

**Health Policy and Management 423
Spring 2016**

Advanced Evaluation Theory and Methods for Health Services

- Instructor:** Beth Glenn, Ph.D.
- Class Time:** Tuesday & Thursday, 10:00 a.m. – 11:50 a.m.
Discussion Session: Tuesday, 9:00 a.m. – 9:50 a.m.
- Room:** CHS 61-235
- Office Hours:** Beth Glenn, PhD
Thursdays 12 p.m.-2 p.m. or by appointment,
Center for Cancer Prevention and Control Research
A2-125 CHS
(310) 206-9715
bglenn@ucla.edu
- Special Reader:** Adriane Wynn, MPP
Office hours by appointment
adriane.wynn@g.ucla.edu
- Course Website:** <https://ccle.ucla.edu/course/view/15S-HLTPOL423-1>
- Required Reading:** David Grembowski. *The Practice of Health Program Evaluation*.
Sage Publications, Inc.: Thousand Oaks, Ca (2001)
ISBN-13: 9780761918479
(On Reserve at the Bio-Med Library)
- Donald Campbell and Julian Stanley. *Experimental and Quasi-
Experimental Designs for Research*.
ISBN-13: 9780395307878
Houghton Mifflin/Cengage (1963)
(On Reserve at the Bio-Med Library)
- Journal articles listed on the course website.
Additional readings will be periodically assigned.

Course Description

The objective of this course is to provide students with an in-depth understanding of the critical role of systematic evaluation in assessing the effectiveness of health services programs and policies. Students will become familiar with current theoretical concepts in evaluation and gain skills in integrating theory into program implementation and evaluation design. A primary focus of the course will be on developing students' ability to apply various evaluation methodologies most appropriate to a variety of settings both within and outside of health care and public health and consider the advantages and disadvantages of potential designs. Students will also become familiar with the shift in the field of evaluation over the past decade from a principal focus on program efficacy (i.e., internal validity) to a more balanced approach considering efficacy in the context of feasibility, reach, cost, and sustainability (i.e., external validity) and evaluation designs that have emerged as a result (e.g., pragmatic and adaptive trials).

Development of an "impact" evaluation proposal applied to a "real world" setting will be one of the major course assignments. Each student should plan to select a program site by the Thursday of the second week of classes. In consultation with a site preceptor (administrator, etc.), the student will identify a researchable evaluation question/problem. All potential sites and research questions must be approved by the instructor. Each student will design/develop an "impact" evaluation proposal to address the identified problem/question. Whether or not an actual evaluation is carried out during the quarter will depend upon the nature of the design and the circumstances at the particular site. The design, however, must be feasible and realistic. A written report and oral presentation of the evaluation design are expected. A copy of the written report must be provided to the preceptor.

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to distinguish between various types of evaluations and their appropriate applications; assess the advantages and disadvantages of the various pre-experimental, quasi-experimental and experimental evaluation designs as applied to specific contexts and settings; understand how aspects of measurement including reliability and validity of measures among others may affect evaluation; and understand the concepts of cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness. Upon completion of this course, students should be able to conduct an evaluation of a program or policy including: conceptualization, integration of a theoretical perspective, design, implementation and monitoring of the program, and the use of information obtained to evaluate the impact of a program or policy.

Evaluation of Student Performance

15%	In-class presentation of assigned reading and other periodic assignments
30%	Final Examination (May 26, 2015)
35%	Written proposal (Due by 5pm, June 4, 2015)
10%	Oral presentation
10%	Attendance and class participation

Schedule of Topics+

- March 31 Introduction and Course Overview
Grembowski- Chapters 1 & 2
- April 2 Needs Assessment and Program Monitoring
Grembowski- Chapters 3 & 6
Readings 1, 2, 3, 4
- April 7 Overview of Impact Assessment & Intro to Pre-Experimental Designs
Grembowski- Chapter 4 (65-83)
Campbell and Stanley – p.1-13
- April 9* Pre-experimental Designs cont.
Grembowski- Chapter 4 (p.65-82)
Readings 5, 6, 7
- April 14 Experimental Designs
Grembowski- Chapter 4 (p.83-89)
Campbell and Stanley – p.13-33
Reading 8
- April 16* Experimental Designs
Readings 9, 10
- April 21 Experimental Designs
Reading 11
- April 23 Group Discussion of Project Ideas
- April 28 Quasi-experimental Designs
Grembowski- Chapter 4 (p.89-108)
Campbell and Stanley – p.34-70
- Classic Quasi-Experimental Studies
Readings 12, 12a
- April 30* Quasi-experimental Designs (Classic Studies cont.)
Reading 13

Schedule of Topics (continued)

- May 5 Quasi-experimental Designs
Reading 14,15
- May 7 Quasi-experimental Designs
Readings 16, 17, 18
- May 12 Mixed Methods for Evaluation
Readings 19, 20
- May 14 Enhancing External Validity in Evaluation Research via Emerging Designs
Readings 21, 22
- May 19 Enhancing External Validity (cont.)
Reading 23
- May 21 Lecture Wrap-Up

Exam Review
- May 26 EXAM**
- May 28 Student Presentations
- June 2 Student Presentations

Exam Review
- June 4 Student Presentations

&
FINAL PROPOSALS DUE by 5 p.m. on June 4, 2015
Late proposals will be penalized by reducing the earned grade to the next lower step (e.g., A- will be reduced to a B+). The penalty will accumulate for each additional late day.

*Homework due
+ We will progress through the Schedule of Topics in the order indicated. We will not begin discussion of a reading in advance of the Schedule, but will likely fall behind from time to time.

Advanced Evaluation Theory and Methods for Health Services

HEALTH POLICY AND MANAGEMENT 423 – Spring 2015

Required Readings

Needs Assessment and Program Monitoring

1. Stokley S, Cohn A, Dorell C, Hariri S, Yankey D, Messonnier N, Wortley PM. (2011). Adolescent vaccination-coverage levels in the United States: 2006-2009. *Pediatrics*, 128(6):1078-1086.
2. Reiter PL, Cates JR, McRee AL, Gottlieb SL, Shafer A, Smith JS, Brewer NT. (2010). Statewide HPV vaccine initiation among adolescent females in North Carolina. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, 37(9):549-556.
3. Gottlieb SL, Brewer NT, Sternberg MR, Smith JS, Ziarnowski K, Liddon N, Markowitz LE. (2009). Human papillomavirus vaccine initiation in an area with elevated rates of cervical cancer. *Journal Adolescent Health*, 45(5):430-437.
4. Swartz SH, Cowan TM, Klayman JE, Welton MT, Leonard BA. (2005). Use and effectiveness of tobacco telephone counseling and nicotine therapy in Maine. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 29(4):288-294.

Pre-Experimental Designs

5. Zack JE, Garrison T, Trovillion E, Clinkscale D, Coopersmith CM, Fraser VJ, Kollef MH. (2002). Effect of an education program aimed at reducing the occurrence of ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Critical Care Medicine*, 30(11):2407-12.
6. *Armour BS, Friedman C, Pitts M, Wike J, Alley L, Etchason J. (2004). The influence of year-end bonuses on colorectal cancer screening. *The American Journal of Managed Care*, 10(9):617-624.
7. Young GJ, Meterko M, Beckman H, Baker E, White B, Sautter KM, Greene R, Curtin K, Bokhour BG, Berlowitz D, Burgess JF. (2007). Effects of paying physicians based on their relative performance for quality. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 22(6):872-876.

Experimental Designs

8. Clemson L, Cumming RG, Kendig H, Swann M, Heard R, Taylor K. (2004). The effectiveness of a community-based program for reducing the incidence of falls in the elderly: A randomized trial. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 52(9):1487-1494.
9. *Simons-Morton BG, Bingham CR, Ouimet MC, Pradhan AK, Chen R, Barretto A, Shope JT. (2013). The effect on teenage risky driving of feedback from a safety monitoring system: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 2013 Jan 31, Epub ahead of print.

10. Bastani R, Mojica CM, Berman BA, Ganz PA. (2010). Low-income women with abnormal breast findings: Results of a randomized trial to increase rates of diagnostic resolution. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers and Prevention*, 19(8):1927-1936.
11. Baicker, K., Taubman, S.L., Allen, H.L., Bernstein, M., Gruber, J.H., Newhouse, J.P., Schneider, E.C., Wright, B.J., Zaslavsky, A.M., Finkelstein, et al. (2013). The Oregon Experiment — Effects of Medicaid on Clinical Outcomes, *New England Journal of Medicine*, 368: 1713-1722

Quasi-Experimental Designs (Classic Evaluations)

12. Kotelchuck M, Schwartz JB, Anderka MT, Finison KS. (1984). WIC participation and pregnancy outcomes: Massachusetts statewide evaluation project. *American Journal of Public Health*, 74(10):1086-1092.
- 12a. Rush D. (1984). Some comments on the Massachusetts WIC evaluation. *American Journal of Public Health*, 74(10):1145-1146.
13. *Bickman L. (1996). A continuum of care: More is not always better. *American Psychologist*, 51(7):689-701.
14. Payne SMC, Ash A, Restuccia JD. (1991). The role of feedback in reducing medically unnecessary hospital use. *Medical Care*, 29(8 Suppl):AS91-AS106.
15. Schriger DL, Barraff LJ, Rogers WH, Cretin S. (1997). Implementation of clinical guidelines using a computer charting system: Effect on the initial care of health care workers exposed to body fluids. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 278(19):1585-1597.
16. Dowding DW, Turley M, Garrido T. (2012). The impact of an electronic health record on nurse sensitive patient outcomes: an interrupted time series analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 19(4):615-620.
17. Fuller D, Sahlqvist S, Cummins S, Ogilvie D. (2011). The impact of public transportation strikes on use of a bicycle share program in London: Interrupted time series design. *Preventive Medicine*, 54(1):74-76.
18. Coates TJ, Kulich M, Celentano DD, Zelaya CE, Chariyalertsak S, et al (2014). Effect of community based voluntary counselling and testing on HIV incidence and social and behavioural outcomes (NIMH Project Accept; HPTN 043): a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Global Health*, Published Online: April 9, 2014.

Mixed Methods in Evaluation Research

19. Curry LA, Nembhard IM, Bradley EH. (2009). Qualitative and mixed methods provide unique contributions to outcomes research. *Circulation*, 119(10):1442-1452.
20. Chang LW1, Kagaayi J, Arem H, Nakigozi G, Ssempijja V, Serwadda D, Quinn TC, Gray RH, Bollinger RC, Reynolds SJ. (2011). Impact of a mHealth intervention for peer health workers on

AIDS care in rural Uganda: a mixed methods evaluation of a cluster-randomized trial. *AIDS and Behavior*, 15 (8): 1776-1784.

Enhancing External Validity in Evaluation Research via Emerging Designs

21. Kessler, R., Glasgow, R.E. (2011). A Proposal to Speed Translation of Healthcare Research Into Practice Dramatic Change Is Needed, *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 40 (6): 637-644.
22. Glenn BA, Bastani R, Maxwell AE. (2013). The perils of ignoring design effects in experimental studies: Lessons from a mammography screening trial. *Psychology and Health*, 28 (5): 593-602.
23. Krist, A.H., Glenn, B.A., Glasgow, R.E., Balasubramanian, B.A., Chambers, D.A., Fernandez, M.E. Heurtin-Roberts, S., Kessler, R., Ory, M.G., Phillips, S.M., Ritzwoller, D.P., Roby, D.H., Rodriguez H.P., Sabo, R. T., Sheinfeld Gorin, S.N., Stange, K.C., and MOHR Study Group. (2013). Designing valid randomized pragmatic primary care implementation trial: the My Own Health Report (MOHR) Project, *Implementation Science*, Published online June 25, 2013.

HEALTH POLICY AND MANAGEMENT 423 – Spring 2015

Beth Glenn, PhD

Guidelines for Evaluation Project Proposal

(15-20 typewritten, double-spaced pages with at least 12-point font)

General Overview

Include the following sections in your paper: Background, Design, Sample, Data Collection, Threats to Validity and Implications. Devote no more than 1-2 pages to the background section. **The bulk of your paper should be on the threats to validity.**

NOTE: Two copies of the final paper should be submitted on June 4. One hard copy should be submitted for grading, by 5 pm on June 4, 2015. A second copy of the written report must be provided to the preceptor or a grade will not be submitted for the course. This can be done by emailing the report to the preceptor and copying the course the special reader. Or it may be submitted together with the “grading copy”, in hard copy form, with an unsealed, stamped, manila-mailing envelope addressed to the preceptor.

Specific points to cover in your paper

1. **Cover page to include ALL of the following:**
 - a. Title of paper, HS 423, Spring 2015
 - b. Student’s first and last name, e-mail address and phone number
 - c. Preceptor’s first and last name, title, e-mail address, phone and fax numbers
 - d. Name of the sponsoring organization, street address, city, state and zip code
2. Background, introduction, statement of the problem, etc. (no more than 1 page)
3. State the causal and intervention hypotheses.
4. Describe, in general, the outcomes of interest.
5. Describe the intervention, i.e. the program or policy whose effect you will be evaluating. What is the target population of the intervention? (no more than 1 page)
6. Describe and critically comment on any needs assessment that was performed (or planned) before the intervention was (is) implemented. If no needs assessment was performed (or planned) describe what questions you would have asked in a needs assessment. What methods would you have used to obtain this information? (no more than 1 page)

7. Describe and critically comment on any monitoring activities that are in place or planned. If none are planned or in place, describe what you would recommend. Be specific regarding the methods you would employ. (no more than 1 page)
8. Describe the evaluation design you have chosen and include a diagram using Rs, Xs and Os. What Campbell and Stanley design does it most closely resemble? Describe any modifications from a standard design and provide your reasons for making the modifications. Clearly specify the independent (predictor) and dependent (outcome) variables?
9. How will the outcomes/dependent variable(s) be measured? Comment on the reliability and validity of the measures.
10. Will you be measuring any other variables such as control variables that could influence the outcome?
11. What (if any) is the sampling process you will use?
12. Describe in general terms the analytic methods you will use on the data.
13. Discuss in detail how **EACH** of the threats to internal and external validity apply to your study design. Do not simply state whether a particular threat is present or absent. Give specific reasons for why this is so in your case. For example, if you think that “history” is an issue in your design, give an illustration of a specific historical factor that could bias the conclusions you may be able to draw regarding the effectiveness of the intervention. **This section should be the bulk of your paper.**
14. What are the implications of your study/evaluation for: (a) the program or organization and (b) administrators of other similar programs or organizations?

Oral Presentations

You will have 10 minutes to describe the evaluation you designed. Please include the following PowerPoint slides in your presentation (limit to 7 slides):

1. Question or problem (1 slide)
2. Intervention or program (1-2 slides)
3. Design (1 slide)
4. Threats to validity (2-3 slides)

NOTE: Finalized PowerPoint slides must be submitted to Dr. Glenn by 5pm on the day before each student's scheduled presentation day. You may include a cover slide if you wish.

Learning Objectives	HPM PhD/MS Program Competencies	How Evaluated / Assessed
1) Distinguish between various types of evaluations and their appropriate applications	5) Describe the strengths and weaknesses of study designs to appropriately address specific health services research questions	1. Homework Assignments 2. In-class presentation of assigned reading 3. Final Exam 4. Written Proposal 5. Oral presentation 6. Class discussion
2) Understand the advantages and disadvantages of the various pre-experimental, quasi-experimental and experimental evaluation designs	5) Describe the strengths and weaknesses of study designs to appropriately address specific health services research questions	1. Homework Assignments 2. In-class presentation of assigned reading 3. Final Exam 4. Written Proposal 5. Oral presentation 6. Class discussion
3) Identify a researchable evaluation question/problem through professional communication with an existing health care institution, health provider, or community-based organization	2) Apply or develop theoretical and conceptual models relevant to health services research 3) Pose relevant and important research questions, evaluate them, and formulate solutions to health problems, practice and policy. 4) Use or develop a conceptual model to specify study constructs for a health services research question and develop variables that reliably and validly measure these constructs. 5) Describe the strengths and weaknesses of study designs to appropriately address specific health services research questions 6) Sample and collect primary health and health care data and/or assemble and manage existing data from public and private sources. 9) Work collaboratively in teams within disciplines, across disciplines, and/or with stakeholders.	1. Written Proposal 2. Oral presentation
4) Develop a written and oral evaluation proposal of a program/policy that includes conceptualization, design, implementation and monitoring of the	4) Use or develop a conceptual model to specify study constructs for a health services research question and develop variables that reliably and validly measure these	1. Written Proposal 2. Oral presentation

program/policy, and the use of evaluation results to inform the program/policy	constructs. 6) Sample and collect primary health and health care data and/or assemble and manage existing data from public and private sources. 10) Effectively communicate the process, findings, and implications of health services research through multiple modalities with stakeholders.	
--	--	--