duty of evaluators to produce credible evaluations, as their findings may have far reaching effects. A discreditable evaluation which is unable to show that a program is achieving its purpose when it is in fact creating positive change may cause the program to lose its funding undeservedly. The steps described are: Evaluating Collective Impact[edit] Though program evaluation processes mentioned here are appropriate for most programs, highly complex non-linear initiatives, such as those using the collective impact CI model, require a dynamic approach to evaluation. Collective impact is "the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem" [20] and typically involves three stages, each with a different recommended evaluation approach: CI participants are exploring possible strategies and developing plans for action.

The sample worksheet 1B (see Table) helped identify the perspectives and needs of the key stakeholders and the implications for designing and implementing the evaluation. Note in the CLPP example that while all stakeholders may applaud efforts to reduce EBLL in children, several stakeholders put priority on outcomes that might or might not.

This Chapter [PDF â€" KB] The program evaluation process goes through four phases â€" planning, implementation, completion, and dissemination and reporting â€" that complement the phases of program development and implementation. Each phase has unique issues, methods, and procedures. In this section, each of the four phases is discussed. Planning The relevant questions during evaluation planning and implementation involve determining the feasibility of the evaluation, identifying stakeholders, and specifying short- and long-term goals. For example, does the program have the clarity of objectives or transparency in its methods required for evaluation? What criteria were used to determine the need for the program? Is the program gathering information to ensure that it works in the current community context? Defining and identifying stakeholders is a significant component of the planning stage. Stakeholders are people or organizations that have an interest in or could be affected by the program evaluation. They can be people who are involved in program operations, people who are served or affected by the program, or the primary users of the evaluation. The inclusion of stakeholders in an evaluation not only helps build support for the evaluation but also increases its credibility, provides a participatory approach, and supplies the multiple perspectives of participants and partners Rossi et al. Stakeholders might include community residents, businesses, community-based organizations, schools, policy makers, legislators, politicians, educators, researchers, media, and the public. For example, in the evaluation of a program to increase access to healthy food choices in and near schools, stakeholders could include store merchants, school boards, zoning commissions, parents, and students. Stakeholders constitute an important resource for identifying the questions a program evaluation should consider, selecting the methodology to be used, identifying data sources, interpreting findings, and implementing recommendations CDC, Once stakeholders are identified, a strategy must be created to engage them in all stages of the evaluation. Ideally, this engagement takes place from the beginning of the project or program or, at least, the beginning of the evaluation. The stakeholders should know that they are an important part of the evaluation and will be consulted on an ongoing basis throughout its development and implementation. The relationship between the stakeholders and the evaluators should involve two-way communication, and stakeholders should be comfortable initiating ideas and suggestions. One strategy to engage stakeholders in community programs and evaluations is to establish a community advisory board to oversee programs and evaluation activities in the community. This structure can be established as a resource to draw upon for multiple projects and activities that involve community engagement. An important consideration when engaging stakeholders in an evaluation, beginning with its planning, is the need to understand and embrace cultural diversity. Recognizing diversity can improve the evaluation and ensure that important constructs and concepts are measured. Evaluation during program implementation could be used to inform mid-course corrections to program implementation formative evaluation or to shed light on implementation processes process evaluation. For community-engaged initiatives, formative and process evaluation can include evaluation of the process by which partnerships are created and maintained and ultimately succeed in functioning. Top of Page Completion â€" Summative, Outcome, and Impact Evaluation Following completion of the program, evaluation may examine its immediate outcomes or long-term impact or summarize its overall performance, including, for example, its efficiency and sustainability. For example, control of blood glucose was an appropriate program outcome when the efficacy of empowerment-based education of diabetes patients was evaluated Anderson et al. In contrast, the number of people who received the empowerment education or any program service would not be considered a program outcome unless participation in and of itself represented a change in behavior or attitude e. Similarly, the number of elderly

housebound people receiving meals would not be considered a program outcome, but the nutritional benefits of the meals actually consumed for the health of the elderly, as well as improvements in their perceived quality of life, would be appropriate program outcomes Rossi et al. Program evaluation also can determine the extent to which a change in an outcome can be attributed to the program. If a partnership is being evaluated, the contributions of that partnership to program outcomes may also be part of the evaluation. The CBPR model presented in Chapter 1 is an example of a model that could be used in evaluating both the process and outcomes of partnership. Once the positive outcome of a program is confirmed, subsequent program evaluation may examine the long-term impact the program hopes to have. For example, the outcome of a program designed to increase the skills and retention of health care workers in a medically underserved area would not be represented by the number of providers who participated in the training program, but it could be represented by the proportion of health care workers who stay for one year. Reduction in maternal mortality might constitute the long-term impact that such a program would hope to effect Mullan, Top of Page Dissemination and Reporting To ensure that the dissemination and reporting of results to all appropriate audiences is accomplished in a comprehensive and systematic manner, one needs to develop a dissemination plan during the planning stage of the evaluation. This plan should include guidelines on who will present results, which audiences will receive the results, and who will be included as a coauthor on manuscripts and presentations. Dissemination of the results of the evaluation requires adequate resources, such as people, time, and money. Finding time to write papers and make presentations may be difficult for community members who have other commitments Parker et al. In addition, academics may not be rewarded for nonscientific presentations and may thus be hesitant to spend time on such activities. Additional resources may be needed for the translation of materials to ensure that they are culturally appropriate. Although the content and format of reporting may vary depending on the audience, the emphasis should be on full disclosure and a balanced assessment so that results can be used to strengthen the program. Dissemination of results may also be used for building capacity among stakeholders.

Chapter 4 : A Practical Guide for Engaging Stakeholders in Developing Evaluation Questions - RWJF

Link evaluation work to the organization's blog.quintoapp.come stakeholders throughout and communicate with blog.quintoapp.com evaluation work to management. Start with small projects involving only a few stakeholders, then widely disseminate findings throughout the organization.

Beverly Peters has written recently about qualitative interviewing and conducting and using focus groups. To build off of qualitative interviews and focus groups, we need to think about what sort of questions we ask in program evaluation. Before we decide what types of data we need qualitative or quantitative we need to know the bigger question of the project: What specific problem does the project or program address? Evaluation questions, similar to research questions in academic research projects, guide the methods and tools used to collect data to understand the problem under investigation. Evaluation questions may seem intuitive, and thus be quickly developed to get to the more detailed program planning. But, without well-developed, relevant, and accurate evaluation questions, developed with stakeholders connected to the problem, projects can move around a problem without addressing the most appropriate issues. Methodologically, evaluation questions focus on varied assessment types. The following list is not exhaustive nor mutually exclusive but provides a framework for thinking about what kind of evaluation you are doing and what generic evaluation questions you may need to ask. Needs assessment, or identifying the surrounding social conditions and need for a program. These questions identify and support the problem that the intervention hopes to address. If the problem is not identifiable by stakeholder communities, projects addressing it will not be successful. Needs assessment evaluation questions may include focus on the significance of the problem, drawing on literature, previous projects, and baseline data with potential stakeholders. Some sample questions are: What are their needs? What specific services are needed? How could those services be provided? Through what mechanisms or arrangements? Program theory assessment, or identifying how the program intends to address the problem. Programs that are already running should have a theory of change, or how they think their intervention will lead to the stated outcome, objective, goal, or impact they hope to see. Program theory assessment evaluation questions should focus on this theory of change to see if there are gaps in logical connections or inaccurate assumptions. Who is the target population? What services do they need? Process evaluation, or how the program addresses the problem, what it does, what the program services are and how the program operates. Process evaluation questions focus on how a program is working, program performance, and involve extensive monitoring. Similarly, formative evaluation questions look at whether program activities occur according to plan or the project is achieving its goals while it is underway. If not, why not? Are activities conducted with the target population? Are there other populations the program should be working with? Is the target population adequately reached by and involved in activities? How does the target population interact with the program? What do they think of the services? The evaluation questions may also be used in summative evaluations which focus on what happened after the program or project completed, i. And what can be learned? What are the outputs, outcomes, objectives, and goals of the project? Are outcomes, objectives, and goals achieved? Do they have negative effects? Assessment of efficiency, or how cost-effective is the program. Is the cost of the services or activities reasonable in relation to the benefits? Are there alternative approaches that could have the same outcomes with less cost? According to Owen and Rogers , there are three levels of evaluation questions at this stage in project planning: Policy level â€" how does, or could, the evaluation impact relevant policy? The evaluator consults with all accessible stakeholders to develop specific questions that the evaluation will seek to answer. According to Rossi, Freeman, and Lipsey , evaluation questions must be: Reasonable and appropriate, or realistic in the given project or program. Answerable, similar to the reasonableness of a question, good evaluation questions must be able to be answered to some degree of certainty. If questions are too vague or broad, or require data that is unavailable or unobservable, they are not answerable. Based on program goals and objectives. A Systematic Approach, 6th Edition.

Chapters 2 and 3. From Evaluation Questions to Evaluation Findings. In Program Evaluation pp. Additional Resources Morra Imas, L. The Road to Results: Designing and conducting effective development evaluations. Report of a study commissioned by the Department for International Development. Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. She is also a Doctoral Candidate in Adult Education and Comparative International Education at Pennsylvania State University and a Visiting Researcher with RET, an international organization providing secondary and post-secondary education to displaced peoples worldwide.

Chapter 5 : Program Evaluation Guide - Step 1 - CDC

Stakeholder mapping and analysis Stakeholders are individuals or organizations that will be affected in some significant way by the outcome of the evaluation process or that are affected by the performance of the intervention, or both.