

HEALTH PROMOTION PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION PH 666, FALL 2006

Division of Health Promotion
Graduate School of Public Health
San Diego State University

Day: Monday, 10:00 am – 12:40 pm
Location: HT 22
Professor: Dr. Karen Coleman
Phone: (619) 594-0559
Office Hours: By appointment only in Hardy Tower 153
e-mail: coleman@mail.sdsu.edu

Please Access the Following Websites Throughout the Course:

PH 666 Course Blackboard Site: <https://blackboard.sdsu.edu/webapps/login>

PH 160 Health Promotion Homeroom: <https://blackboard.sdsu.edu/webapps/login>

There are four required texts for this course:

1. Rossi PH, Lipsey MW, Freeman HE (Eds.). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. 7th edition, Sage Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA. 480 pp., 2003.
2. United Way of America. Measuring Program Outcomes: A Practical Approach. United Way of America, Alexandria, VA. 170 pp., 1996. Item #0989.
3. Timmreck TC. Planning, Program Development, and Evaluation. 2nd edition, Jones & Bartlett Publishers. Sudbury, MA, 238 pp., 2003.
4. Gilmore GD, Campbell MD. Needs and Capacity Assessment Strategies for Health Education and Health Promotion. 3rd edition, Jones & Bartlett Publishers. Sudbury, MA, 267 pp., 2005.

In addition to these texts, Dr. Coleman and guest lecturers will provide articles that will supplement the discussions. These will be handed out in class or posted as downloadable documents on the course blackboard website. **Please let Dr. Coleman know RIGHT AWAY if you are enrolled through open university or you are “sitting in on” the course as you will not be able to access the blackboard website. You must also insure that your email is current for blackboard. Please CHECK the email address that web portal has in your records.**

Course Description: Through lectures, small group projects, guest lectures, and an evaluation project paper, the course will cover the basics of program planning and evaluation. The emphasis in this course will be on program evaluation, as PH 661 and PH 662 are more oriented towards creating and implementing health interventions. However, evaluation cannot be done without planning and ideally the two should be done together, when an organization first begins to put a program together.

One of the cornerstones of this course is the interaction with a community agency in planning and/or implementing evaluation for one or more of its programs. This is a unique aspect of this course, and in particular to Dr. Coleman’s approach to teaching program planning and evaluation. It is anticipated that this part of the course will **require at least 15 hours per week of outside class time** in meetings, research, writing, and presentation work. This will depend upon the needs of the agency.

To assimilate the knowledge in the course, a final program evaluation “paper” will be required and will be due on the day of the scheduled final for this course. These will be done individually. Details about this “final” will be provided later in the course. It will be a take home assignment and you will have two weeks in which to complete it.

HEALTH PROMOTION PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

PH 666, FALL 2006

Learning Objectives:

1. Students will be able to describe the components of theories used in program evaluation, including historical significance, scientific justification, theoretical and empirical grounding, and ethical considerations.
2. Students will be able to create Program Logic Models as presented by the United Way, the Kellogg Foundation, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
3. Students will know the basic types of program evaluation: Formative, Impact, Process, Outcome, and Summative.
4. Students will understand the basic components of a Community Needs and Assets Assessment.
5. Students will have some familiarity with the following program planning and evaluation topics:
 - a. Survey Development (especially from a cross-cultural perspective)
 - b. Cost/Benefit Analysis and Health Economics
 - c. Population Surveillance
 - d. Disparities in Program Evaluation for Underserved Populations
 - e. Evaluation Using Existing Data
6. Students will learn how to work with a community agency to apply course concepts and adjust accordingly to meet the agency's planning and evaluation needs.

Grades: Course grades will be assigned based on each individual's absolute percentage score; grades will not be "curved". Grades will be based on the following percentages of the semester grades earned:

A 96-100	A- 90-95	B+ 87-89	B 84-86	
B- 80-83	C+ 77-79	C 74-76	C- 70-73	F < 70 ?

Incomplete: Medical emergencies verified by practicing clinicians and limited other emergencies will be the basis for an incomplete. Failure to complete assignments on time will result in no credit for the assignment and a lower overall grade point average for the semester. **Attendance** is not required **EXCEPT** during agency project meetings. No make-up exams or quizzes will be scheduled without an **approved** emergency leave.

GRADED MATERIAL

Final "Paper"	~100 points (33%)
Presentation of Agency Project	~100 points (33%)
Agency Project	~ 50 points (17%)
Group Member Ratings	~ 20 points (7%)
Attendance at Scheduled Meetings	~ 30 points (10%)

Final Evaluation "Paper": The final program evaluation "paper" will be assigned two weeks before the December 18, 2006 6 pm deadline. Essentially this last assignment will involve a fictitious agency coming to you for a program evaluation design to add to their program grant. This assignment will be explained in detail in class discussions and in the written assignment given two weeks before the due date. The assignment will be the same for everyone, therefore cheating will be monitored very carefully. All work **MUST** be done individually as this is an exam. **There is now new software that is available to professors which allows us to "check" student work for plagiarism from all sources including the internet and other students.** This should be under the "statement on Cheating and Plagiarism."

Agency Project: This will be the most time consuming portion of the class. Dr. Coleman surveyed several agencies and professors throughout San Diego about their program planning and evaluation needs. Several agencies responded. The first meeting with your group members and the agency to which you have been assigned will be arranged by Dr. Coleman for sometime in the second week of the course. Group

HEALTH PROMOTION PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

PH 666, FALL 2006

assignments will be made based on common interests, schedules, and experience levels. Products from these agency-student group relationships will vary and depend upon the expectations of each agency and needs of each project. The grade for this portion of the course will depend on Dr. Coleman's impressions of each student's contributions to the collaboration and the impressions of the agency about each student or group. These impressions will be written in the form of feedback for each student throughout the course.

In Class Agency Project Presentation: Each project will be presented to the class at the end of the semester by each group. All people in the group will be expected to present. Each presentation will be 15 minutes with 5 minutes of questions. Dates and times as well as details for the content of the presentations will be handed out later in the course.

Group Member Ratings: Another source of feedback about each student's performance within the agency project is group member ratings. These will be collected using rating sheets that each person will receive one week prior to the end of the last day of class. These ratings WILL NOT be distributed to those students who are rated. If a student has a complaint about this portion of the grade for the course, he/she is to discuss the issue with Dr. Coleman directly.

Attendance at Scheduled Meetings: A 30 – 60 minute meeting once per week will be required with Dr. Coleman and each group to discuss the work with each agency project. This is REQUIRED and is part of the attendance grade for the course. This is the only way adjustments can be made in response to students' experiences working with each agency project.

**HEALTH PROMOTION PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION
PH 666, FALL 2006**

COURSE SCHEDULE

DATE	TOPIC	READINGS
9/11/06	Introductory Readings	RLF: Chapters 1 & 3 T: Chapter 1 Levin-Rozalis, M. (2003). Evaluation and research: Differences and Similarities. The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 18, 1 - 31. W. K. Kellogg Foundation. (1998). Evaluation Handbook.
9/18/06	Needs Assessments and Writing Goals and Objectives	RLF: Chapter 4 Review Chapter 3 pages 89 – 91 GC: Chapters 1 & 2 T: Chapters 5 & 4
9/18/06	-----	LAST DAY TO DROP THE COURSE!!!! LAST DAY TO APPLY FOR GRADUATION
9/25/06	Goals and Objectives 'cont	
10/2/06	Program Logic Models	UW: pp. 1 – 58 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1999). Framework for Program Evaluation in Public Health. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 48, 1 - 58. W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (2001). Logic Model Development Guide.
10/9/06	Program Theory and Traditional Behavioral Theories	RLF: Chapter 5 McKenzie, J. F., Neiger, B. L., & Smeltzer, J. L. (2005). Planning, Implementing, and Evaluation Health Promotion Programs: A Primer. Pearson Education Inc., San Francisco, CA. pp. 15 -52.
10/16/06	Theory 'cont	Green, L. W. (1986). Prevention and health education in clinical, school, and community settings. Public Health and Preventive Medicine. Appleton-Century-Crofts Publishers, Norwalk, Conn. Chapter 48, pp. 889 - 904. Patton, M. Q.(1997). Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA. pp. 19 - 38. Fetterman, D. M. (2001). Empowerment Evaluation. Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA. pp. 1 - 44.
10/23/06	Study Design	RLF: Chapter 8, 9, & 10 The World Bank. (2004). Influential Evaluations: Evaluations that Improved Performance and Impacts of Development Programs. pp. 1 - 24.
10/30/06	Quality Assurance AND Evidence-Based Practice	United States General Accounting Office. (1991). Designing Evaluations. pp. 1 - 70. Hatry, H. P., Newcomer, K. E., & Wholey, J. S. (1994). Conclusion: Improving Evaluation Activities and Results. In Wholey, Hatry, & Newcomer (Eds). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA. pp. 590 - 602.
11/1/06	-----	LAST DAY TO TURN IN THESIS TO GRADUATE ON TIME FOR FALL 2005
11/6/06	Study Design 'Cont.	T: Chapters 8, 9, & 10
11/13/06	Process and Outcome	RLF: Chapters 6 & 7 Scheirer, M. A. (1994). Process Evaluation. In Wholey, Hatry, & Newcomer (Eds). Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation,

**HEALTH PROMOTION PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION
PH 666, FALL 2006**

		Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA. pp. 40 - 68.
11/20/06	Measurement Issues	GC: Chapter 3, 4, 5, & 7
11/23 – 11/24/06	THANKSGIVING BREAK	NO CLASSES
11/27/06	Measurement Issues 'Cont.	GC: Appendix G The World Bank. (2004). Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods, and Approaches. pp. 1 - 26. LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). Designing and Conducting Ethnographic Research. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA. pp. 41 - 59. Guba E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth Generation Evaluation. Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA. pp. 156 - 183.
12/4/06	10 Step Planning Model International Settings	T: xxiv & xxv GC: Part V Russon, C. (2000). The Program Evaluation Standards in International Settings. The Evaluation Center Occassional Papers Series. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI. Final Evaluation Paper Assignment Handed Out
12/18/06	FINAL EVALUATION "PAPER"	DUE IN MY MAILBOX, HT 119 OR BY EMAIL BY 6:00 PM

RLF: Rossi PH, Lipsey MW, Freeman HE (Eds.). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. 7th edition, Sage Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA. 480 pp., 2003.

UW: United Way of America. Measuring Program Outcomes: A Practical Approach. United Way of America, Alexandria, VA. 170 pp., 1996. Item #0989.

T: Timmreck TC. Planning, Program Development, and Evaluation. 2nd edition, Jones & Bartlett Publishers. Sudbury, MA, 238 pp., 2003.

GC: Gilmore GD, Campbell MD. Needs and Capacity Assessment Strategies for Health Education and Health Promotion. 3rd edition, Jones & Bartlett Publishers. Sudbury, MA, 267 pp., 2005.

NOTE: Students are held accountable for completing the reading prior to lecture, since questions and discussion of the readings will occur during class.