

**Impact Evaluation – Part II:
Using Logic Models for Evaluation**

**Michael Fagen, Ph.D., M.P.H.
<mfagen1@uic.edu>**

**15th Annual CityMatCH Urban Maternal and Child Health
Leadership Conference**

**Fort Worth, TX
September 11, 2005**

Participant Handouts

1a. Workshop Description

Workshop Prerequisites:

Participation in Impact Evaluation – Part I: Designing Logic Models or understanding of and experience creating logic models.

Workshop Description:

Evaluations are typically conducted to improve the quality of a program or project by identifying its strengths and weaknesses. This session will focus on several evaluation techniques essential to program improvement. Participants will learn how to use logic models and related tools to evaluate program processes and outcomes. Additionally, participants will have the opportunity to use examples from their own agencies and programs during session skill-building exercises.

Workshop Objectives:

By the end of this workshop, participants will:

1. Understand how a logic model is used to guide a program evaluation;
2. Pose sample evaluation questions; and
3. Utilize evaluation questions to sketch a draft evaluation plan.

Presenter Biography:

Dr. Fagen is an Assistant Professor and the Coordinator of Health Education Programs in the Department of Health and Physical Education at Northeastern Illinois University (NEIU). He is currently on leave from NEIU to participate in the Illinois Public Health Research Program, an interdisciplinary fellowship program located at the University of Illinois at Chicago's School of Public Health. Dr. Fagen has provided evaluation consultation for a number of nonprofit agencies and educational entities, including the Illinois Center for Violence Prevention, the Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health, and the Chicago Teachers Center. Dr. Fagen's consulting focuses on the use of evaluation to make data-based programming decisions.

1b. Workshop Agenda

Time	Topic
3:30 – 3:35	1. Workshop Overview
3:35 – 4:00	2. Logic Models – Guiding Program Evaluations
4:00 – 4:15	3. Case Study – Youth Sexuality Program
4:15 – 4:45	4. Exercise – Evaluation Questions and Plan
4:45 – 5:00	5. Questions and Answers

2. Logic Models – Guiding Program Evaluations

Evaluation Planning:

“Evaluation plans create road maps for evaluations. Good evaluation plans outline the when, where, who, and how of the evaluation. Without an evaluation plan, the evaluation will not be optimally organized, and as a result might miss valuable components. Creating an evaluation plan provides an excellent opportunity to engage key stakeholders early in the evaluative process. These stakeholders might include program participants, staff, managers, and funders.

An evaluation plan includes several important components. The first component identifies which indicators will be used to measure the stated outcomes in the objectives (such as crime statistics or school attendance figures). The next component of an evaluation plan specifies how, when, by whom, and how often data will be collected. The final component of an evaluation plan outlines how data will be analyzed, presented, and used.”

Source: Evaluation Resource Institute, 2005

Evaluation Questions - Types:

There are two basic types of evaluation questions:

1. Formative Evaluation Questions – when answered, these questions help you improve your program
2. Summative Evaluation Questions – when answered, these question help you demonstrate whether your program worked the way it was intended to

Formative Evaluation – Improve	Summative Evaluation – Prove
Provides information that helps you improve your program. Generates periodic reports. Information can be shared quickly.	Generates information that can be used to demonstrate the results of your program to funders and your community.
Focuses most on program activities, outputs, and short-term outcomes for the purpose of monitoring progress and making mid-course corrections when needed.	Focuses most on program's intermediate-term outcomes and impact. Although data may be collected throughout the program, the purpose is to determine the value and worth of a program based on results.
Helpful in bringing suggestions for improvement to the attention of staff.	Helpful in describing the quality and effectiveness of your program by documenting its impact on participants and the community.

³ Adapted from Bond, S.L., Boyd, S. E., & Montgomery, D.L.(1997 *Taking Stock: A Practical Guide to Evaluating Your Own Programs*, Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc. Available online at <http://www.horizon-research.com>.

Source: W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2001

Evaluation Questions - Stakeholders:

Audience	Typical Questions	Evaluation Use
Program Management and Staff	Are we reaching our target population? Are our participants satisfied with our program? Is the program being run efficiently? How can we improve our program?	Programming decisions, day-today operations
Participants	Programming decisions, day-today operations Did the program help me and people like me? What would improve the program next time?	Decisions about continuing participation.
Community Members	Is the program suited to our community needs? What is the program really accomplishing?	Decisions about participation and support.
Public Officials	Who is the program serving? What difference has the program made? Is the program reaching its target population? What do participants think about the program? Is the program worth the cost?	Decisions about commitment and support. Knowledge about the utility and feasibility of the program approach.
Funders	Is what was promised being achieved? Is the program working? Is the program worth the cost?	Accountability and improvement of future grantmaking efforts.

Source: W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2001

3. Case Study – Youth Sexuality Program

Organization: “Agency X” is a small nonprofit focusing on adolescent health issues. During its 28 years of existence, Agency X has done program and policy work in a variety of areas related to adolescent health, including teen pregnancy prevention, workforce development, and sexuality education. Agency X was hard hit three years ago by the retirement of its founding executive director and the national economic downturn. These events forced the agency to lay off staff members, diminish programming, and tighten its mission in order to attract new funding sources. Agency X’s new mission is to “promote a positive approach to adolescent sexual health and comprehensive support for young parents”.

Program: The “YP Program” was a three year project created in the year 2000 with approximately \$100,000 per year in funding. The project was designed as “a comprehensive public education and media campaign”, and had two stated goals: (1) to increase access to and use of health and mental health services by adolescents; and (2) to increase awareness and knowledge of adolescent health issues and resources among parents, healthcare providers, and youth service providers. While originally conceived as a media and advocacy campaign, the YP Program rapidly evolved into a health education and prevention program in three high schools. As implemented in 2002-2004, the YP Program became a sex education and youth development program led by a single staff member from Agency X. During the 2004-2005 fiscal year, the YP Program was transformed into a peer sex education program that worked with teams of school-based youth based on logic model and work plan development during summer 2004.

Evaluation: In the context of rapid changes to Agency X’s budget, staffing, and programming, the agency’s executive director and board of directors hired an external evaluator (Festen, 2004) to assess the YP Program in spring 2004. The evaluator reviewed project materials, interviewed 12 program partners (primarily funding agencies), and held two forums with project-engaged youth. After conducting her evaluation, the evaluator recommended that Agency X refocus the project to provide a closer fit between the YP Program and the agency’s mission. Furthermore, the evaluator recommended that the transformed project be structured around specific program objectives and accompanying timetables, budget allocations, and staffing procedures. As a result of these recommendations, key members of the agency’s staff and board created a program logic model and an associated work plan during summer 2004. Currently, the evaluator is collecting data in order to assess the transformed YP program and help improve it during fiscal year 2005-2006. Evaluation data include portfolios of youth work on school-based sex education projects and youth self-reflections on this work. Evaluation results will be connected to the YP Program logic model to ensure that the program’s vision is being implemented; adjustments to the YP Program work plan will be made as necessary.

Inputs

Staff:
 :: Executive Director
 :: Administrative Director
 :: Youth Coordinator
 :: Policy Specialist

Consultants

Youth Leaders:
 :: College Age/ Interns
 :: Paid High School Students

Board Members

Strategic Partners

Space

Equipment:

Activities

Recruitment:
 :: Web
 :: Word of Mouth
 :: Promote among network of like-minded CBOs

Induction:
 :: Data Collection
 :: Mutual Expectation Setting
 :: Plan for Youth’s Development
 :: I.D. Problems/Protocol

<u>Content</u>	<u>Skills</u>
:: Sexual Health	:: Activism
:: Rights	:: Planning
:: Etc.	

Projects:
 :: Campaigns
 :: Fairs
 :: Media
 :: Adult Education
 :: Peer Education
 :: Action Research
 :: Reflection/Evaluation

Theory of Change

:: Recruitment + Induction = Infrastructure for later evaluation

:: Training is the basis for all other activities but achieving short term outcomes independently

:: Best practice in prevention: engaging youth after school = better personal outcomes for youth – connections to adults and institutions do the same

:: High quality training combined with real project work will engage diverse young leaders in achieving mid and long term outcomes

:: Best practice in policy and advocacy - engaging those with the most at stake not only extends reach but also increases impact

Outcomes

Short Term:
 Youth are developed as leaders
 :: increase skills
 :: increase knowledge
 :: real experience and connection to high impact initiatives/ activities (local)

Mid Term:
 Youth leaders make positive/ healthy choices:
 :: sexual health and parenting

Youth leaders influence other youth and adults.

Long Term:
 Improve Adolescent sexual health in Illinois:
 :: youth know and can access rights /resources
 :: youth receive complete sex. ed
 :: youth benefit from teen friendly health care

Improve support for young parents in Illinois:
 :: young parents have the choice/support in how to complete their education
 :: young parents have access to safe housing
 :: young parents have access to income support

Assumptions

- Partnering with youth to do youth work yields great results.
- Decision makers want to hear from youth on their issues.
- Adults respect potential power of youth.
- Sex education improves sexual health.
- Diversity strengthens work.
- Young parents can succeed and build power.
- Youth have the right to grow into sexually healthy adults.

Agency X Work Plan – YP Program

Youth Partnership on Promoting a Positive Approach to Adolescent Sexual Health

Based on our formal evaluation by Marcia Festen, and on four sequential workshops led by board member Michael Fagen with staff, board and youth involvement, Agency X is embarking on a new approach to our work with youth to promote sexual health in their communities, the city, and the state of Illinois.

More detailed information about the philosophy behind our new plan is available, as is our logic model that underpins the plan.

The following is a basic description of our plans for FY 2005, as well as a detailed work plan and timeline.

Recruitment and Induction:

Youth will be recruited in two ways. First, we will offer an annual large-scale training opportunity open to any and all youth in the area, and give them a chance to apply for one of the opportunities described below at the conclusion of that training. Second, we will promote our opportunities for involvement twice annually through an application process that we will market among service learning coaches, school counselors, school based health centers, and other activist or youth serving agencies.

All youth who join Agency X will have a face to face interview with our staff to make sure we know all of their “basic” information (contacts, etc) as well as information about their needs, any issues they may have, and the kinds of things they want to get out of their contact with Agency X. This process will also serve as a mutual goal-setting and expectation setting process. At this time, we will gain “benchmark” information about our new youth participant against which we can later evaluate our success. Data will be kept in a standard format in Filemaker or in a “neat” file.

Projects:

Each school semester, Agency X will select between 2 and 6 youth-led sexual health-related projects and offer the youth leading those projects customized, intensive training and focused technical assistance for the duration of their project. Projects could include (but are not limited to) school-based or community-based advocacy campaigns, health fairs, or action research. The purpose of each project must be to promote a positive approach to adolescent sexual health, but the range of activities within that umbrella is limitless. Based on initial budget estimates, Agency X will financially support projects and help youth raise additional funding if necessary.

Work Plan for FY 2005:

Activity	Deadline	Staff	Issues
Create plan	8/5		
Create marketing tool	8/23		
Create application	8/23		
Design induction tool	8/26		
Flesh out “workshopping” of the project ideas	8/26		
Present to youth at 5- day	8/27		
Create distribution list in case not enough interest at 5-day	8/31		
Send marketing tool and application to list	8/31		
Recruit review team for applications	8/31 – 9/20		
Receive applications	9/20		
Convene team for review, make selections	10/1		
Announce decisions, begin induction process with projects	10/5		
Do project training and T/A	10/5 – 12/15		
Plan second semester	...		

Above and Beyond:

From time to time, all youth working on projects will be offered ad hoc training as opportunities come up or as a need for more in depth training becomes apparent – training on how to navigate the legislative world in Springfield, for example.

Additionally, youth who complete projects and want to remain involved in Agency X can and will be offered opportunities to do so, including opportunities to join our trainer’s bureau, to take larger leadership roles in Agency X campaigns, and to become members of our Board of Directors.

Evaluation:

We plan to engage Marcia Festen to design and conduct an evaluation aligned with our logic model and our induction process.

4. Exercise – Evaluation Questions and Plan

Part I – Evaluation Questions:

Individual:

Think about an organization and program that you are familiar with. Given this context, pose several evaluation questions related to the program you have identified. Ideally, you will pose your evaluation questions for the program whose draft logic model you designed in Workshop I.

Brief Description of Program:		
Evaluation Question	Type – Formative or Summative	Key Audience

Small Group:

Now that you have started to pose some evaluation questions, please share your emerging questions with members of your group. Solicit feedback from your group members, and refine your evaluation questions based on this feedback.

Time permitting, we will hear from several participants regarding their initial evaluation questions.

Part II – Evaluation Plan:

Small Group:

Select one program and its corresponding evaluation questions to work with. For the selected program, work together to sketch a draft evaluation plan using the chart below.

Brief Description of Program:		
Evaluation Question	Key Indicators	Data Collection Methods

Time permitting, we will hear from several participants regarding their initial evaluation plans.

Sources Cited in Workshop

Evaluation Resource Institute [ERI]. (2005). *Seven phases of an evaluation*. Chicago, IL: Illinois Center for Violence Prevention. For more information on the Illinois Center for Violence Prevention and/or the ERI, please visit:
<www.icvp.org>

Festen, M.K. (2004). *Assessment of YP Program*. Chicago, IL: Marcia Festen and Associates. For more information on Marcia Festen and Associates, please visit:
<www.festen.net>

W. K. Kellogg Foundation. (2001). *Logic model development guide*. Battle Creek, MI: Author.