I. SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION

Program evaluation is an unbiased exploration of a program’s merits, including its effectiveness, quality, and value. An effective program provides substantial benefits to individuals, delivery systems, communities, and populations and these benefits are greater than their human and financial costs. A high-quality program meets its users’ needs and is based on sound theory and the best available research evidence. A program’s value is measured by its worth to individuals, the community, and society.

This course will provide students with an understanding of the critical role of systematic evaluation in assessing the effectiveness of health services, programs, policies, and other health-related interventions. Students will learn a systematic approach to conceptualize, design, implement, and evaluate the impact of a new or existing program, service, product, policy, or organizational change intervention. Students will be exposed to the basic theoretical concepts as well as the methodology of program evaluation. The primary focus will be on practical application of evaluation principles and methods.

The first month of the class will be dedicated to: (1) conceptualizing, analyzing, and applying evaluation design, and (2) completing an individual literature review assignment that will be used to build the team proposal in the second part of the course.

The second month of the class will be dedicated to covering and incorporating all topics required for completing the team proposal. We take an applied learning approach in the second hour of each class to meet with the teams and to apply the didactic learnings in each session.
The final two weeks of the course will be dedicated to presenting the final team evaluation design proposals, synthesizing course learning, and assessing new levels of competency and implications for future professional development.

**Appendix I** outlines the Course Learning Objectives and MPH competencies for this course. Specific learning activities will provide students with the competency to practice evaluation and/or interact with professional evaluators at entry-level career. Learning objectives and competencies will be assessed through self-rating, performance on individual and team assignments, in-class examination, class participation, and verbal and written communication and presentation. Overall, in the Master’s program the MPH students in HPM are tested on Domains A-F. Management students are also tested on Domain K and Policy students on Domain L: [http://ph.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/Competencies%20for%20FSPH%20degree%20programs%20may0815.pdf](http://ph.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/Competencies%20for%20FSPH%20degree%20programs%20may0815.pdf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Distinguish between various types of evaluations and their appropriate applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Assess the advantages and disadvantages of the various experimental and non-experimental evaluation designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Identify a researchable evaluation question/problem through professional communication with an existing health care provider, subject matter expert, or community-based organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Select and apply statistical concepts in the evaluation of programs/policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Develop a written and oral evaluation proposal of a program that includes conceptualization, design, implementation and impact assessment, and the use of evaluation results to inform policy, delivery system, intervention/program, population health improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Center for Accessible Education (CAE)**
Students needing academic accommodations based on a disability should contact the Center for Accessible Education (CAE) at (310)825-1501 or in person at Murphy Hall A255. When possible, students should contact the CAE within the first two weeks of the term as reasonable notice is needed to coordinate accommodations. For more information visit [www.cae.ucla.edu](http://www.cae.ucla.edu)

### II. COURSE ASSIGNMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Percent of Total Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Class Participation and Attendance</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>AskCHIS Data Assignment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Individual Literature Review Paper</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Team Proposal: Final Paper</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Team Proposal: Individual Presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Mid-Term Exam</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Peer-Evaluation Rating</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Class Participation and Attendance (10-points)

The general format for the course is learning community. Hence, it is necessary to be present and engaged to participate. In general the two-hour class will be divided into:

➢ 10-11 AM: Lectures on program development and evaluation design theory, methods, and practice

➢ 11-12 Noon: Applied learning: major features of evaluation design and problem solving, real world evaluation design reported in the peer-reviewed literature, individual literature review, team evaluation design proposals and presentations

Attendance will be recorded at each session and attending team meetings and presentations at the end of the quarter is required and will be figured into the final grade.

II. Initial AskCHIS Assignment (Team Assignment) (5 points)

Up to Eight (8) teams consisting of ~5 students each will be formed on the first day of class, **Monday, April 3.** On **Wednesday April 5** the teams will make their final CHIS subtopic selection for the Individual Lit Review papers and the Team Evaluation Design Proposal.

The teams will select their top 3 AskCHIS health topics during the first class. Each individual on the team will register for AskCHIS:

(1) After you have completed registration for AskCHIS, you will download the Excel template from our CCLE site to record your top 3 health subtopics. For each subtopic, you will be prompted to record the following information:

(a) Topic
(b) Target Population(s)
(c) Geographic Area(s)
(d) CHIS Data Availability?
(e) CHIS Data Characteristics (What information does it provide? Type of data?)
(f) *Additional Information (What information is missing?)
(g) *External Data Sources (Are there other data sources for your topic? Why would you use this data instead of AskCHIS data?)
(h) *Expert Consultation (Are there experts here at UCLA or in the LA area that can
advise you?)

(2) You will be able to complete this assignment on our CCLE site as Appendix II under Course Logistics.

(3) Please submit the assignment (a.-e.) as a pdf document on CCLE.

(4) *Plan to add assignment (f.-h.) as an appendix to the Literature Review assignment on Monday, May 1.

Appendix II outlines AskCHIS registration information, optional areas for developing an evaluation design, and procedures for access to public use versus confidential data files. The team should start by analyzing baseline AskCHIS data for their team evaluation proposal.

III. Individual Literature Review Paper (foundation for the Team Evaluation Design Proposal) (30-points)

At the end of the first month each student will submit a literature review paper with an executive summary. The primary goal of conducting database search and preparing a literature review is to teach students how to identify and evaluate reliable and pertinent research to include in their evaluation proposals. Reliable research meets scholarly standards. Pertinent research provides students with the knowledge and understanding they need to select research questions that meet the patient/population/community needs and answers them in a transparent and unbiased manner.

Each student will address all the subtopic(s) listed below including executive summary, with an emphasis on #5 evaluation design.

Each student on the team should identify 10 unique evaluation design studies for a total of 50 journal articles (per 5 team members). If the literature review does not yield 50 evaluation design articles, please discuss with the instructors.

***Refer to Session 2 (April 5) Slides for Literature Review Specifications

This assignment will receive an “individual” grade only. The electronic and hardcopy literature review papers are due in class on Monday, May 1. Late papers will lose points.

IV. Team Evaluation Design Proposal: Final Paper/30 and V. Individual Presentation/10 (40-points)

About half way through the term (May 1), you will begin work on the Team Evaluation Design Proposal. Each team must determine an evaluation design for their proposal; we prefer a mix of designs in the class to compare and contrast: (1) experimental, (2) quasi-experimental, or (3) pre-experimental. Each team will develop and present the design to the entire class. Your written contribution to the team proposal can earn up to 30 points. Your individual oral presentation can earn up to 10 points. An outline for the written component of the team
Your team will return to the Ask CHIS website and prepare an analysis of baseline data for the evaluation design. In selecting data for the evaluation design you have the option of generating comparable baseline data at multiple points in time and by various geographic areas. You will also suggest new data (quantitative and qualitative) that will need to be collected as part of the proposal. using the Oral Report outline provided below.

The literature review should inform the team regarding the types of interventions that have been tested previously. You can either evaluate an existing program or policy change, or you can propose a new program. As a group, you will develop specific aims for the study, and propose the study population, sampling design, evaluation design, measures, and data analysis plan. Policy, programmatic, intervention, and population relevance and limitations of the design must also be discussed. The proposal will also include a detailed budget. At the end of the term, each group will give a Powerpoint presentation that summarizes the proposal and the major features.

**Appendix III** summarizes the outline for the Team Evaluation Design Proposal.

Your team’s oral presentation should cover the following:

**Oral report:**
1. Title
2. Purpose/ Description of the program
3. Evaluation Question(s) and Purpose
4. Description of participants -- units of observation
5. Description of independent and outcome measures
6. Description of evaluation design & rationale for selection
7. Threats to internal and external validity
8. Budget/ Budget Justification
9. How findings might be used for improving within the four sections of the health pyramid: direct health services, enabling services, population-based services, and/or infrastructure.

**Maximum presentation time** (TBD will be based on number of presentation days and the final number of teams); **Use visual aids**

**VI. Mid-Term Exam (10-points)**

This in-class, closed book exam will focus on evaluation design. You will be given several evaluation design scenarios to analyze. Using Campbell and Stanley notation and narrative description, you will be asked to: (a) propose different designs that might be used to evaluate a program’s effectiveness, (b) discuss strengths and weaknesses of each design in terms of internal and external validity, and (c) select the strongest design that is also feasible and practical to implement. More information will be provided in advance of the exam.

**VII. Peer-Evaluation Rating (5-points)**

Multi-rater peer evaluation is one method for assessing individual performance on a team. Your
assessment of your peer’s participation in preparing the Team Proposal will serve as input to the instructors for determining final course grades. Similarly, your team members will rate your participation and performance on the team.

**OPTIONAL: CITI Program HIPAA and Ethics Training**

It is recommended that students will complete the information privacy and research ethics training modules on the CITIprogram.org website. This certification can be used in future settings, for other courses, and can be added to your resume.

**Maximum course credit is 100 possible points (70% is individual performance and 30% is team performance). The student’s letter grade will be determined as follows:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>LETTER GRADES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98 – 100</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 – 97</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 – 94</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 – 89</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 – 87</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 82</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 – 79</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 – 77</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – 72</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 70</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excellent work showing mastery of principles and extra effort on design is required for an A. Good, solid work is required for a B. It is possible to get below a B.

**READINGS**

The text is available in the HEALTH SCIENCES BOOK STORE and the readings will be available in PDF format from the course website. The required text for this course is:

The required supplementary readings will be posted on the website in advance of the classes.